

INTERNATIONALIZING ILLINOIS:
ENGLISH LANGUAGE POLICY AT UIUC

BY

NATALIE J. MULLEN

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Policy Studies
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2017

Urbana, Illinois

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Cameron McCarthy, Chair
Professor Anne Haas-Dyson
Associate Professor Pradeep Dhillon
Associate Professor Randall W. Sadler

ABSTRACT

This dissertation examines the experiences and perceptions of multilingual international undergraduate students with English language policy at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) in order to better understand the larger issue of language ideology and language practices amid the context of the internationalization of higher education in a hyper-globalized and neoliberal age. This qualitative study uses participant observations, interviews, and document analysis to analyze the language ideologies, language management, and language practices (Spolsky, 2004) that make up the language policy from above and language policy from below (Mortensen, 2014; Preisler 1999) that affect students taking a mandatory English as a Second Language writing course. The study aims to answer the questions: What are the English language policies at this university, and what are the implications of those policies for multilingual international undergraduate students?

The main findings of the research are: 1) English language policies at UIUC are complex, multi-faceted, ad hoc, and often contradictory, leaving students with varying experiences and perceptions; 2) Institutional language ideology at UIUC has language-as-problem orientation and a monoglossic bias that perpetuates English hegemony; 3) Student participants' navigation of language policy at UIUC is heavily influenced by their own language ideologies and previous language policy experiences prior to university life; 4) English-only language policy in official university spaces can be harmful to multilingual international undergraduate students. The findings of this dissertation lead to the conclusion that in order to protect the linguistic human rights of multilingual international undergraduate students, UIUC should work towards a shift in language ideology, both in English language policy from above and from below, that rejects the

hegemony of English and reflects language-as-right and language-as-resource orientations towards language.

Keywords: English language policy, higher education, internationalization, international students, multilingualism, language ideology

*To all of the amazing multilingual international students I met during my time at UIUC.
This research is for you.*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Wow. I can't believe that I wrote a dissertation! It feels like I have been in a fog for months, if not years, during this entire process, and sometimes it was difficult to see through. This is not an end, as I once believed it would be; instead, it is a stepping stone along the way. It has been a humbling journey filled with many realizations: some about myself, and some about the nature of the world in which we live. I got to the other side of this thing because of an amazing support system who believed in me, believed in my calling, and gave me everything I needed in order to make this happen. I will inevitably (and regrettably) leave out names that should be mentioned here, but I want to attempt to acknowledge some of those who contributed to this work of the dissertation and the dissertator along the way.

UIUC (or Illinois, as it prefers to be called), proved to be an amazing place to study and do the work of a Ph.D. I am ever grateful to this institution, and especially to the professors on my committee that agreed to be a part of my dissertating process. My advisor, Dr. Cameron McCarthy, was one of the most encouraging professors I've ever had. From the beginning, he took my ideas about international students and higher education seriously and contributed to them in a way that formed my thinking and writing beyond what I knew possible. I could not have asked for better guidance and support in the process of becoming a scholar. Dr. Anne Haas Dyson opened my eyes to see the injustices that multilingual students face, and helped me understand the importance of and power in qualitative inquiry. She cheered me on in every step of developing this dissertation, taught me how to do research, and gave me confidence that I could do this work and had something valuable to say. Dr. Pradeep Dhillon was the first one to introduce me to the philosophy of language, and in one semester, I learned more about

language than in my entire student career. Saussure, Wittgenstein, Searle, Austin, Kant—her teaching on these thinkers gave me the foundation I needed to feel that I had actually entered the realm of scholarship on language at all. She also challenged me during my first year as a Ph.D. student to remember in my scholarship that globalization is not a new process, but rather one that has been around for the ages. Dr. Randall Sadler, one of my professors when I was getting my Master's in TESL, was the first one ever to encourage me to present at an academic conference. Because of that experience many years ago, I had the confidence to present papers early on in my Ph.D. years. Also, this dissertation research would literally not have happened without his trust and confidence in me, as he made a way for me to conduct my research in the ESL department and gave me his time and knowledge of policies and institutional history. Dr. Sadler, Dr. Dhillon, Dr. Dyson, and Dr. McCarthy—I owe so much to these four professors who took the time to invest in me and believed that I could one day make it to this point.

There are two other very significant professors in my life, without whom I would not have begun a Ph.D. at all. Dr. Wayne Dickerson invested personally in me as a student in his English Phonology course (the best course of its kind in the world), let me teach English pronunciation with him as a master's student, listened to me with care and understanding as I told him about my story that led me to teach ESL, and then made the significant decision to introduce me to his wife, Dr. Lonna Dickerson. I immediately started working with Lonna at Wheaton College to help non-profit workers be better language and culture learners, and discovered my calling. I asked her how I could do that work more permanently, and she said that I needed to get a Ph.D. So, here I am, getting the Ph.D. and working full-time with her at Wheaton. Lonna's (and Wayne's) constant encouragement, support, advice, and prayers

pushed me forward to the finish line, continuously giving me the perspective that the dissertation is not the end; instead, it is just the beginning of what God has in store.

My friends and colleagues in the College of Education propelled me forward with their own goals, pushed my intellectual capacity, helped me solidify ideas, and walked with me through this. My cohort in Global Studies in Education thought with me, wrote with me, and inspired me throughout the research development and writing process (thank you especially to Sophy, Gayoung and Dinah, and to Lisa, who will forever be my writing and thinking buddy). Dr. Dyson's Qualitative Research course classmates were there to encourage me, challenge me, and get me through some very difficult dissertation moments (thank you especially to Amos and Brett for the consistent spreadsheet accountability over several months). The ESL Service Courses department at UIUC were so helpful and gracious in allowing me to do research in and among their department, answering my emails and questions, and letting me into their world of excellent teaching (thanks to Susan and Cassandra, and to Patti for the "DEIL boxes"). So many more colleagues along the way were there to offer kind words, ideas, and a sense of comradery in it all.

I actually have amazing personal friends to thank for helping me with the dissertation process, as well. A few months before the submission deadline, I sent out a general call to my personal friends, begging them to come and sit with me at the coffee shop while I write (a dissertation is a lonely thing to do for an extrovert). To my surprise, many of them took me up on that offer, drove hours to where I was, sat with me, and helped me stay focused and motivated! I offer so many thanks to Michelle, Chelsie, Rachel, Katherine, Tiffany, Amy, Katie, Jo, Fei, Stacey, and my mom Crystal (who "doesn't go to coffee shops to do work"). My friend

Dr. Elise Ahn not only introduced me to the field of Language Policy and Planning, but also hosted me in Wisconsin for a writing retreat, helped me formulate my argument, and helped me make significant progress on my dissertation (Elise, I owe you so much more than coffee). To Val, Stacey, and Jo for spending so many valuable hours editing my writing, I owe you. Thanks to Rachel, Edward, Dipti (pseudonym), and Julian for doing some transcription work when I was desperate for the help. To my friends and colleagues at the Institute for Cross-Cultural Training and the Intercultural Studies Department at Wheaton, thanks so much for holding down the fort while I buried my head in my laptop to get this done. So many of my friends, my faith community, and my family lifted up precious prayers of faith for me and sent timely messages of encouragement, and I am humbled that they cared and showed their love in that way. “The prayer of a righteous person is powerful and effective” (James 5:16, The Holy Bible). I will always, in earnest, say that this dissertation was completed only by the grace of God.

In addition to colleagues, mentors, and friends, my family has been a constant source of support, love, and encouragement. Their excitement to “have a doctor in the family” made me want to push myself harder and not quit. They blessed me with their sincere questions about my dissertation and what I studied, listening with patience as I tried to explain what I do, and always finished the conversations with “Well, we know you can do it! We believe in you! We are praying for you! We are proud of you!”. They sent messages almost on a daily basis with prayers they prayed or a word of encouragement; I cherish my family. To Dad and Janie, thank you for your love, support, phone calls, and believing that it could be done. Thank you to my mom, Crystal Swan-Gravatt and step-father Rick Gravatt, for their support of many kinds during

the last leg of this journey. It has been a blessing, to say the least, to be able to share the daily parts of this dissertation work with you. I know stressed-out Natalie was not easy to handle all of the time! I defend this work on my mother's birthday, so, to my mom: Nothing makes me prouder than to be your daughter. You are the brilliant woman who studied hard and worked hard so that I could be the woman I am who studies and works. I am forever blessed by your legacy, your support, your faith, and your love. Thank you. And to my brother Nathan, who passed away before I completed this Ph.D. thing: Thank you for always being proud of me and selflessly cheering me on to do my best. Your "Way to go, sis!" meant more to me than the applause of an entire crowd.

This dissertation simply would not exist if it were not for the gracious participants. The ESL 115 instructor, "Elise", was an angel and answer to prayer. She is an exceptional ESL instructor and even more exceptional person. Her willingness to let me watch her do her thing in class day after day was generous, and her openness towards me, sharing her perspectives, experiences, and passion for her students was remarkable. I'm also ever-grateful to the other instructors, campus administrators, and interviewee participants that sat with me and helped me figure out the puzzle that is language policy, offering me access to things, spaces, and stories that would otherwise have remained unfound. And then, there are the student participants. They, in particular, showed an incredible openness to me as they willingly and patiently answered question after question—sometimes very personal ones—about their lives, families, and histories, allowing me a glimpse into what it means to enact the role of "international student" at UIUC. They are what is important here in this study, and also what is at stake. This is not research to help recruit more students like them or to help UIUC be a more

prominent player in the neoliberal landscape of international higher education. This work is to bring forward and illuminate the voice of these multilingual students that are often discussed in terms of their economic value for the University, but underestimated at every turn, and even delegitimized as brilliant people who have dreams, aspirations, and humanity, just like every other student at UIUC. Without them and their willingness to let me come alongside them for a semester, this dissertation would not be, and I will forever be indebted to them.

Though, by nature, a dissertation is a student's demonstration of becoming a legitimate scholar, and this dissertation is definitely one that reflects my status as a junior scholar, I do believe that there are valuable things learned through this process of inquiry on English language policy at UIUC and at other U.S. higher education institutions. I believe that this study shows a great injustice that is overlooked on this campus, and that is the injustice of language. There is injustice in how multilingual international undergraduate students are viewed, treated, and made to feel about their own multilingualism, brilliance, and bravery as "international students" at UIUC. It is not right, and it should be addressed immediately in every campus space.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE.....	1
CHAPTER 1: Introduction: UIUC and Language Policy.....	6
CHAPTER 2: Literature Review.....	23
CHAPTER 3: Methods and Procedures: A Qualitative Study.....	46
CHAPTER 4: Language Policy from Above: Language-as-Problem.....	81
CHAPTER 5: Language Policy from Below: Languageing and the Languageers.....	130
CHAPTER 6: Conclusion: Towards Language-as-Resource.....	246
References.....	275
APPENDIX A: Student Participant Chart.....	288
APPENDIX B: ESL 115 Suggested Course Syllabus.....	290
APPENDIX C: ESL 115 First Day Handout.....	294
APPENDIX D: IRB Approval Letter.....	298
APPENDIX E: Interview Protocol for Students.....	299

PREFACE

I'm sitting across from Yangjin sipping on a spring-garden-flavored bubble tea in a café—the same café that I've been interviewing students at for months.¹ He's a freshman in a mandatory writing course for multilingual international undergraduate students that fulfills the composition requirement for a bachelor's degree at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and I'm asking him questions like where he grew up, what his family's like, and how he uses, views, and relates to language. He tells me what every other freshman Chinese international student in his writing class has told me in almost every single interview I have conducted:

Yangjin: I speak English and Chinese.

Me: And by Chinese, you mean...

Yangjin: ...Mandarin.

As another Chinese student told me, "It's really weird that you Americans say Mandarin or Cantonese. I never thought about there being two different Chinese languages until I came here. We just say Chinese". Putonghua is what they are referring to. Transliterated, it means "common spoken language". If I hadn't lived in China for two years and if I didn't know so much about Chinese languages, I probably would have stopped asking about Yangjin's language background when he told me he speaks Mandarin, but, I knew to press further:

Me: Do you know any other dialects?

Yangjin: Yeah, Anyang dialect that sounds completely different from Putonghua. ... It's my native language.

¹ All names of people in this dissertation are pseudonyms unless otherwise noted.

I asked about a “dialect”, not because I believe that he was truly about to tell me that he speaks a dialect which is basically the same language as Mandarin with some minor differences in terms of pronunciation and vocabulary, but because I have heard many Chinese people over the years reference minority languages in terms of “dialects” and not languages.²

Yangjin goes on to say, “But in my home, we only speak Chinese”. If I hadn’t lived in China for two years and if I didn’t know so much about Chinese languages, and if I didn’t know so much about modern Chinese family structure from all of my Chinese friends and former students in China, I could have stopped there. But, I knew to press further: “You say you are from Anyang province? Did you grow up there?” “Yes”, he says. “Do your grandparents live with you?” A little surprised I asked that question, he answers, “Well, kind of.” He goes on to explain a typical Chinese family story that I heard many times in my other interviews with students: his grandparents, who are from a smaller village, moved to the larger city when he was born to take care of him so both of his parents could work. I inquire again: “Do your grandparents speak Mandarin?” He tells me no, and says that there are sometimes language barrier issues in the household because of this. His father speaks Anyanghua (Anyang dialect), but not well, he says. “Do your parents know that you can speak Anyanghua?” I asked Yangjin. A slow smile creeps across his face as he thinks for a moment. “They don’t know I can speak Anyanghua”, he replies firmly, looking me directly in the eyes. “They don’t speak dialect to me when I was young cause they don’t want me to learn it”. “Did they say that?” I ask. “They just told me that we won’t teach you that, but if you can learn by yourself, then you can learn, but we don’t want to teach you that. Cause they think it’s better for me to fit in the bigger city after I grow up”.

² This idea is further discussed in Chapter 5.

Bewildered at what I'm hearing, and not able to read his facial expression at all—he was giving me this story with such a straight face, I ask: “What do you think about that?” Without missing a beat, he says, “I think they underestimate my ability to study language”. I laugh, and he smiles and says, “Yeah”.

This phrase—“I think they underestimate my ability to study language” —carried me through the entirety of this dissertation. These amazing multilingual international undergraduate students—students like Yangjin, the students in this study—are all underestimated at every turn when it pertains to their language ability, both in their home countries and at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. The students in my study all had people at home or at school when they were younger telling them which languages to speak, and which languages not to speak. They've grown up with language policies that have dictated, to some degree, their very own identities and even futures, based on language ideologies of people in power. This, in turn, has created in their minds certain beliefs about their own language repertoires, and it affects how they interact with others on a daily basis on the campus of UIUC. Additionally, they find themselves in a university that has its own language ideologies as well, as an institution that has elaborate, complicated, and mostly unwritten policies in place to manage their use of language in both big and small ways.

Among these different language policies that they experience at UIUC is a belief that multilingualism³ is somehow a deficit; that it is somehow a thing that must be overcome in

³ My use of multilingualism in this dissertation is to highlight the diverse linguistic repertoires of the student participants in a way that will be understood by the audience that I hope will read this work. I recognize the tension of the term and distance my work from other controversial connotations that might come with it.

order to succeed in a U.S. university. Their ability to take standardized tests on their English language proficiency determines how they will spend their time on campus, even before they arrive. It determines which classes they will be allowed to take, and possibly even which major they are allowed to study. What they are not told is that their multilingualism—their mother tongue, and even second or third languages apart from English—will be a benefit to them.

These students have not heard from UIUC that they are especially gifted in languages, and that it is an asset to themselves and others at the university that they can so proficiently live life in multiple languages. They come here, live among, and navigate life through language policies that carry one message: English is the only way, and other languages are unnecessary at best, and unwelcome at worst. Their very power in their own multilingualism is not recognized or celebrated, and sometimes, not even wanted.⁴

Multilingual international undergraduate students should not be experiencing language policies that hold them back from learning, from embracing their own linguistic backgrounds, and that create unnecessary barriers to their education. At UIUC, this must change. I wrote this dissertation in a way that will hopefully make this important issue accessible to the many stakeholders that play a part in this issue of language policy at UIUC: administrators, instructors, staff, students, board members, and academics alike. It is my hope that this research plays a part in empowering and highlighting the brilliance of the multilingual

⁴ The students' English language abilities are a source of cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1986). They are not merely victims in a world that forces English upon them, but also take up English as a means of surviving and thriving in a world that places a high value upon the English language. I do not discuss this idea further in this dissertation, but it must be noted that they are bright individuals who are eager to increase their cultural capital through English.

international undergraduate students that come to this university to get a degree, and that it serves in some way to help the institution—the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign—see, embrace, and move towards language policies that view multilingualism as a resource that benefits not only the students in this study, but also the campus community as a whole. In this moment in time in U.S. history, the university should be leaders in embracing the genius and beauty that comes from language policies that build bridges and doors of opportunity for multilingual students, instead of policies that build walls.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction: UIUC and Language Policy

“We will be the pre-eminent public research university with a land-grant mission and global impact” (University of Illinois, Strategic Plan, 2013).

Step foot onto the campus of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC), and you can almost instantly feel the vision statement from its *2013 Strategic Plan* (above) come alive: it’s beautiful, collegiate brick buildings and tall white columns on the student union, the bell tower of the mathematics building, and the bronze statue of the Alma Mater dressed in robes welcoming students to the spaces of higher education and learning. It all gives a sense of history, scholarship, and prestige. You’ll see old and new architecture, natural spaces mixed with concrete, and see buildings dedicated to super-computing, biochemistry, and education. Indeed, this must be a university where learning and research takes place. On your way to campus, you likely drove past miles of corn fields, reminding you that this is a part of the Midwest, and has a connection to the land. If you take a campus tour, the tour guide will assuredly walk you past the first corn research field in the world: the beloved Morrow Plots (there’s even a song written about that small square space that demanded one of the library buildings be driven underground so that its corn stalks could get enough sunlight—it’s a true story). Perhaps because of needing to bow down to corn stalks, the campus library system compensated by becoming the largest of any public university in the U.S.; they’ll mention that on the tour, as well. You’ll also get to hear about the nation’s first engineering-based medical college that’s being built on the edge of campus near the research farms (it’s apparently costing a lot of money, but it’s supposed to bring in a lot, too).

What you'll also notice on a walk through campus is the diversity of students. Certainly, many of the students, at least outwardly, look as though they probably came from surrounding towns or cities in Illinois from which the campus was intended to draw as a land-grant institution,⁵ and that does create a diverse student population on its own. In fact, the campus is quite proud of that diversity. The Chancellor just sent out a campus-wide email proclaiming that UIUC is a recipient of the *INSIGHT Into Diversity* magazine's 2016 Higher Education Excellence in Diversity Award, "an honor we have earned for four years in a row".⁶ In that email entitled "Reaffirmation of Campus Commitment", the Chancellor lists every aspect of diversity that is protected by campus policies, and I believe that it is meant to be an exhaustive list: "race, color, religion, sex, pregnancy, disability, national origin, citizenship status, ancestry, age, order of protection status, genetic information, marital status, sexual orientation including gender identity, arrest record status, unfavorable discharge from the military or status as a protected veteran." To be sure, this list, and the University's commitment to it, is to be applauded.

However, I believe and hope to show through this dissertation, that there is one aspect of diversity that is often over-looked and not celebrated, embraced, or protected on campus, and that is language. Language is an issue that is separate and distinct from all other categories of diversity (and possible discrimination) that the University has listed. One's national origin, religion, citizenship status, race, genetic information, or otherwise are not determiners for one's language, and language is an issue that affects all people of the campus, as all people use

⁵ A land-grant institution is a publicly funded university through the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890. More on that later in this chapter.

⁶ Email from Chancellor Robert J. Jones on Friday, January 6, 2017.

language in one form or another. As Jan Blommaert writes, “Language is ‘the architecture of social behavior itself’” (as cited in McCarty, 2011, pp. 2).

During any given weekday in the fall or spring semester, stand at the corner of Green St. and Wright St.—the intersection of the twin cities Champaign and Urbana—and listen as students walk by. Past the cars, buses, and beeps, you will hear languages—lots of them. Students, perhaps even the participants from this study, would be talking to each other about things that students talk about, in languages that you might have never heard of before. You might hear Dipti,⁷ a freshman from India, talking to her parents on her cell phone in a language called Marwari—a language that only she and a handful of other people on campus understand. You might hear Nor, a sophomore student from Malaysia, speaking to the Malaysian student on her right in Northern Malay, a language that the Malaysian student on her left doesn’t understand because they were raised in the southern part of their country and only know the national language—Southern Malay. You’ll almost certainly hear students talking to each other in Mandarin Chinese, since Chinese students make up approximately 10% of the campus, and because UIUC is home to the most Chinese international students in the entire U.S. International students, the majority of them multilingual, comprise nearly 25% of the entire student body of this campus, and are truly the ones making a “global impact”.⁸

⁷ All names of the participants in this dissertation are pseudonyms unless otherwise specified to protect anonymity.

⁸ Statics are from the 2015-2016 school year, when this research was conducted. The information is from UIUC’s Division of Information Management and the International Student and Scholars Services reports on their websites.

Multilingual International Students and Language at UIUC

In 2015-2016, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign was home to 10,208 international students,⁹ making it the second-largest university international student population among public universities in the U.S. (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2016c). This student body demographic came about as a policy shift from the 2006-2008 Strategic Plan, where the University intended to implement a 50% increase in international student enrollment. This was a goal they reached before 2013 when the new Strategic Plan was presented to the campus. UIUC went from 5,146 international students in 2006 to 9,421 in 2013, exceeding their projections for international student matriculation (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2017b). This policy caused a rapid shift in student demographics on the campus, particularly in undergraduate enrollment, which is where the majority of the change in student-body make-up appeared.

2016 was also the same year that “xenophobia” was declared the “Word of the Year” by Dictionary.com (Steinmetz, 2016). It is defined by them as “fear or hatred of foreigners, people from different cultures, or strangers” (Dictionary.com, 2017). Even as UIUC and other higher education institutions across the U.S. are increasing the number of visas for foreigners in the U.S., the country as a whole has been experiencing a heightened awareness of the immigration issue, particularly in 2016 during the presidential election. The FBI reported an increase in hate crimes, 78.9% of which were motivated by bias against race, ethnicity, ancestry, or religion (FBI, 2016; Lichtblau, 2016). While UIUC makes attempts to promote a sense of diversity, inclusiveness, and a welcoming of all at their campus, they declined to sign a declaration of the

⁹ “International student” does not mean multilingual, but denotes visa status.

University as a “Safe Haven” for immigrants and foreigners—a declaration that other universities of its stature and reputation in the Midwest promoted and approved. This is an extremely precarious time and climate in which international students in the U.S. live.

Do international students at UIUC feel they are protected? Do they feel as much like members of the student body as other students on campus? Do they feel valued? These questions are at the heart of this dissertation, and what ultimately drives my inquiry into issues of language and language policy at UIUC. Language is a fundamental part of being human, and it is not currently protected under UIUC’s statement of diversity and inclusion. This omission, even if unintended, leaves multilingual international students at UIUC in a vulnerable position. Consequently, the language policies at UIUC must be examined and problematized because, as Teresa McCarty argues, “decisions about language, whether officially sanctioned or not, are, at their core, contests over political and economic participation, democracy, and human rights” (2011, p. 10).

Global, Local, and Personal Context of Study

The global. Universities in the U.S. and around the globe are making great efforts to meet the demands of globalization in the 21st century through processes of internationalization, often focused on issues of student mobility. Altbach and Knight (2007) define internationalization simply as “policies and practices undertaken by academic systems and institutions – and even individuals –to cope with the global academic environment” (p. 290). A more in-depth and higher education-focused definition from Ellingboe (1998) is: “an ongoing, future-oriented, multidimensional, interdisciplinary, leadership-driven vision that involves many stakeholders working to change the internal dynamics of an institution to respond and adapt

appropriately to an increasingly diverse, globally focused, ever-changing external environment” (p. 199). This response to globalization has led to, among many other global-focused initiatives, a growing and rapid recruitment of international students in the U.S. (especially in terms of undergraduate student growth). With the global convergence towards neoliberalism (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010), measurements and evaluations of higher education institutions and their internationalization efforts are increasingly quantitative-focused and driven by market-based competition, where universities with large numbers of international students are competitively ranked higher and seen as more prestigious global institutions (Andrade & Evans, 2009).

Competition-driven rankings of top-international-student-enrollment universities are put out each year by the Institute of International Education (IIE) in its annual Open Doors report, presenting quantitative data regarding internationalization efforts of universities around the U.S. One of its major focuses is international student enrollment, giving statistics and infographics that show numbers and growth. For example, the report from 2015-2016 says that the number of international students in the U.S. has increased from 25,464 in 1948/49 to 1,043,839 in 2015/2016 (Institute of International Education, 2016). Campuses around the U.S. have been competing for the IIE’s ranked spot of top international student enrollment, such as UIUC, which has seen the number of international students more than double and become almost 25 % of its student body in just a few years. This dynamic change in student enrollment has had great impacts on U.S. tertiary institutions, but to what degree and how best can those impacts be measured, discussed, and evaluated?

The local. UIUC is an institution that has received much attention from the IIE and other organizations in the past decade for being a leader in the internationalization of higher

education. The University has consistently ranked high in institution with the most international students, ranking second among public universities and fifth overall in 2015-2016, with an all-time high of almost 25% of the student body, practically doubling its international student enrollment since 2006 (IIE, 2016; University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2016c)¹⁰. Apart from the IIE, other organizations have developed ranking systems, and UIUC sits high among those as well: it recently ranked 29th on the *Times Higher Education* World University Rankings¹¹ for 2014-2015, and 28th on Shanghai Jiao Tong Academic Ranking of World Universities¹² for 2014, both well-respected organizations in the field of international education. UIUC's commitment to the project of internationalization can also be seen in its "Shared Vision", implemented in the 2013-2016 Strategic Plan: "We will be the pre-eminent public research university with a land-grant mission and a global impact" (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2013). This "global impact" goal is laid out in the *Strategic Plan* through more than just high international student enrollment; it is to be achieved through international partnerships and projects of all kinds, conducted both on the U.S. campus and abroad.

¹⁰ The exact count of international students on UIUC's campus differs slightly according to source, but the overall percentage in 2015-2016—24-25%—is the same.

¹¹ From the website: "The *Times Higher Education* World University Rankings 2014-2015 list the best global universities and are the only international university performance tables to judge world class universities across all of their core missions - teaching, research, knowledge transfer and international outlook." <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/world-university-rankings/2014-15/world-ranking>

¹² From the website: "Universities are ranked by several indicators of academic or research performance, including alumni and staff winning Nobel Prizes and Fields Medals, highly cited researchers, papers published in *Nature* and *Science*, papers indexed in major citation indices, and the per capita academic performance of an institution." <http://www.shanghairanking.com/ARWU2014.html>

This focus on internationalization for any campus would undoubtedly change the landscape of daily operations, policies, and rhetoric, and indeed, for UIUC, it has—especially in the past ten years as the student body demographic has shifted. Doubling the international student enrollment on UIUC’s campus in eight years is a feat that was coordinated in part through the 2007 campus *Strategic Plan* (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2007). Even more remarkable is that this growth came mainly through undergraduate students, which went from 1,554 in 2006 to now 5,410 (graduate students only slightly increased from 3,503 to 4,798) (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2016a). This change in enrollment demographics could be seen by some as taking a departure from the original founding mission of UIUC as a part of the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890, where the University was created to be a space of higher education for the “working class” and minorities in Illinois (Association of Public and Land-grant Universities, 2012, p. 1). Minority student enrollment from Illinois has been declining in recent years at UIUC (and remaining stagnant at best), while the international student population continues to climb, prompting critics to ask questions that point to UIUC’s lack of commitment to the people of its own state. Whether or not these accusations are true, one thing is certain: internationalization efforts on campus has led to new interpretations of founding documents and policies that prioritize global competition.

With the increased focus on internationalization at U.S. higher education institutions like UIUC comes far-reaching consequences on a university’s functioning, from boardroom meetings to classrooms and cafeterias, and has led to special seminars, forums, trainings, focus groups, and policy changes, specifically trying to manage the increase of and better understand and serve the international undergraduate student population. At UIUC, this has led to the wide

expansion of the English as a Second Language Service Courses (namely, its writing courses), the development of special sections of courses in different majors around campus specifically for international students, and an increased focus on serving the international student population in almost every department around campus, from the Counseling Center to Career Services. There is a need for research on just how these new internationalization efforts are affecting everyday lived experiences of students on campus—especially those new students who find themselves entering a new culture and educational system, half way around the world from their homes. This dissertation enters this discussion through the intersectionality of language, language policy, and the internationalization of higher education.

The personal. My research on language policy and the campus of UIUC stems from my personal etic and emic connections to the topic. It is difficult to know when my research on language policy at UIUC began, because I have been living and breathing the thing for so long. I have been at UIUC since 2006, first as a student in the Masters in Teaching English as a Second Language (MATESL) program, as a TA in the ESL Service Courses teaching English pronunciation and as a TA at the Intensive English Institute (IEI), then as a full-time ESL instructor at the campus's intensive English program (the IEI) and their Cultural Engagement Coordinator (a mid-level administrative position), and then as a part-time instructor at the IEI as Cultural Engagement Coordinator and full-time PhD student in the Global Studies in Education division of Education Policy Studies (EPOL). My life and work has revolved around ESL learners, English language policies, and multilingual, global-impact-making international students for the past decade. This contributes to my emic understanding of the locality and its politics, as well as my etic understanding of sociolinguistics, second language acquisition, and education policy in

higher education. I have been on campus during what I would label as one of the largest policy changes in the past 20 years of the institution—the rapid and intentional increase of international student enrollment.

When the increase of undergraduate international students has been brought up on campus in meetings, boardrooms, and over coffee, it has been my observation over the past ten years that talk almost always goes towards the English language proficiency of those students. Policies related to English language proficiency are often made quickly and ad hoc without much reflection or study on their effectiveness or outcomes (intended or unintended) (agreeing with the dominant language policy and planning literature), as well as without any input from the international students themselves—they are almost always excluded from these institutional conversations about their own linguistic abilities and policies that directly affect their everyday lived experiences. In order to gain insight into their perspectives as well as to better understand how I can best research this topic, I conducted a qualitative pilot study in the Spring of 2015 to look at how UIUC undergraduate international students experience and perceive language policies at UIUC. Then, through this dissertation work, I have conducted a qualitative study that focuses on the student perspective. I hope to bring a democratic and inclusive perspective (using the field of Evaluation’s definitions of democratic and inclusive) to the many conversations that are evolving around the topic of “international students” at UIUC, empowering those students that are often disenfranchised and powerless members of their host institution.

Definition of Terms

A discussion of a few key terms used in this dissertation is needed in order to

understand the perspective at which I have approached this topic:

- Language—It became apparent as I conducted my interviews and asked the simple question, “What languages do you know?” to the student participants, the definition of language I used and the definition they understood were two different things. This was true for every single student participant, whether they were from India, Malaysia, or China. “Language” is a social (and sociopolitical) construct, and as such, it is difficult to even count how many languages exist in the world (Garcia & Wei, 2014). Where what one person might call a “language”, another person might refer to it as a “dialect”, depending on one’s sociopolitical perspectives. For the purposes of this dissertation, I use “language” to mean a discrete set of codes and symbols, though describing a language as such is problematic in other arenas. Here, I want to emphasize the student participants’ multiple linguistic repertoires and resources that are often overlooked, even by themselves, so I choose to enumerate the languages that they “know” in order to highlight that fact.
- Language policy— The definition of language policy I use in this dissertation comes from the field of language policy and planning. As Teresa McCarty puts it, language policy “is best understood as a verb” (2011, p. 2). Rather than discussing language policy as a written set of rules, it should be understood as something that is enacted and often unwritten, “overt and covert, top-down and bottom-up, de jure and de facto (Schiffman, 1996, 2006; Shohamy, 2006)”, (McCarty, 2011, p. 2). It is something that may or may not have been made explicit, and something that oftentimes must be inferred from an institution’s (or society’s) language practices, beliefs/ideologies, and management

(Spolksy, 2004).

- Language policy from above and language policy from below—These two terms come from Mortensen’s (2014) use of Preisler’s (1999) concepts of English from above and English from below. Language policy from above has to do with institutional policy (i.e., gatekeeping policies, admissions requirements, ESL course requirements, language ideologies in official documents), and language policy from below has to do with classroom spaces coming from both instructors and students (i.e. language practice during class, syllabus statements on language management, and language ideologies of students and instructors).
- ESL—English as a Second Language. This term is used in this dissertation to describe English language courses that are offered on UIUC’s campus for multilingual international students.
- Multilingual undergraduate international student—This dissertation specifically is interested in the multilingual undergraduate international student; that is:
 - Multilingual—I have chosen to refer to the participants of this study as multilingual because the term agrees with the language-as-resource and linguistic human rights perspective that multilingualism should be viewed as something positive and beneficial. Other terms that were considered and can be found in research regarding these students were ESL student, English language learner, non-English speaking background student, and non-native speaker. Throughout my research I came to see a slightly pejorative view of those terms, and made the decision to refer to these students as multilinguals. I considered

adding the descriptor “English language learner” to “multilingual”, but decided that it was unnecessary. This study is bound by students that were enrolled in an ESL writing course and thus can be inferred to be English language learners without having to label them as such. Additionally, extracting the word “English” from the label of these students avoids privileging the English language, which is necessary as part of the work of this dissertation is to deconstruct harmful language ideologies that privilege English and are rooted in colonial and hegemonic attitudes.

- Undergraduate—This study is only concerned with matriculated, degree-seeking undergraduate students and not graduate students, visiting scholars, or non-degree seeking students enrolled in the intensive English language program at the University.
- International student—The participants of this study self-identify as an “international student” in some way, though that may not be the official documentation of the student according to the University or the Department of Homeland Security, as some participants are U.S. passport holders (in most cases due to being born in the U.S. during a parent’s temporary time in the U.S. for either educational, professional, or personal reasons). These students, whether or not they are officially “international”, get labeled as such in their everyday lives, mainly because of issues related to the indexicality of language. They self-identify as an “international student” mainly because they reportedly feel that they identify more with the nationality and culture in which they spent the

majority of their lives (in all cases, that was a country other than the U.S.). The countries that they came from were not necessarily “non-English speaking”, as each country has a large number of English speakers (there are more English speakers in China than in the U.S.), has English as an official national language (India), or uses English as the primary mode of communication for education (Malaysia).

- Chinese—When the term “Chinese” is used to describe a language, either by myself or the student participants, it is referring to Mandarin, unless otherwise stated. This is because the student participants overwhelmingly referred to Mandarin as “Chinese”. The Chinese word for Mandarin, Putonghua, is also used in this study.
- Chinese student—I refer to many of the participants of this study as “Chinese”. They are from the People’s Republic of China.
- Competence— When the term competence is used in this dissertation, it refers to Hymes’ (1972) concept of communicative competence, which is the idea that there are multiple aspects of a language that users of a language need to learn in order to use the language for communicative purposes. Communicative competence is largely accepted to be comprised of four components: sociolinguistic, formal linguistic, discourse, and strategic.
- Proficiency—Proficiency in this dissertation is defined as how well a person can use language for communicative purposes.

Research Questions and Overview of Chapters

This study is driven by the following research questions:

1. What are the language policies at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign that most affect multilingual international undergraduate students in this study?
 - a. What are the language policies “from above”? (From the institution, campus admissions, and department levels)
 - b. What are the language policies “from below”? (From the students, teachers, and day-to-day levels)
2. What are multilingual international undergraduate students’ experiences with and perceptions of language policies at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign?

In Chapter One, I discuss the phenomenon of language policy at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, contextualizing this dissertation in globalization and the internationalization of higher education in the U.S. I describe the case context, give a brief overview of relevant literature, discuss the research questions and qualitative nature of the study, and set the scene for the coming chapters.

In Chapter Two, I expand on the relevant literature of the study and describe how this study fits into theories of globalization. I then discuss issues related to globalization and language, touching upon global Englishes, the linguistic human rights perspective, and language orientations in policy and planning. The chapter moves on to explain the framework of language policy that I use in this dissertation. After that, I briefly review some existing literature and past studies on language policy in higher education and emphasize how this dissertation fills a gap in that body of work, and the uniqueness of this study. At the end of the chapter, I address two of the key concepts that I use in my data analysis and conclusion: translingual

communicative practices and linguistic hegemony, giving reasons for why those concepts are chosen over others.

In Chapter Three, I give a detailed description of the research methodology I used. I defend my decision to use qualitative inquiry for this topic, give a detailed description of the participants of the study, explain my data collection tools, and how I analyzed the data that was collected.

Chapter Four presents the data as it relates to language policy from above. I discuss UIUC as an institution, give a brief history of the creation of language policy going back to the 1950s, and discuss the current language policy situation as it relates to admission, standardized tests, and the institutional language ideologies, beliefs, and management that was found in my data from interviews of administrators and document analysis. This chapter shows that language policy from an institutional perspective has a language-as-problem orientation.

In Chapter Five, I discuss language policy from below, looking closely at the qualitative data collected in classroom observations of an ESL writing course, discourse analysis of the talk that occurred in that course, and detailed interviews with student and instructor participants. This chapter shows that translingual communicative practices occurred in the classroom, and that individual language ideologies as well as their past experiences with language policies in other places and spaces in time affect student experiences with and perceptions of current language policy at UIUC.

In Chapter Six, the conclusion, I give a brief summary of this dissertation project. I conclude that the language policies at UIUC need a shift in language ideology at both policy from above and policy from below, and should work towards creating a more language-as-

resource and language-as-right orientation in order to truly be more inclusive, embrace diversity, and protect the human rights of all students.

CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

This chapter will give an overview of the relevant literature that is needed to understand this dissertation. First, I will explain globalization and internationalization and how it informs the significance of this study. I will briefly discuss previous studies that others have conducted around the topic of international students in higher education and language issues, and demonstrate where this dissertation fits into that existing body of literature. I will then present the framework of language policy that I used to frame the research and analyze the data. Finally, I discuss several theories that I used to interpret and analyze the data, and use as I discuss conclusions from this study.

Theoretical Framework for the Study

Globalization and language. This examination of language and language policies at UIUC is set within the larger context of the effects of globalization on higher education in the U.S. and grounded in Saskia Sassen's theory of globalization, which helps to illuminate the scope of this study. Sassen's work on globalization and global cities discusses the importance of lived experiences of people in the intersection of the global and the local, asserting that theorists and researchers should go beyond thinking just in terms of time/space compression and hypermobility. Like Anthony Giddens, her scholarship on globalization focuses on the interplay between the global and local, but where Giddens talks about a push and pull among nation-states, Sassen (2000) speaks of the interaction between the global and local in terms of overlap that "distinguish(es) our contemporary moment" (p. 215). One of her main arguments is that globalization is a reality, and it has specificity that "has to be actively implemented, reproduced,

serviced, and financed” through what she terms “capital fixity”, taken from David Harvey (p. 217). Sassen calls for an expansion of theorization and research of globalization beyond the nation-state borders, into the new “spatiotemporal order” of “global restructurings” (p. 216). This spatiotemporal order that results from globalization should be researched, she argues, to better understand the social thickness (in the traditions of Clifford Geertz and William Sewell), texture, and complexities of the overlap (p. 217).

Sassen describes these new spaces of overlap in terms of intellectual “frontier zones” and “analytic borderlands” (Sassen, 2000, p. 216; Sassen, 1996). The analytic borderland concept “entails opening up a line (represented or experienced as dividing two mutually exclusive zones) into a border zone that demands its own theorization and empirical specification and that can accommodate its own distinct practices” (Sassen, 2000, p. 220). Her work has focused mainly on the global city as an analytic borderland—an overlapping space of the national and the global. I use her concept of analytic borderlands in this dissertation to assert that the modern university is another type of analytic borderland, where the global and local meet to create a new spatiotemporality that should be researched to better understand its complexities in relation to globalization.

One way of conceptualizing these analytic borderlands, she proposes, is to see “an incipient and partial denationalization of domains once understood and/or constructed as national” (p. 216). She sees global cities as denationalizing, and eventually becoming more important than the nation-state¹³. Using this framework, I look at the university as a space that

¹³ Translated from an interview on a Universidad de Alicante sociologist’s Spanish blog: <http://sociologos.com/2012/07/06/entrevista-a-saskia-sassenlas-ciudades-van-a-ser-mas-importantes-que-los-estados/>).

has at least partially become denationalized through the process of globalization. For UIUC (and its internationalization project), the influx of international student enrollment possibly signals a denationalization of the University, where UIUC—once primarily concerned with educating the working class of Illinois—is now abandoning that more nationalist mission for a denationalized vision, where the University is the primary space of power and concern (and not the nation-state).

Sassen’s concepts of splitting the line between the global and the national to find rich places of inquiry, and the denationalization of domains traditionally constructed as national, give me room to see the internationalization of UIUC as a space where inquiry into the effects of globalization is warranted. Thus, I argue that the modern internationalizing university is one such borderland that needs rich description and ethnographic research in order to better understand the effects of globalization—the interaction of the local and the global. This dissertation delves into the analytic borderlands of globalization at UIUC, looking at the multilingual international undergraduate student population and the language polices on campus through qualitative research (drawing upon ethnographic methodology as well as document analysis), bringing to light how globalization is affecting everyday lived experiences of those at a higher education institution in the U.S.

The massive change in the global diversity of student enrollment in U.S. higher education institutions such as UIUC has caused a change in the linguistic diversity of campuses. Alistair Pennycook (2005) notes that changes in “linguistic flows”, such as increasing the number of students with multilingual backgrounds on campuses, is a “part of a reorganization of the local”, and that “cultural and linguistic forms are always in a state of flux, always

changing, always part of a process of the refashioning of identity” (p. 33). He goes on to say that “...with English increasingly becoming the medium of global transcultural exchange, we need to understand the relations between English, popular culture, education and identity, or the ways in which global Englishes become a shifting means of transcultural identity formation” (p. 29).

A. Suresh Canagarajah (1999a, 2002, 2006) has written much on the concept of “global Englishes” that Pennycook refers to, asserting that today’s educational systems should embrace the diversity of Englishes that are used by students in a way that affirms multilingualism as a resource, not a deficit (Ruiz, 1984). Richard Ruiz (1984) contends that institutional attitudes and orientations towards language affect language planning activities (such as the development of language policies), existing in the form of language-as-problem, language-as-right, and language-as-resource, arguing that it is essential that language planning activities and language policy development come from a language-as-resource and language-as-right orientation.

Language policies are so important to the process of globalization and should be paid attention to as it interacts with internationalization processes on U.S. campuses, with particular focus on how those policies affect those that interact with it most—namely, the multilingual international students who find themselves amidst this shifting transcultural identity and environment of global English. This dissertation problematizes language policies at UIUC, finding that most policies have a language-as-problem orientation, and contends that to be a truly inclusive and supportive environment for all students, the policies should have more of a language-as-resource orientation.

Linguistic human rights perspective. Following the work of Tove Skutnabb-Kangas

(2000) and Gisele Waters (2001), I look at this language policy problem through a linguistic human rights perspective, where multilingualism should be seen as a resource and not a deficit. Waters points out that, along with other scholars such as Suresh Canagarajah, language policies are not supportive enough of students' needs and have a damaging deficit perspective on multilingualism. Language policies should recognize that multilingualism is an extremely beneficial resource for the students as individuals and campuses as institutions, but overwhelmingly, universities in the U.S. still seem to view "monolingualism and assimilation as 'legitimate' goals" (p. 299).

This language ideology of valuing monolingualism in policies can lead to an even more serious weakness: inherently racist and biased policies towards multilingual international students. Andrea Sterzuk (2015) points out that race and language, and thus race and English, are intertwined, making language policies and users of those policies racialised. She addresses these problems through a post-colonial and critical race studies lens, using Catherine Prendergast's (2003) idea that "standard English" (a controversial concept in itself), and literacy can be described as "white property", "positing that perhaps some English language policies at universities stem from white settler society notions of 'white property': why increased English language diversity on a university campus might lead some community members to behave 'as if something has been taken away from them'" (Sterzuk, 2015, p. 55). Overall, the literature seems to agree that the main weakness of language policies at U.S. tertiary institutions is a pejorative language ideology of linguistic heterogeneity, and the indexicality of the "non-standard English" of multilingual international students.

Language orientations. In his seminal paper entitled “Orientations in Language Planning”, Ruiz (1984) laid out what he coined “orientations toward language”, where attitudes and beliefs about language (and multilingualism in its various forms) heavily influence language policy and language planning¹⁴. The three orientations he describes are language-as-problem, language-as-right, and language-as-resource. These three orientations are often cited in language policy and planning literature, and form the framework on which the conclusion for this dissertation is based.

Ruiz defines a language orientation as “a complex of dispositions toward language and its role, and toward languages and their role in society” (p. 16). He goes on to remark that language orientations may be unconsciously held positions and beliefs, and that part of the work of scholars in language policy and planning should be to make obvious those language orientations that are either held by existing policies or that can be built into future ones (p. 16). Language orientations are related to language attitudes, where language orientations can deem certain attitudes about language acceptable or legitimate, determining “what is thinkable about language in society” (p. 16).

Language-as-problem orientation, according to Ruiz, results from a tendency in any society where “a sociolinguistic Darwinism will force on us the notion that subordinate languages are problems to be resolved” (p. 19). This orientation tends to see speakers of the non-dominant language of a society to be ones that need remediation, help from the dominant group, and almost always is accompanied by deficit rhetoric. Language-as-problem orientation

¹⁴ Ruiz points out the similarities that one might see between the term language orientations and the term language ideologies, but makes the case that the two are intrinsically different (p. 29). I am using them in this dissertation as separate and distinct ideas, as well.

also tends to have a neoliberal aspect, where language is something that is (and should be) measured, even quantifiably. Most language planning efforts come out of this orientation where there is a communication problem that must be solved through creating policies around language. Language-as-right orientation sometimes accompanies language-as-problem orientation, where there are communication issues to be solved in a society, but that the non-dominant language group must be preserved and must be allowed to exist, following a “strong movement, both within the United States and internationally, which would advocate consideration of language as a basic human right” (p. 22). Those who advocate for the construct of language as a human right might agree with Reynaldo Macias, who suggests that language as a human right means “the right to freedom from discrimination on the basis of language” and “the right to use your language(s) in the activities of communal life (1979:88-89)” (Macias, 1979, as cited in Ruiz, 1984). I argue in this dissertation that English language policy at UIUC from an institutional perspective, in general, has a language-as-problem orientation, but that it would be beneficial to include a language-as-right orientation in certain aspects of the institutional policies.

Language-as-resource orientation is the view that languages, or multilingualism in a society, should be seen as resources for the greater good of all and should be encouraged to thrive. He offers this language-as-resource orientation “as a counter-narrative to the dominant deficit perspective in the United States” (Ruiz, 2010, p. 166, as quoted in Hult & Hornberger, 2016, p. 38). Ruiz explains that a language-as-resource orientation approach would mean a shift in a society’s attitudes towards language and language groups, where language capability is seen as a benefit in every way. In his seminal article, Ruiz points to “trans-national

considerations”, national security, enlightened leadership in foreign policy, economic growth, greater international and social awareness, and cognitive benefits of multilingualism on individuals (p. 26-28). While he is nationalistic and neoliberal in his arguments for seeing a language-as-resource orientation as necessary and progressive in language policy and planning in the U.S. and clearly making the case to those who see language from a monolingual perspective, he elaborates in the later years of his career about what is meant by a language-as-resource orientation and how language is a resource for all. I adopt his perspective that language-as-resource orientation is a beneficial orientation for language policy and planning, especially in higher education in the U.S. It is beneficial for both the speakers of non-dominant languages and speakers of the dominant variety of English, especially when combined with a language-as-right orientation.

Though his work is geared towards language policy and planning in the field of bilingualism (especially concerning K-12 in the U.S.), my dissertation is not speaking to the field of bilingualism or bilingual education. Instead, I apply his theory of language orientations to language policy in higher education in the U.S. In “Revisiting Orientations in Language Planning: Problem, Right, and Resource as an Analytical Heuristic”, Hult and Hornberger (2016) argue that Ruiz’s three orientations to language planning are useful as etic concepts for researchers in language policy and planning to analyze language ideologies in policies, as well as useful as emic concepts to help people discuss their own beliefs about language. It is upon this idea that I rely, making use of Ruiz’s language orientations in the analysis and conclusion of this dissertation work.

Language policy and planning. In order to research language policies at a U.S. university

(or in any space in time), an understanding of what language policies are is needed. One cannot merely do a web search on the institution's homepage for "language policy", or do a library search for "language policies". Because language policies everywhere, not just at higher education institutions, are often unwritten, de facto, and so tacit that they can exist by a mere non-existence of a written policy, defining and analyzing an institution's language policies is challenging. Additionally, language policy encompasses much more than an institution's written rule or linguistic code of conduct, so to speak. According to Levinson and Sutton (2000), education policy must be The most important thing to understand about language policy, as it is understood in its field and used in this dissertation, is that it is not just what is written and then enforced or not; instead, language policy should be seen as a verb; that is, an enactment of (stated, unstated, implied, or unrecognized) beliefs and ideologies about language itself by all stakeholders and individuals who use language in a common spatiotemporality.

Much of my understanding about language policy comes from Teresa McCarty's edited book *Ethnography and Language Policy* (2011). A language policy (or language policy and planning) framework is essentially a "multifaceted question: 'What *actors* attempt to influence what *behaviors* of which *people* for what *ends* under what *conditions* by what *means* through what *decision-making process* with what *effect*?' (1989, p. 98)" (p. 6, McCarty, 2011). To define language policy, I quote a portion from her co-authored chapter entitled "Critical Ethnography and Indigenous Language Survival": "...we take policy to mean not only official acts and texts, but also the undeclared, unofficial interactions and discourses that regulate language statuses, uses, and choices, and that are transacted in everyday social practice (Levinson, Sutton, & Winstead, 2009; McCarty, 2004; Ramanathan, 2005; Schiffman, 1996; Shohamy, 2006; Spolsky,

2004; Sutton & Levinson, 2001)” (McCarty, Romero-Little, Warhol, & Zepeda, 2011, pp. 32). This definition also draws heavily from Dell Hymes’ (1980) book of essays entitled *Language in Education: Ethnolinguistic Essays*, where he writes to his academic audience about the study and importance of language and sociolinguistics in education. In his essays he addresses questions regarding the use of language in context, asking “How do members of a group use language in order to conduct a certain activity? How do members of a group use language in order to be taken as a certain kind of person, status, role, or the like?” (p. x). So, in this perspective, inquiry into language policy must look at the everyday usage, “everyday language policy-making”, and beliefs and ideologies about language in the lives of people (McCarty, 2011, pp. 32).

In addition to providing a widely-recognized definition of language policy (or language policy and planning), McCarty (2011) pulls together scholars that believe in the value and importance of using ethnographic methodology for the inquiry of language policy and planning. They together, standing under the umbrella of Dell Hymes’ thinking and writing on sociolinguistics and ethnography, argue that the very nature of language policy requires and benefits from an academic inquiry that is ethnographic in nature. Ethnographic methods—participant observation, in-depth interviews, and document analysis—and ethnographic analysis, they assert, provides a way of answering the question “What is going on here?”, giving “a ‘way of seeing’ that is situated and systematic, ad a ‘way of looking’ that is grounded in long-term, in-depth, first-hand accounts” (Wolcott, 2008, pp. 73-74, as cited in McCarty, 2011, pp. 3).

Language practices, language ideology, and language management. Many scholars in

language policy in higher education (Tardy, 2011; De Costa, 2010; Mortensen, 2014; Ramanathan, Morgan, & Moore, 2007; Bjorkman, 2014) have chosen to use Bernard Spolsky's (2004) three-part framework of language policies to help identify and examine the phenomenon, as I have in this dissertation.

Language policies can be identified by "three components of the language policy in a speech community:

- its *language practices*—the habitual pattern of selecting among the varieties that make up its linguistic repertoire;
- its *language beliefs or ideology*—the beliefs about language and language use; and
- any specific efforts to modify or influence that practice by any kind of *language intervention, planning, or management*" (p. 5, bullet points and italics mine).

Spolsky points out that what must be remembered about studying language policy is that you must look for the unwritten practices, ideologies, and management efforts embedded in the sociolinguistic settings in which they occur. He says:

"...language policy exists even where it has not been made explicit or established by authority. Many countries and institutions and social groups do not have formal or written language policies, so that the nature of their language policy must be derived from a study of their language practice or beliefs. Even where there is a formal, written language policy, its effect on language practices is neither guaranteed nor consistent" (p. 8).

In addition to their de facto and tacit nature, Spolsky asserts that language policies must be examined in light of the contexts in which they develop. He claims that language policies

(and language itself), as well as language management efforts are formed, exist in, and must contend with “highly complex, interacting and dynamic contexts” and that “a host of non-linguistic factors (political, demographic, social, religious, cultural, psychological, bureaucratic and so on) regularly account for any attempt by persons or groups to intervene in the language practices and the beliefs of other persons or groups, and for the subsequent changes that do or do not occur” (p. 9). Spolsky’s three components of language policy—language practices, language ideology, and language management, in addition to the contexts in which the policies develop and interact, have been the most useful out of all language policy and planning literature for the purposes of this dissertation, and served as a guide for collecting and analyzing this data.

Policy from above and policy from below. In addition to Spolsky’s framework on language policies, I also looked at language policies using an expansion of Preisler (1999)’s “English from above” and “English from below” conceptualization, as it was used by Mortensen (2014) in his work on language policy in Denmark. Language policies from above refer to official policies and language ideologies from the institution itself. For example, in Mortensen’s study in a Danish university, a language policy from above states that degree programs at that particular university exist dichotomously, either in Danish or in English, expressing a policy of monolingualism. In contrast to that, a language policy from below is a language practice or ideology of the students and instructors on campuses that function in everyday use. In his study, Mortensen shows through discourse analysis of classroom interactions that a language policy from below on that campus is that English and Danish are used side by side in every degree program, determined by many different social, political, and sociolinguistic factors and

enforced by instructors and students alike, no matter what the policy from above states. He also points out that differing and contrasting language ideologies, which are a part of language policy according to Spolsky, can come from above or below, and all exist concurrently.

Institutions may espouse certain ideologies, and students interacting within that institution may either concur or dissent with those institutional ideologies, both implicitly and explicitly. Both of these frameworks have helped structure my research of language policies at UIUC.

Focus on Multilingual International Undergraduate Students

Dell Hymes (1980) called the study of language policy “fundamental to education” (pp. 70), and McCarty et al. (2011) reaffirmed that same commitment. In fact, in the field of language policy and planning, much of the research and inquiry has been done on youth in K-12. For example, in McCarty’s (2011) edited volume *Ethnography and Language Policy*, half of the 14 chapters focus on language policy research in K-12 schooling (of the other half, two chapters are focused on indigenous transnational communities, and the rest are commentaries on ethnography as a methodology for language policy research).

In terms of language policy studies in higher education, much scholarly work has been done on language policies in higher education in Europe, and it is no wonder, given the complexity of language policies in the European Union (Ahn, 2007), even as the Bologna process—a process of agreements between European countries to ensure comparable standards for higher education institutions (European Higher Education Area, 2017)—has brought about new English language medium international degree programs across the continent, in places where English is not the most common (nor the national) language used. For example, Kuteeva & Airey (2013) published a study on English language policies in Sweden

and Erling & Hilgendorf (2006) conducted research on language policies in German higher education. Jennifer Jenkins (2013) has done work looking at the role of English and international students in higher education in the UK. As for language policy studies conducted on other regions of the world, Rebecca Hughes (2008) has done recognized work on language policies of higher education institutions in non-Anglophone countries, focusing her work on a UK university based in China. There has also been language policy studies done on post-colonial regions (and corresponding diaspora) of the world. Foley (2004) published an article of work on language policy in South African higher education institutions, and a collection of writings edited by Lin & Martin (2005) features work by A. Suresh Canagarajah (focusing mainly on India) and other authors looking at language policy in Turkey, South Africa, Tanzania, Hong Kong, Singapore, Malaysia, Iran, and Kenya.

However, in U.S. higher education, language policies (though they've been around for decades) are noticeably sparse in the literature. Kanno and Varghese (2010) did a study on immigrant and refugee populations' access to higher education, concluding that oftentimes, university admissions policies relating to English (their English language policies) are barriers to access for these student populations, arguing that universities put an over-emphasis on English proficiency for these students instead of also addressing structural and economic issues. Jennifer E. Haan (2009) did dissertation work on what she calls "ESL policy" at Purdue University in West Lafayette, Indiana. Her research was a historical case study that focused on language policy planning at the University, describing what Purdue offers (and has offered) for international students regarding English language assistance at an institutional level. She concludes, as I do in this dissertation for UIUC's English language policy, that Purdue has a

language-as-problem orientation to ESL and international students. Her work does not differentiate much between undergraduate and graduate international students, and does have more research regarding policies related to graduate international students. She also does not include a definition of what the “international student” is, but it can be assumed through her writing that she means the multilingual student with non-citizenship status. Her research is focused on the planning aspect of language policy and planning, and mainly from the institution’s perspective.

Maureen Snow Andrade and Norman W. Evans, (often collaborating with K. James Hartshorn) have perhaps done the most work on English language policy in U.S. higher education in recent times (Andrade, Evans, & Hartshorn 2014, 2015, and 2016, and Andrade & Evans, 2009). In a February 2017 editorial for the *Journal of International Students*, Andrade discusses U.S. university institutional practices in English language policy related to English proficiency of students. Citing results from a 2016 study done by the neoliberal for-profit private company International Consultants for Educations and Fairs (ICEF), “Prospective international students indicate that their primary motivation for studying abroad is to learn to speak English fluently followed by achieving a degree, obtaining a satisfying job, living in another country, and making a difference in the world” (p. ii). The ICEF and studies conducted by Andrade often share the purpose of understanding how to better serve “international students” through providing English language services, so that universities can continue to attract large numbers of that student demographic for enrollment in order to remain globally competitive. I argue that studies with that purpose are not in the best interest of “international students” (using their term), because the ultimate aim is not for the benefit of the students, but

instead economic growth and competitiveness for the institution—something that my study is not concerned with.

That being said, Andrade’s work offers a spring-board for my research and provides useful insights into institutional language policies in U.S. higher education. Andrade’s (2017) editorial poses the question, “Are U.S. institutions of higher education enabling students to achieve their top goal?” (of learning English while studying in the U.S.) (p. ii). She offers an overview of surveys of U.S. universities with the most international students (presumably, UIUC would be one of those) conducted by herself, Evans, and Hartshorn in 2014, 2015, and 2016, and presents findings that are relevant for this dissertation. The relevant findings are:

- “Institutions determine if prospective students are native or non-native English speakers based on country of origin and citizenship” (p. ii).
- “Students are admitted on a single standardized proficiency test” (p. ii).
- Testing of proficiency after admission is most commonly based on writing skills assessment (p. ii-iii).
- Undergraduate students are more likely than graduate students to be required to further their English language skills through coursework. (p. iii)
- Participants (the universities) sometimes admitted that “they were making subjective assumptions about student success” in the admissions process related to students’ English proficiency (p. iii).
- “Faculty/staff tend to lack knowledge of language acquisition factors (e.g., general v. academic English)” (p. iii)

- “International students who speak English as an additional language perform as well academically as native English speakers, yet faculty are likely not satisfied with students’ skill levels” (p. iii).

In the end of her editorial, she advocates for universities to move from focusing on providing English proficiency support to a focus on developing students’ English proficiency (p. iii). She goes on to say that understanding the language ideologies of stakeholders is an important factor in helping students improve their English proficiency while attending university in the U.S. (p. iv).

Andrade and I have different approaches to English language and English language proficiency, as this dissertation will show. She is concerned with university efforts towards improving English language proficiency of “international students” for the purpose of helping students meet the expressed goal (from the ICEF survey) of “improving their English”, which ultimately will help U.S. universities attract and maintain their “market share” of “international students” (p. i-ii). Some of the findings of her research, however, are useful for understanding institutional language ideologies, which I explore further in this study. Her findings overall point to the importance of language ideologies in English language policy at U.S. institutions among all stakeholders—policy makers, faculty, and the “international student”.

In addition to the research above, many studies have focused on international students’ (particularly graduate students’) adjustment, acculturation, and factors affecting their academic success (for a synopsis of this research, see Martirosyan, Hwang, & Wanjohi, 2015 as well as the many articles in *The Journal of International Students*). Conversations around international students in the U.S. often lead to students’ English language proficiency as predictors and

determiners of academic success (Daller and Phelan, 2013). Indeed, both qualitative and quantitative research studies have shown that the English language proficiency of students from non-English speaking backgrounds (NESB) do play a role in how well they perform academically in university settings, so there is good reason for this research to exist (Li, Chen, & Duanmu, 2010; Wardlow, 1999; Martirosyan, Hwang, & Wanjohi, 2015).

However, while most research on language and international students (mainly graduate students) in the U.S. has been focused on English proficiency and academic success, this dissertation is not concerned with success, overall English proficiency, or the cultural adjustment (or “integration”, as many refer to it) of those students. In a different vein, I have focused my work here on student experiences and perceptions of language policies, purposely excluding the other research aims. Instead of researching and advocating for U.S. universities’ institutional neoliberal agendas to obtain a higher “market share” of international students as many studies do, I conducted this research to highlight the undergraduate students’ voices and experiences, as well as to reveal language ideologies that affect language policy at every level. This is not a predictive study about what will better help the undergraduate students succeed in academic life, but rather an exploration of the real-life effects of globalization on a U.S. university and some of its most vulnerable students—examining the intersection of language, policy, and internationalization.

With the recent increase of international student enrollment in U.S. higher education, it is ever-more important to investigate and evaluate these (often unwritten) policies that are developing in order to protect and uphold the rights of international students, as well as to develop a more language-as-resource orientation. The “local” linguistic forms (especially of

English) on U.S. campuses are changing in ways that have caused institutions to react with policies, oftentimes tacit and de facto policies (Spolsky, 2004; Tardy, 2011; Horner & Trimbur, 2002), that intend to manage language use as a part of this constant reorganization, or, as Matsuda (2006) labels it, “linguistic containment”, where policies strive to separate linguistic issues from other academic and sociopolitical issues, to the detriment of students. Spolsky (2004) asserts that when looking at language policies, one must remember that “...language practices and policies...tend to grow without overmuch official intervention. Only in special cases is explicit formulation necessary. ... More often, any existing national or local language practice has evolved piecemeal, with a combination of law, regulation and custom” (p. 13), giving more reasons to evaluate and examine policies at the tertiary level. The focus of this dissertation is not to evaluate the English language policies at UIUC as a whole, but to focus on the multilingual international undergraduate students’ experiences with them.

Other Relevant Concepts

Translingual communicative practices. It became apparent through my fieldwork that I needed a way to talk about how multilingual international undergraduate students used language in the ESL 115 classroom and in other official university spaces, and the term translingual practices (or translingual communicative practices) kept emerging from literature that I read and other scholars that I spoke to at conferences regarding language policy and multilinguals. The practice refers to using multiple languages from one’s linguistic repertoire in order to communicate. This refers to all aspects of languaging, including speaking and writing. To understand why I choose to use the term, I must discuss why I am not choosing to write about code-switching or code-meshing, which other terms that one finds in literature about

multilinguals.

Why translingual communicative practices. In Second Language Acquisition or Linguistics literature, one might find the terms code-switching, code-mixing, or code-meshing to describe when a person uses more than one language to communicate in a certain situation. These terms emerged out of the study of bilingualism, which primarily concerns itself with child-language acquisition. The terms bilingualism and code-switching/mixing/meshing are grounded in an understanding of language that harkens back to Saussure's (1916) ideas of *langue* (the structure and rules of a language) and *parole* (the speaker's actual usage of language and its rules), all of which view "language" as a discrete entity where a speaker (or user) of a language (or languages) consciously or sub-consciously switches between the *langue* of each in their repertoire (Milroy, L., & Muysken, P., 1995).

In current language policy literature, the term translinguaging is now used in place of others like code-switching or code-meshing. The term was coined by Cen Williams (1994, 1996, as cited in Garcia & Wei, 2014) in his work on English/Welsh bilingual classrooms in Wales, but has since then been adopted by many scholars to "refer to both the complex language practices of plurilingual individuals and communities, as well as the pedagogical approaches that use those complex practices" (Garcia & Wei, 2014, p. 20). Garcia and Wei note that "the concept of translinguaging is based on radically different notions of language and bilingualism than those espoused in the 20th century, an epistemological change that is the product of acting and languaging in our highly technological globalized world" (p. 20).

Suresh Canagarajah (2012) offers a succinct explanation for the reason that translinguaging, or "translingual practice", is adopted, rather than other terms previously used

by scholars to discuss the use of multiple languages by speakers in communication:

“We have many other terms used by diverse scholars to represent their insights into cross-language relations in the global contact zones. Jorgensen (2008) coins *poly-lingual languaging* to refer to children’s playful shuttling between languages in Europe. Blommaert (2008) uses *hetero-graphy* for African literacy which involves a mix of different languages and semiotic systems. Pennycook (2010) adopts *metrolinguistics* for urban communication in which people adopt languages not traditionally associated with their communities for new identities. The Council of Europe (2000) has used *plurilingualism* to refer to the functional competence in partial languages it is aiming to develop among school children. I adopt the umbrella term *translingual practice* to capture the common underlying processes and orientations motivating these communicative modes” (Canagarajah, 2012, p. 6).

He goes on to emphasize that the use of the term translingual practice differs from a monolingual perspective that is undergirded in other terms to describe similar practices. A monolingual perspective, according to Canagarajah, says that speakers have a certain competence in discrete languages, and those speakers must have certain levels of competence in those discrete languages in order to be able to use them in communication (code-meshing and code-switching both have this monolingual view where high levels of competence are required in both cases by bilingual speakers) (p. 10). This is a paradigm-shift where all speakers are translingual to some degree, where we use different codes (linguistic codes and semiotics) in our repertoires to communicate (languages frequently “borrow” words from other languages, etc.) (p. 8).

Perhaps most convincingly, the term translingual practice fits this dissertation because of how Canagarajah (2012) separates it from the terms *translanguaging*, *dynamic bilingualism*, and *plurilingualism*. He states that the scholars in applied linguistics use those terms “have been more concerned with defining translingual practices as involving a different type of cognitive competence”, where language use is purely cognitive (p. 10). Instead, Canagarajah asserts, and I agree, that “we have to treat meaning-making as a social practice that engages holistically with ecological and contextual affordances” and not as “a solitary mental activity” (p. 10). Thus, I will use translingual practice, or translingual communicative practices, to describe how the student participants in this study use and view language in a way that connects to the social and political, and not only to the cognitive.

English hegemony. Another concept that becomes relevant as I analyzed the data for this study is linguistic hegemony, specifically English hegemony. S.M. Shannon defines linguistic hegemony as “Wherever more than one language or language variety exists together, their status in relation to one another is often asymmetric. In those cases, one will be perceived as superior, desirable, and necessary, whereas the other will be seen as inferior, undesirable, and extraneous” (Shannon, 1995, p. 176). She notes that one of the major consequences of linguistic hegemony is that “the speakers of languages take on the prestigious or devalued characteristics of their languages” (p. 176). English hegemony is the belief that English is a way to achieve success and power in the world, and if you are empowered to speak English according to the norms and practices of the dominant, educated western English-speaking world, you will achieve more in life. So, what does this mean for the multilingual international

student at UIUC, where they are speakers of both a dominant language and minority language?
How do they navigate that space and those languages?

Among the students that participated in this study, all of them recognized the existence of the hegemony of English, but the way in which they navigated that hegemony varied. On one hand, some students accepted the hegemony of English, viewing their own uses of minority languages (their mother tongues) as undesirable in the university space. On the other hand, some of the students exhibited signs of rebelling against this hegemony, choosing to reject the notion of their own mother tongue as inferior to English.

CHAPTER 3

Methods and Procedures: A Qualitative Study

This chapter focuses on the qualitative methodology and procedures that were used in this study. The first section presents an overview of the rationale for using a qualitative approach for a study on language policy in an educational setting. The second section presents the data collection procedures, including a description of the case site: UIUC and student demographics with a break-down of undergraduate international student demographics¹⁵, general ESL policies¹⁶, the specific features of the classroom in which I spent the most time doing observations, and the ESL 115 class structure and goals. The third section is a discussion on my thematic data analysis procedures, which included open-coding of field notes, interview transcriptions, classroom talk transcriptions, and document analysis). I conclude this chapter with a discussion on my positionality and my role as a researcher—that is, how both my professional and personal experiences as well as my identity—affect my work in this project.

Rationale for Qualitative Research

My research focus—how international undergraduate students at UIUC experience English Language Policies at UIUC—is fit for a qualitative, phenomenological approach (Bogdan & Biklen, 1997). Qualitative projects are formulated to explore the perspectives of a particular group of people or individuals and how they “make sense of their lives” (Biklen and Casella, 2007, p. 4). The qualitative methodology that I followed in this dissertation is similar to other studies focused on U.S. higher education institutions, language policy, and international

¹⁵More detail of UIUC as the site of the study can be found in the introduction.

¹⁶ Chapter four is a more in-depth look at the specific ESL policies of UIUC affecting the participants of this study.

students. For example, Leonard (2011) did an extensive qualitative study on the ESL program and language policies at UC Davis, finding that “the ‘ESL issue’ was, and is, contentious and tenuous” (p. 2). Yu (2010) did a qualitative study examining language ideologies of Chinese college students. Hsieh (2006) used qualitative methods to explore how female East Asian college students viewed language and language policies affected their identity. All of these studies used interviews, document analysis, and ethnographic/participant observations, just as I have done in this case study.

Epistemologically, qualitative research does not attempt to find “facts” and “causes,” but instead tries to understand participants’ different points of views about a phenomenon in particular situations (Bogdan and Biklen, 1997, p. 25). This agrees with the philosophy of antinaturalism, where antinaturalists believe that the aim of research should not try to explain human behaviors, but should instead try to understand them through inquiry (Schwandt, 2007). Antinaturalists believe that there are fundamental differences between the natural and human sciences, and because of that uniqueness, there needs to be unique methods for studying human phenomenon (Schwandt, 2013). Along with philosophical underpinnings of antinaturalism, this dissertation also agrees with a social constructivist view that focuses on “social process and interaction,” and looks at how the participants of studies recognize, explain, and understand specific situations in their lives (Schwandt, 2007, p. 39). I did not attempt to primarily ask about the “facts” of ESL policies (although an investigation into what policies exist was necessary for the study), nor the “cause” of certain international student English language proficiency issues and success or lack thereof in academia (as many other studies in this and other research fields have done). Instead, through this dissertation, I wanted to understand the

phenomenon of undergraduate student multilingual English language learners and their experiences with and perceptions of ESL policies at UIUC.

Focusing on this phenomenon gave me insight into the complex nature of language policy as an enacted entity, language ideologies of the students, the institution, and other stakeholders within the institution. It also allowed me glimpses into the students' naturally occurring language and language practices in the classroom and university context, as well as their reported language use, touching on Dell Hymes' (1964) work on the ethnography of communication. The phenomenological approach gave me the freedom to conduct this research in an open-ended way, allowing me to discover knowledge about my site and participants, and let the story unfold as I collected and analyzed my data, rather than predicting facts and making assumptions about the phenomenon before I began. I attempted to, as Stake (1995) says, "enter the scene with a sincere interest in learning how they function in their ordinary pursuits and milieus... with a willingness to put aside many presumptions while [I] learn" (p. 1).

In qualitative research, the questions that are best answered from this approach lend themselves to sampling that is best done in such a way where the researcher can focus on a particular space and context versus other research methods that might involve "random sampling." Qualitative research is "concerned with the relation between meaning— perspectives of actors and the ecological circumstances of action in which they find themselves" (Erickson, 1985, p. 127). The research focuses on a specific, bounded space (Anne Dyson refers to this as a "reality box"), and looks at how actors in that space make meaning of certain realities. As Stake (1995) said, "Case study is the study of the particularity and

complexity of a single case, coming to understand its activity within important circumstances” (p. xi).

This dissertation is a case study that is bound by the “reality box” of international undergraduate students that are multilingual English language learners at UIUC. These multilingual undergraduate students, my participants, were all enrolled in the same section of an ESL 115 writing course in the Spring 2016 semester at UIUC. Bounding this case to one specific ESL 115 writing course was important for many reasons. Firstly, each individual multilingual undergraduate international student has their own story, history, and experiences on campus that change the way policies affect them, and even change the very policies themselves. Because of the nature of the interaction between individual experiences and language policy on campus, I needed to find a group of students that would have as many similar language policy experiences as possible, and students that were taking an ESL course. That course was perhaps mandatory from a policy perspective for many of the students in that course, which made sense for this study’s purposes. Given that language policies vary between different sections of the same ESL course, and that I wanted to get rich and stories that were as “thick” (per Geertz) as possible, bounding this study to one section of one ESL undergraduate course was the best choice.

Research Questions

In designing this study, developing research questions was a fluid process. As Biklen and Casella (2007) noted, “You do not design your study in the qualitative approach and then carry out the work. Design is more mobile than this and requires some flexibility” (p. 5). I began with questions regarding the nature of meaning-making and identity in international students and

language policy. Those questions changed early on in the process, first after a pilot study I conducted in the Spring of 2015, and then again soon after data collection began in the Spring of 2016. I realized that the things I was learning and indeed, wanted to learn more about, went in a similar but slightly different direction, and sub-questions developed around two primary research questions. As I observed the everyday lived experiences and language practices of multilingual international undergraduate students taking an ESL writing course, I began to realize that one of my primary research questions had to revolve around better understanding the institutional context of language policy (and some of its history). This connected to my other primary question which was intended to focus on the students themselves, their experiences, perceptions, and everyday lives as they relate to language, language policy, language ideologies, and language use. Thus, these questions below were edited repeatedly as I narrowed my attention to the aspects of the phenomenon that I deemed most important in terms of how the results could most benefit the students, which has always been my top priority.

1. What are the language policies at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign that most affect multilingual international undergraduate students in this study?
 - a. What are the language policies “from above”? (From the institution, campus admissions, and department levels)
 - b. What are the language policies “from below”? (From the students, teachers, and day-to-day levels)
2. What are multilingual international undergraduate students’ experiences with and perceptions of language policies at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign?

Data Collection

Site. UIUC. The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign is a large Midwestern university that is an R-1 institution, top-ranked in engineering, and known for its innovation in science and technology as well as agriculture, though the majority of students are enrolled in its College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. A land-grant institution that was founded as a part of the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign was originally founded to serve the “working class” and minorities of the state of Illinois (Association of Public and Land-grant Universities, 2012, p. 1), and it still fulfills that mission to some degree, as 73.2% of its undergraduate student body considers Illinois their home state (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2017a). Somewhat controversially, UIUC has seen the number of international students more than double and become almost 25 % of its student body in just a few years (IIE, 2016; University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2017a). Under the current 2013-2016 Strategic Plan for the University (the second official strategic plan for the institution), this intentional change in student enrollment demographics is a part of the larger campus-wide Shared Vision articulated in the plan: “We will be the pre-eminent public research university with a land-grant mission and a global impact” (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2013). This enrollment change, as well as the focus on internationalization, has caused waves on campus in many ways, as well as in the surrounding community.

In the 2015-2016 school year, the student body was comprised of 32,878 undergraduate students and 11,209 graduate students. For the undergraduate population, 16.8 % are international students, and 16.2 % are considered “underrepresented” students. The majority

of undergraduate international students come from the People's Republic of China, with a total of 3070, followed by 697 from South Korea, 485 from India, 91 from Taiwan, 83 from Malaysia, and 560 from other countries (the student participants in this study come from China, India, and Malaysia). By all accounts, UIUC has become quite a diverse campus.

ESL 115 writing course. The international students at UIUC are required to have a certain level of English proficiency to gain admittance into the University, and a certain number of those students are required to take ESL courses as a part of their graduation requirements. These ESL courses are housed in the Linguistics Department under the title "ESL Service Courses" and serve as the site for my observations of one section of an ESL writing course for this case study about the English language policies at UIUC.¹⁷ ESL 111 Intro to Academic Writing I and ESL 112 Intro to Academic Writing II, as well as ESL 115 Principles of Academic Writing, are all courses that fulfill the Composition I requirement for undergraduate degree-seeking students (the Rhetoric 105 equivalent). Based on English Placement Test (EPT) scores, undergraduate students are placed into either a two-sequence course (ESL 111/112) or a one semester course (ESL 115). ESL 111/112 is the course sequence for those with lower EPT scores and starts with basic paragraph development and rhetorical analysis, as well as the development of oral skills. ESL 112 introduces the larger research paper, which includes conducting library research and synthesizing sources, and continues the focus on academic writing style. The course content for ESL 115 covers research paper writing, rhetoric, discourse, and the American academic writing style process (including peer feedback). Undergraduate

¹⁷ More information about the specific policies regarding ESL writing courses can be found in Chapter 4.

students may also earn James Scholars honors credit in these courses. I chose to conduct this dissertation around one section of an ESL 115 course instead of the ESL 111/112 sequence because the study would easily be contained to one semester of classroom observations, and thus make it less likely that participants would drop-out of the study during semester breaks. The students in the two different tracks (ESL 111/112 and ESL 115) may have slightly different English proficiency levels (based on EPT results and TOEFL scores, although that is not necessarily a guarantee), but this was not a concern in my selection criteria; instead, I was mainly concerned with participation rates of the students in the study rather than their proficiency or test scores.

The ESL 115 classroom. The ESL 115 course I observed met in a computer lab in the basement of the Foreign Languages Building on campus. The room itself was dimly lit and had PC desktop computers lining three of the four walls of the small classroom (there were no more than 20 computers in the room). There were two long tables in the middle of the room and on one end, the instructor's PC computer station was placed from a position where things could be projected on to the wall behind the computer station. The chairs were padded, rolling desk chairs, and there were chairs at each computer station as well as a few pulled up to the middle table. Space is tight in the small room, leaving a very small space to pass between the middle table and the chairs, especially when students were sitting at their stations, which was always. In some cases it was impossible for the instructor to pass by the students if the students were doing a group assignment and had their chairs clustered together to converse with groupmates. The ESL instructor talked about the pros and cons of this set-up, but ultimately expressed the positive aspect of being able to see the students' screens during class, which proved especially

helpful for error correction during class writing activities. Some students used the provided PCs, and others brought their own laptops.

Other settings for the study. I followed some of the focal participants to their classes located in other buildings on campus, but the specific buildings and classes will be explained in the data chapters as they become relevant. I conducted interviews with students primarily at a bubble tea café on campus that was recommended by two of the student participants at the beginning of the semester as a place that they frequented. Some of the other student interviews were conducted at two other coffee shop locations on campus, as well as walking to and from classes and in my car in transit to their homes or other locations as the occasion arose. For administrators and instructors, those interviews were conducted primarily in private office spaces of their choosing on campus, once in a private home, and once over Skype.

Participants

The main participants, and indeed the main focus, in my study were the 15 students in one ESL 115 course at UIUC in Spring 2016 (there was 100% participation in my study from this class).¹⁸ Of the 15 students, 13 were from China, one was from India, and the other from Malaysia. The class had six males (all from China) and nine females (seven from China, one from India, and one from Malaysia). The 15 student participants had a total of 18 discrete languages in their collective linguistic repertoires. In the class, 11 students were freshmen,

¹⁸ Because of the low participation rate of my pilot study, and after consulting with some international undergraduate student connections, I chose to pay students for participating in my study. I paid them \$20, which was stated on the consent form that they received during their one-on-one interview with me (they had to consent to be observed for the entire semester and to do one interview with me in order to receive compensation). I paid the primary instructor \$50 for her participation and made it clear on the consent form that payment would be received at the end of the semester. The other participants were unpaid.

three were sophomores, and one was a junior. Six students attended at least one year of high school in the U.S. The range of their TOEFL score is 96-107, and the range of their SAT score is 1900-2200 (all self-reported figures; see Appendix A for the “Student Participant Chart”).

Because international students can have such varying experiences with language policies at Illinois (e.g. different academic units, different language experiences, different advisors, different “loopholes,” different instructor approaches and activities in courses), I chose to bound the study to a case involving undergraduates that are labeled as “ESL students” from the University’s perspective, and those in one single ESL course, so that I could better understand this group of students’ particular context in a way where they all have as many common factors as possible. I chose to focus on undergraduates for three reasons: 1) much existing research on international students has been done on graduate students, but there is a lack of focus on undergraduate students; 2) there are such variances in how undergraduate, graduate, and intensive English program international students experience and interact with ELPs, that it is necessary to choose one population to focus on; 3) there is a need to learn more about this population of students as the enrollment numbers for undergraduate international students are growing faster than other student populations. In addition to the students, the instructor for the ESL 115 class was also a main participant, as I spent time observing her and her actions, and we had informal chats and one formal interview together. There were other peripheral participants in the study that I will also describe below.

Focal participants. As I spent time observing the class, especially in the early days of the study, I arrived early to chat with the students before class began. I was looking for students that who seemed to warm up to me, were interested in what I was doing, and felt willing to

share about their lives. Additionally, I was looking for groups of students who seemed to have natural connections with each other, whether that be friend groups, study groups, or perhaps friendships that evolved over the course of the semester. I was interested in making at least one of the non-Chinese students to be a focal participant and wanted to have different genders, majors, and language backgrounds as focal participants to enrich the data.

In the end, I was able to have four focal students that met my criteria who were mainly chosen because of the special rapport that we developed either during class or during our initial interview: two Chinese females (Ying and Kirstie), one Indian female (Dipti), and one Chinese male (Guohua).¹⁹ Their majors and language backgrounds varied as well as their gender and country of origin. With those students, I had at least one extra interview day with them and went to at least one non-ESL class with them to observe their experiences. I spent additional hours with Ying and Dipti, the most time being with Ying. As I describe my focal participants, there are a few things about them that became very relevant to the topic of this dissertation, in addition to basic demographics: type of high school they went to and what languages they know and can use (this was sometimes difficult for students to identify—more on this in the later findings chapters). I also will describe Elise, the focal participant who instructed the ESL 115 course.

Ying. Ying is a Chinese freshman female from Beijing, majoring in Psychology. Ying is the most multilingual student in the class with seven languages in her linguistic repertoire:

¹⁹ All names of participants talked about in this dissertation are pseudonyms except for the administrator participants who agreed to let me use their real names. I used pseudonyms for the students based on the names they used in class. (E.g., Chinese names got a Chinese pseudonym and English names got English pseudonyms). I did this to respect their preferences for what names they use on campus.

Mandarin, English, Cantonese, Korean, Spanish, and two Chinese dialects—Shandonghua and Anhuihua. She described her family as “rich but not super-rich” and went to an elite British private high school in Beijing. Her family wanted her to attend a U.S. university, and her father specifically chose UIUC for her. However, because her high school also had a direct pipeline to British universities, her family decided she should take tests and prepare both for the British system and U.S. system. She spent a significant amount of time talking to me about the relationships she had formed in her high school and how that carried over to the relationships she has now at UIUC (which also affects her language use on campus), elaborating on the complexities of the “super-rich” lifestyle of students that were her classmates in China; this made her initial interview fascinating. She and I chatted naturally, and she was excited to take me to a couple of her Psychology classes and spend extra time with me later in the semester. As a student in ESL 115 and her other classes, I observed Ying as a student who is prompt, quiet, focused, and on-task. She told me that she understood every word from the class lectures and said that she did not feel that her courses were particularly difficult for her; an overall “A” student. Ying spoke in a combination of Mandarin and English when talking to classmates, but mostly Mandarin.

Ying has a cool air about her with an almost aloof expression that makes it seem like she does not care what others think. Long, strawberry-blonde-dyed hair, make-up, accessories, name-brand clothing styled in a distinctly urban Chinese way, and the way she carries herself give off the vibe that she is much older than she actually is, or at the very least, more mature than her peers. You would not likely catch her smiling in class or walking on campus, but when you sit down to a cup of coffee (she drinks coffee and not tea—very fashionable in China), she

is attentive, wide-eyed, and opens up easily. She has a sense of awareness about the world around her that is intriguing (the way she describes things with a sense of history is particularly insightful), and she speaks in English smoothly and easily (not without an accent, but easy to converse with), sharing her very reflective thoughts about her own culture, her classes, and her future dreams. Ying and I got along well as we had chats over coffee, and over the course of the semester, we had thoughtful conversations about many different subjects.

Dipti. Dipti is an Indian female freshman student from Rajasthan (the largest state in India), majoring in Industrial Design. She converses fluently in four languages: Hindi, English, French, and Marwari (a language specific to her state). Dipti is short and petite and alternates her clothing between American and Indian styles. For example, she will wear jeans and a hoodie some days, and other days an embellished cotton outfit from India, but it is always with a very natural and carefree look. Dipti is a bright young woman who speaks quickly and with enthusiasm. Her simultaneous confidence and humility make her very approachable. She is very accomplished and spoke simply with a straightforward manner about her grades (top of her class), test scores (“not that great—but I didn’t really study”), and other abilities. She not only told me about her successes on the national lawn tennis team in India, but mentioned that she was not good enough to make the team here at UIUC; “maybe next year”).

As for socioeconomic status, her family is considered some of the wealthier in her town, though Dipti talked about coming to UIUC instead of University of Southern California (her first choice) to save her parents some money. The reason Dipti gave for coming to UIUC, however, was not because of cost; her boyfriend of seven years (they have been “dating” since they were in junior high school) was accepted to UIUC the year before, and she came to join him. It was a

lucky coincidence that UIUC also had her major of choice. As a student, Dipti freely raised her hand to ask or answer the instructor's questions in almost every ESL 115 class session, and she even raised her hand during her large Art History lecture to answer a question the professor directed to the crowd. Dipti makes her presence known in class, but she is focused and seems to everything her professors say (she related to me that she understood every word that was exchanged in her classes). She is friendly and talks to other students around her before and after the class, and exudes an air of openness without being loud or boisterous. Dipti always speaks English to her classmates in ESL 115 as it is her only common language with them, but speaks in a combination of Hindi, Marwari, and English when she is with Aisha in Art History class.

Within the first few minutes of our one-on-one interview, Dipti offered to have dinner with me and bring along her best friend Aisha, so that I could ask them both questions about being multilingual and observe them speaking in their hometown language. She, Aisha, and I went to one of their lecture halls and then spent a couple of hours at a coffee shop afterwards, talking more about what their experiences were in class and on campus. They both had very insightful things to say about language and their own language use and seemed to enjoy telling me about where they were from and what their lives were like back in India in comparison to their lives now. They have invited me to stay in their family homes when I visit India next year, and we three are now Facebook friends, so I am enjoying staying in touch with them. I didn't get to include many direct quotes from my time with Dipti in this dissertation, but it was important to spend time with her to add to the diverse perspective of students in this study (not only focusing on the Chinese students).

Kirstie. Kirstie is a Chinese female from Beijing, China, majoring in Mathematics. She speaks Mandarin and English, and no other Chinese language. Kirstie is tall (taller than most in her class) and always comes to class put-together—make-up done, hair styled, wearing a carefully selected outfit with matching accessories, and usually something that includes a light pink bow somewhere (either in her hair or on an accessory), all in a very typical Chinese pop-culture style (think Hello Kitty meets the catwalk). In class, Kirstie always sits next to Ying, and when given the chance, the two always do group work together. While Ying will work independently on the project, Kirstie is the one to ask a brief and whispered question to Ying about the assignment in class that day, or on occasion just chit chat quietly, usually in Mandarin. When she thinks no one is looking, she will look at herself on the camera on her iPhone (which is in a pink and sparkly case) and adjust her hair or make-up. As a student, Kirstie is sharp, understands everything that is said by her instructors (in ESL 115 and other courses, as she told me during our interviews), and is an “A” student.

During our interviews, Kirstie, though very quiet and rarely smiley during ESL 115 class, was very animated, giggled a lot, and asked a lot of questions about me, my time in China, and this research project. She likes cooking and chose to live in an apartment that is more non-traditional in nature as it allows daily and easy access to a kitchen, so that she did not have to eat at residence hall cafes every day. She spoke frequently about feeling self-conscious about her English language abilities, and when speaking English with me, often resorted to Mandarin words that she did not have the vocabulary for in English, hoping that my Mandarin proficiency and her English proficiency would result in better understanding (it sometimes did and other times did not). Kirstie came to the U.S. to study to follow her boyfriend, who is studying in

another state (they were not admitted to the same university) . She intends to finish her degree and go back to China to find a good job.

Guohua. Guohua is a male freshman from China majoring in Mathematics and Statistics. He speaks Mandarin, English, and Spanish, and went to high school all four years in the U.S. He is about 5'9" in height, always came to class dressed casually but put together, and often times in name brands (either ones popular in the U.S. or in China). His hair was always styled in Chinese pop-culture style, and he wore an expensive watch. From our interview and the things he shared with me about vehicles that he and his family drive, I could tell that his family is quite wealthy. During ESL 115, he always sat beside a pair of Chinese girls who always spoke to each other in a loud whisper in Mandarin, and while he would sometimes look over at them and smile, he rarely engaged in the talk during class while the instructor was speaking (unlike the two girls he sat near). The three of them would always work together on group projects when given the option and speak in Mandarin to each other to accomplish the group tasks. He was quiet, never raised his hand to volunteer answers to the instructor's questions, and when called upon, did not seem to know the answers that the instructor was looking for. However, he seemed focused in class and because I could see his screen (I sat across the room from him most of the time), his computer screen was always on the correct website page, so he was following along in class and focused.

Guohua was one of the students that surprised me most during our initial one-on-one interview. Because he did not speak much in class and often did not know the answer to the instructor's questions, I unsure what to expect in terms of fruitfulness of our interviews. It turned out that he was very easy to talk to, opened up and shared a lot about his experiences,

was a very reflective person, and was eager to let me come with him to visit his courses. His spoken English was actually quite smooth and fluent, and he was able to talk about very complicated issues in English with ease. He was quite insightful about language use—his own, his professors, and his peers, and felt quite confident in his English abilities. After I observed a statistics course with him one day, I was impressed with how he understood every part of the lecture and was able to engage in meta-talk about the language that the professor used during the class.

Elise, the instructor. The instructor, whom I will call Elise, was a teaching assistant in the Division of English as an International Language, getting her Master's in Teaching English as a Second Language. Elise is a white female in her early 30s who dressed in a business casual style, wore no make-up and had a simple hair style, and always looked laid-back and approachable. She had taught the ESL 115 course in prior semesters and had experience teaching abroad in another country. She told me in our chats and interview that her experiences living and teaching abroad have influenced the way she views language (her language ideology), language learners, and the way that she handles language policy and management in her ESL classroom. I gained access to her classroom primarily because she was the instructor that participated in my pilot study of this dissertation work, and we had built a good rapport the previous year from that time I spent in her classroom.

Elise had a classroom demeanor with students that was always friendly, and she never seemed to have a bad day. She was clearly prepared for every class, knew every student on a level to which she could talk about his/her writing, and called every student by their preferred name with fairly accurate pronunciation. The students and I could tell that she tried to say their

names the way they pronounced them. She and I established early on that I needed to keep some distance from her so that the students would trust that I was there to observe them without the fear of being reported on to their instructor, and she respected that boundary. We got along well, shared chats at moments when there were no or few students around, and had a mutual sense of respect for each other and the work that we were trying to accomplish in the classroom.

Other participants. In addition to the students from ESL 115, the other participants of my study include one student from a different ESL 115 class (Ethan, a friend of my friend), one friend of a student in ESL 115 (Dipti's best friend, Aisha), one instructor from a different ESL 115 class in Spring 2016 (Rachel, who was referred to me by Elise), one instructor who taught Rhetoric 105 in Spring 2016 (Alex, whom I met at a workshop on campus geared towards instructors who teach international students), and two former administrators of the Division of English as an International Language who have first-hand knowledge of the history of ESL at UIUC dating back to the 1950s (Dr. Kay Aston and Dr. Wayne Dickerson, both of whom agreed to be identified in this study). These participants were helpful to get an understanding of how my case—this particular group of people in this particular ESL 115 class—might be the same or different from other students in similar courses around campus, and to further my understanding of the history of ESL at UIUC and the language ideologies that exist on campus. I conducted one interview for each of these other participants with the exception of the two students with whom I spent more time.

Limitations of participant selection. The students in this ESL 115 course are a good representation of the undergraduate students on campus—the majority of international

undergraduates are from China, South Korea, India, Taiwan, and Malaysia. It is, of course, not a perfect statistical correlation, but it does reflect that the majority of students who encounter language policies are Chinese multilingual English language learners, as well as a smaller number of students from other countries, as in this course. Because this is a case study, my intent is to not gather data about all students on campus nor was it to intentionally create a sample of participants that is randomized yet generalizable for campus. I was lucky that the class that I gained access to happened to be a reasonable representation of international undergraduates as a whole (the majority from China, one from India, and one from Malaysia).

As for the instructor, all MATESL students have to be multilingual and have a certain level of proficiency to gain admission into the program, and preference for teaching assistants is usually given to those who have experience teaching and/or living abroad. Since she had taught ESL 115 in previous semesters, her knowledge of the department and course procedures, as well as her teaching and classroom management skills, were presumably better than those of someone who had just begun teaching that semester or that year. That being said, her own language ideology and views of language policy in the classroom did not seem to be the norm for other instructors of the ESL 115 course (per her and others' interview responses), so the way that she managed language with her students might have been unusual for the department. I do feel, though, that the students' responses to her policies and the classroom environment were not unusual. All in all, while this was not meant to be a representative sample, and it is certainly a small sample of the thousands of undergraduate international students and other individuals in the arena of language policy at UIUC. While there will be limitations to the generalizability of the information that I gained from these

participants, the group is nonetheless representative of the typical student in an ESL 115 course.

Data Collection Procedures

“There is no particular moment when data gathering begins. It begins before there is commitment to do the study: back-grounding, acquaintance with other cases, first impressions. A considerable proportion of all data is impressionistic, picked up informally as the researcher first becomes acquainted with the case. Many of these early impressions will later be refined or replaced, but the pool of data includes the earliest of observations.” – Stake, 1995, p. 49.

In many ways, I have lived in this dissertation for over 10 years. My first years on this campus were spent getting a Master’s degree in Teaching English as a Second Language in the Department of English as an International Language within the larger Linguistics Department and in teaching in the ESL service courses. While I explain my positionality later on in this chapter, it is important to note that, as Stake puts it, data gathering did not only begin when I started classroom observations in the Spring of 2016 or even when I conducted a pilot study in Spring 2015, or even further back when I began casing the joint (a term used in Dyson and Genishi, 2005). When I wrote my statement of purpose for entrance into this PhD program, I wrote about international students and language policy issues. This research topic has been on my mind, and indeed my heart, for a very long time, and I finally had “the privilege to pay attention to what [I] consider worthy of attention and the obligation to make conclusions drawn from those choices meaningful to colleagues and clients” (Stake, 1995, p. 49). The bulk of this dissertation data “officially” was collected during the Spring 2016 semester, but

“unofficially” was being gathered since the Fall of 2006 when I came to this campus, or it could be argued (though I will not argue it here)—even earlier than that.

Gaining access to the site. To begin data collection, I needed to gain access to one section of ESL 115. It was a simple process for the pilot study, as I only wanted to observe a few class sessions, but for a semester-long observational study, it proved to be more difficult than what I had originally thought it would be. Given my history with the ESL service courses and my long-standing relationships with instructors and administrators in the department, I did not anticipate having problems gaining access to one class for the spring semester. I had completed a pilot study the year before and gaining access to that pilot study was fairly straight-forward: I got permission from the course administrators to email instructors, and after several instructors had emailed back agreeing to let me observe their course for research for half of a semester, I was able to choose the instructor that most closely aligned with my study needs as well as with my schedule. However, when it came time to gain access to a course for my dissertation research, I encountered some unanticipated roadblocks, some of which were due to inconvenient timing of my study and others which had further implications for my research. The department itself overall was very helpful to me, and while I eventually gained access to an ESL 115 section to observe, the initial stages were difficult.

I got permission from the head course administrator to contact one particular instructor for research purposes rather than receiving permission to email all ESL 115 instructors as I had done for my pilot study. This surprised me to only have permission to contact one person that the administration had chosen, but the reasons the administration gave were ultimately to

protect instructors and to help me narrow down which class might be the best for me to observe given my research goals.

After an initial email, the instructor took one week to respond, and after another week, finally agreed upon a time to meet with me. At this point, the semester was in week two, and I met with this particular recommended instructor for two hours at a coffee shop on campus. We talked about that instructor's history and interest in ESL, both professionally and academically (the instructor has a Master's in Teaching ESL as I do), and I explained my dissertation research plan. The instructor had many questions about the nature of qualitative research and dissertation projects in general as well as specific research methods that I had mentioned (such as ethnography), and she seemed quite interested in the project. After all, we had spent two hours discussing the subject in detail and how it might relate to the instructor's own potential future in academia. I thought the more detail I could give, the more at ease the instructor would feel. At the end of our meeting, I could sense that the instructor was not ready to give a yes or no answer, so I recommended that they she email me back with a decision. After one week, the instructor emailed and said that after doing their own research into qualitative methodology, they were not comfortable with participating in my study.

Initially disappointed but persevering, I emailed the head of the ESL department and got permission to contact any instructor that I needed to in order to complete my study. The next instructor I contacted swiftly agreed (I chose to contact her because she had agreed to participate in my pilot study the year before), and I was able to begin my observations the very next day. The graciousness and helpfulness of the department is ultimately why my study was successful, and for that I will forever be grateful. Gaining access to a research site is not always

about institutional relationships, but also can simply be a matter of how the researcher presents the details of the project to the participants, and I learned my lesson: sometimes less is more.

ESL 115 observations. Data collection took place during the Spring 2016 semester. The ESL 115 course was held three days per week for 50 minutes per session. I visited the research site two to three times per week for one to one and a half hours over the course of the semester (depending on the amount of chit chat that happened with students before and after class). I generally sat in the back corner of the class and took quick notes that included what was happening in the class, mainly focusing on the student interactions with each other and their language use. In addition, I noted what was happening in the course curriculum that day or interactions between students and the instructor. Each day I noted the seating chart (the students got to choose where to sit and it was never assigned by the instructor), who was in attendance or who was absent (though rarely was someone in a different seat or absent), what was talked about that day in class, and key incidents that I observed as well as general thoughts about the phenomenon, site, and participants. I also had a copy of the course syllabus to reference.

I came early to class and stayed late to chat with students and expedite the rapport building. It was important to make them feel comfortable with my presence in the class. The instructor also did this type of rapport building, and overall, the classroom had a relaxed feeling before instruction began each day. As the semester progressed, I focused my attention on focal students or certain groups of students depending on the day or the amount of interaction that was happening among the students. The instructor often assigned small group work during the

class, and I set multiple audio recorders near certain groups of students to record their language during the group work. Furthermore, I changed my seating position to take notes about their interactions during group work. The students became very comfortable with me changing seats and moving recorders around the room during group work so that it was not an issue affecting their participation in the class or their interaction with each other. After my observations, I turned my quick notes into field notes and also wrote up analytic memos of key incidents that caught my attention so I could review them during the data analysis phase.

Student interviews. Before or after class, I would set up individual interviews with the student participants, discussing where and when to meet, and confirming contact information. It became clear after the first few interviews which students were friends and that the class had shared information with each other over a Wechat group about me, the researcher, and what to expect during an interview with me. One of them showed me the Wechat, and it was simple—all in Chinese, but quite short—someone just wanted reminded what my name was. I then started reminding the student of my name before I asked to set up a time to meet for an interview, which usually provoked a smile or a laugh and put the student at ease.

When I met a student at the café, I started by greeting them and asked their permission to start my recorder right away and held it in my hand as we waited in line together to purchase a beverage and then placed the recorder on the table between us after we sat down to talk. I always offered to purchase the beverage for them as a way to show my appreciation (this was in addition to the official compensation that they received for participating in the study). I started out with chit chat, brief small talk, or answered questions they had as they often were eager to ask me questions about myself or about my study. I had a prepared list of questions

and topics (see Appendix E) to try to address during our time, but I memorized that and did not keep it out on the table as we sat and talked. I initially took notes during my first two student interviews, but found that I was unfocused, and it derailed the natural flow of the conversation, so I stopped taking notes and conducted the rest of the interviews as a conversation. I then only took notes about something if they gave the name of a place I needed to know how to spell. I also took notes if they said the name of something in a language I did not know but I wanted to recall it immediately after the interview. I just started out once we sat down to let the student know that I was interested in getting to know them, asked why they came to UIUC, and talked a little about language and their language use on campus. In each interview, we hit on the topics and questions that I wanted to address and other things that the students brought up that were extremely valuable, interesting, and pertinent to the study. The interviews generally lasted between one and two hours, and sometimes would lead to another appointment the next day or another time. After each interview, I recorded notes about the important highlights from our time together. Each interview was also later transcribed for data analysis purposes.

Focal participant observations and interviews. My focal participants were chosen once I had the initial one-on-one interviews with them, either because we developed exceptionally good rapport or because they had interesting things to say, or because they were eager and willing to let me accompany them to other classes later in the semester. I knew immediately at the end of their one-on-one interviews that I wanted them to be focal participants, so I asked them if I could accompany them to another class. Each of the focal participants were willing, and we immediately set up times to meet at their other classes that I observed. I accompanied

Ying to two separate courses, two psychology courses, and spent time talking with her at a coffee shop and informally on walks or in-transit. I went to one art history class with Dipti and then afterwards went to a café with her and her friend. Also, we spent time texting and connecting on Facebook throughout the semester. Kirstie let me accompany her to an economics lecture, and we spent time talking about that experience later. I went with Guohua to one statistics lecture and spent time talking with him afterwards.

Other interviews and observations: Instructors, administrators, workshop. In addition to interviewing students, I interviewed the instructor of the ESL 115 course, Elise, at least twice—once at the beginning of the semester and once at the end. We also spent many hours together during the previous year when I observed her course and interviewed her for my pilot study. While I kept that observational data separate, my knowledge of her as a person and instructor has grown since that point. My initial interview with her was conducted after the first class I observed in the Foreign Languages Building. In addition to having a conversation and discussing a few specific topics, I wanted to remind her of some “ground rules” for my presence in her course. I was not there to critique her teaching, and I was not there as a teacher observer or a classroom helper. Instead, my main focus for the study was the students. I also told her that if she ever felt I was hindering the class in any way, she was free to let me know. That type of incident never happened over the course of the semester. That interview was not recorded, but I immediately went into my car and took notes on things she said and wrote out an analytic memo when I got home. I had a mental list of things I wanted to ask her but no other written prepared questions. At the end of the semester, we scheduled a time after she submitted final grades and met at a coffee shop. I prepared a list of questions and topics to talk about and

recorded the interview. Even though I knew it would disrupt the flow of the conversation, there were several things that she brought up during our talk that I wanted to review, and if I did not take notes about them, I would forget. On another note, I was used to interviewing multilingual English language learners all semester who spoke in English during our interviews at a slower pace (almost all of them), so this interview was an adjustment for me. I believe she and I had developed a collegial relationship as fellow students and ESL instructors and connected on a personal level, so we enjoyed talking with each other and processing the semester together. After our interview, I recorded more notes about key topics.

The interviews with the other instructors and administrators were primarily conducted as semi-structured interviews because I had prepared questions and topics in advance, but all of the interviews were fairly informal and conversational. All were audio recorded, jottings were taken down during the interviews, and then they all were transcribed. An extra step was taken with the interview with Dr. Wayne Dickerson because we were discussing the history of ESL at UIUC. I took copious notes during the interview. After that interview, I wrote additional notes and thoughts about our conversation and sent him my loose transcript of our talk and the notes so that he could correct any errors I may have made in my interpretation or transcription of what he said. He sent an email back confirming that my analysis and notes were correct according to his understanding.

I also attended one workshop during Spring 2016 for instructors on campus entitled “Working with International Students” that lasted three hours in order to make connections with other instructors or administrators on campus that work with international undergraduate students with the hope of learning more about English language policy at the University. Per

IRB protocol, because of the large number of participants at the workshop, I only recorded notes as a participant observer regarding the general content of the workshop and connected with the Rhetoric 105 instructor that taught international undergraduates, whom I interviewed at a later date.

Document collection. This qualitative dissertation is incomplete without document collection and analysis. I looked at the 2013-2016 Strategic Plan for UIUC, which is available online and in hard copy. A small number of these booklets were published and distributed when the plan was created; I looked for evidence of language policy including language management but especially language ideology. UIUC websites were also useful in synthesizing language management practices and English language policies at an institutional level, all of which are discussed as they become relevant in each chapter. For piecing together the history of ESL at UIUC, Dr. Wayne Dickerson gave me a spiral-bound book of the Division of English as an International Language's 50th Anniversary "Memories and Recollections," which is a collection of writings that was informally published and printed for the department's anniversary celebration in 1997. I read it, made notes of relevant topics to discuss with Dr. Dickerson over our Skype interview, and it proved extremely helpful as a foundational piece for historical information of the department. I also collected three banker boxes of documents from Patti Watts, a long-time instructor in the ESL Service Courses, that had been passed down to her from former department heads and retired professors. These boxes contained information about the history of the department. I reviewed these documents to confirm stories that Dr. Kay Aston and Dr. Wayne Dickerson had shared about the history of ESL at the University.

Data Analysis

As Stake (1995) writes, “There is no particular moment when data analysis begins. Analysis is a matter of giving meaning to first impressions as well as to final compilations.” (p. 71). Just as it is difficult to pinpoint exactly the moment data collection began, it is difficult to pinpoint the exact moment that data analysis for this dissertation began. As soon as data started coming in, the analysis started. I started categorizing what I was learning, developing themes, re-working those themes, and confirming the knowledge that I was gathering with those that I was working with—the students, instructors and administrators. Then, I did Open-coding, triangulated data, and then repeated. The official data analysis, following the conclusion of classroom observations and interviews, followed this path:

- First, I re-read my quick notes, field notes, and analytic memos as well as the themes that I had developed along the way. I then personally transcribed all of my student interviews and most of the interviews with the instructors and other administrators. I also contacted Dipti and asked her to transcribe portions of her interview and recorded chit chat during the art history lecture with Aisha. The interview was in three different languages, one of which she and Aisha are two of the only speakers of that language on campus). Also, I asked a friend to transcribe the ESL 115 group work recordings that included talk in Mandarin and English. He is a Mandarin speaker who does not know any of the other participants in my study. I also had someone transcribe the interview with the other ESL 115 instructor and the interview with Kay Aston. All of the transcription work was paid at a rate of \$10 per hour.

- After reading through the notes, transcriptions, and initial open-coding of thematic ideas that I had written while collecting data, which were based on Bogdan and Biklan's (1997) suggestions of coding categories, I developed a system of open-coding that I then changed into themes. The themes revolved around students' previous experiences with language policy in their high school days, language use in the classroom (translingual communicative practices), examples of policy from above and policy from below, and language ideologies of the institution and the students themselves, just to name a few.
- I wrote analytic memos based on the themes that I developed from my analysis of the transcriptions and notes.
- Although this process was much less concrete than following a step-by-step process, the final step was to review all my themes, notes, and memos, and narrow them down to larger categories that became my findings chapters.

Data analysis began the moment data collection began. After each observation and each new interview, I had a clearer idea of what I wanted to focus on and what I was learning. My research questions became more salient, my focal participants became more important in my notes, and the stories I wanted to tell became more exciting. It was helpful to talk through my ideas with fellow PhD students and professors, colleagues at conferences I attended, and even family members and friends, as I would learn new and fascinating things about these wonderful people and this amazingly complex issue of English language policy at UIUC. All of that was part of my data analysis and helped me formulate the themes that became my data chapters in this dissertation.

For example, one of the most fascinating themes was the way the students viewed their multilingual abilities. I would read each transcription repeatedly and look for the places that they discussed or remained silent about their language abilities, not just in terms of English language proficiency, but about their own primary languages. The students from China, especially, were often reluctant to offer the fact that they are not just bilingual; they do not only know Mandarin, English, and Korean, but they also learned and have a high level of proficiency in a local language that very few people in the world actually know exists. I would then read the transcripts to see how their own views of their language abilities came through in other things they said. I focused on questions such as:

- Did they talk about their English ability?
- Did they mention ways in which their parents tried to manage language use in the home?
- Are there certain indexicalities of those local languages that came through in the interviews, and how do all of these things affect how they perceive the English language policies that they experience at UIUC?

As I looked at one theme, I developed another theme, and I condensed, included, or pushed aside other themes. Data analysis for the documents was similar as it included more confirmation of interview transcriptions and notes.

Role of the Researcher

My research on English Language Policies and the campus of UIUC stems from my personal etic and emic connections to the topic. I have been on this campus since 2006, first as a student in the Masters in Teaching English as a Second Language (MATESL) program, as a TA

in the ESL Service Courses teaching English pronunciation, as a TA at the Intensive English Institute (IEI), then as a full-time ESL instructor at the campus's intensive English program (the IEI) and their Cultural Engagement Coordinator (a mid-level administrative position), and now also a PhD student in the Global Studies in Education division of Education Policy Studies (EPOL). My life and work has revolved around English language learners, English language policies, and international students for the past decade. This contributes to emic understanding of the locality and its politics as well as my etic understanding of sociolinguistics, second language acquisition, and education policy in higher education. I have been on campus during what I would label one of the largest policy changes in the past 20 years of the institution—the rapid and intentional increase of undergraduate international student enrollment.

When the increase of undergraduate international students is brought up on campus in meetings, boardrooms, and over coffee, it has been my observation over the past ten years that talk almost always involves the English language proficiency of those students. I have seen policies related to English language proficiency that were often made quickly and ad hoc without much reflection or study on their effectiveness or outcomes whether intended or unintended (agreeing with Spolsky, 2004). Furthermore, the policies were made without any input from the international students themselves; they are almost always excluded from these institutional conversations about their own linguistic abilities and policies (from above) that directly affect their everyday lived experiences.

While I have certainly developed opinions over the years about language issues on this campus, the aim of this study was to discover the perspectives and experiences of the students themselves. I believe that erasing all traces of bias in any research work of this nature is

impossible, but I did approach this study with an awareness that I should moderate my own biases and try to minimize them. For example, because I lived in China for two years and have a degree of proficiency in Mandarin, I did not want my own biases about and experiences with Chinese students to interfere with how I listened to them speak about their lives. I have many friends who are international undergraduate students on this campus from China, and I talk to them frequently about language issues. However, their experiences might be different from the students' experiences in the ESL 115 course I was researching. So, I carefully prepared and asked colleagues to edit research questions that would probe aspects of their language use that I knew existed without making them leading in any way. Then, as I listened to the recordings of interviews with my key participants, I later asked them questions to try to confirm my understanding of what they said. I did not want my suppositions about student perspectives to interfere with what the participants would actually reveal about their experiences.

Additionally, my role as an ESL instructor (formerly in the department where I conducted my research as well as in another department on campus) could substantially interfere with how I pursued this project. I have never taught ESL 115 or any writing course in the ESL service courses, but I did teach pronunciation courses for the department about nine years ago. This gave me an idea of how the department worked, but it meant that the ESL 115 writing course was new to me and I had no stake in it. Because the study was not about evaluating the course itself nor was it about evaluating the quality of teaching that I observed, there was no need to record my observations about such things. That being said, as a professional in the field, there are obvious things that I notice that another researcher outside of TESL might not; thus, it was important for me to keep in mind that I was there as a

supportive researcher. This meant I was someone who was interested in supporting the instructor to the degree that it would be the least invasive for the instructor and her students, and not there as someone who was in any way offering an evaluative perspective on the instruction. Even when I was asked questions from students or instructors (or administrators) regarding evaluating the course itself or the instruction, I declined to respond and re-directed the inquirer to another point. I hope that it also shows in my writing that I truly did want to focus on how the students were experiencing and perceiving English language policies on campus, and that my professional experiences and understanding of the field of TESL only served to give me a fuller understanding of the students' experiences.

I was concerned that my professional role in the University could hinder the trust that the students and other participants would extend to me. In order to gain their trust, I knew that I needed to present myself to the students (and teachers and administrators) in such a way that was non-threatening, and as a person who was on their side. I had to demonstrate that I was someone who had some understanding of their lives and experiences and who wanted the best for them as individuals. In order to do this, I knew that I needed to be convincing in my role as a student and researcher who was seeking to understand their perspectives rather than the role that I have usually fulfilled on campus. Usually, I fulfill the role of the "expert" who has a certain degree of authority (i.e., my role as a workshop facilitator for faculty members about culture and international students or my role as an experienced ESL instructor). I tried to establish myself in this way from the outset of the project. To gain access to an ESL 115 course, I said things such as, "I'm just a PhD student who's trying to graduate—a dissertation is just an exercise in research as a practice; no one will probably read it anyway"). I also introduced

myself on the first day of the class and said, “I’m just a fellow student like you who is trying to complete a project so that I can graduate.” Then, in the interviews that I conducted, I said, “I’m really interested in you as a person and your own life and experiences, and especially you and language—tell me about yourself!”.

Based on the rich data I got from interviews and observations, I feel that I did ultimately gain the trust of my study participants in a positive way. They, for the most part, wanted to open up to me and share their perspectives, and they seemed glad that someone was looking into this part of their lives.

CHAPTER 4

Language Policy from Above: Language-as-Problem

Language policy, or language planning and policy (as it is often referred to in the literature), is an extremely complex and multi-faceted entity. Teresa McCarty (2011) and others in the language policy and planning field describe it as a sociocultural process (or processes), and “an integrated and dynamic whole that operates within intersecting planes of local, regional, national, and global influence” (p. 8). Describing language policy is more than just finding texts that document a clearly articulated position or effort to manage language and its use; instead, as Ricento and Hornberger (1996) write, it is like “unpeeling the onion” of the “multilayered construct” (p. 419; as quoted in McCarty, 2011, p. 8). Understanding, and then disrupting, current language policy at UIUC was much like this—finding layer upon layer of processes and actors that interact with each other over the span of more than 100 years.

Using Mortensen’s (2014) construct of language policy from above and language policy from below (adapting Preisler’s (1999) English from above and English from below), I approached language policy by looking at it from macro-level— an institutional perspective including the history of the development of English language policy (English policy from above), and a more micro-level—in the classroom, among teachers, TAs, and students (English policy from below). I heavily rely on Bernard Spolsky’s three-pronged construct of language policy, where language policy consists of language management efforts, language ideology and beliefs, and language practices, dissecting both English policy from above and English policy from below by looking at each one’s language management efforts, language ideology and beliefs, and language practices.

In this chapter, I discuss UIUC's institutional language policies—English policy from above. The majority of this research was done through analyzing documents and website text, as well as through analyzing interview data from both administrators, instructors, and students. I start with a brief discussion of the late 19th century and focusing largely on the policies that took shape beginning in the 1940s with the creation of ESL courses. I then explain the institutional English language policies that were in effect when this research was conducted (Spring 2016). The main goal of this chapter is to answer the research question “What are the English language policies from above at UIUC that most affect the multilingual international undergraduate students in this study?” I posit that the institutional English language policies (English policy from above) have a language-as-problem orientation.

Interviews on the History of ESL at UIUC

In order to have a full understanding of the context of language policy at UIUC, I interviewed three key people: Prof. Katherine (Kay) Aston, who was one of the original professors involved in creating the Division of English as an International Language (DEIL) at UIUC, and Profs. Lonna and Wayne Dickerson, two of the key professors in DEIL during its early years, and the accompanying Masters in Teaching English as a Second Language program (the oldest of its kind in the U.S.). These three people have a long-term perspective of the full development of language policies, as well as have witnessed a long history of multilingual international students at the institution, and I am lucky enough to know all three of them. I first met Prof. Wayne Dickerson as a MATESL student at UIUC in 2008, and he and Lonna have been influential mentors in my life ever since. The Dickersons introduced me to Prof. Aston, meeting her first informally and then for a formal interview in the Spring of 2016. As I describe the

history of language policy at UIUC going back to the 1940s, I will refer to the multiple unstructured interviews with the Dickersons and Prof. Aston, as well as an informally published and bound collection of memoirs from 29 people (all former instructors, administrators, or students) about the Division of English as an International Language written in 1997 (on loan to me from the Dickersons' private library) (Goodman, 1997).

Timeline of Early English Language Policy at UIUC

1946: First non-credit ESL courses offered (grammar and pronunciation)

1947: First for-credit ESL courses offered (Rhet 9a and Rhet 9b)

1948: First for-credit ESL writing courses were offered to undergraduate students

1953: First non-credit intensive English program offered for UIUC students

1955: Creation of the program in English for foreign students (Helen Brennan as
Chairman)

1956: First special ESL program offered for non-UIUC students through UIUC (Hungarian
refugees relocated to Champaign-Urbana after the Hungarian Revolution)

1958: First course offered to teachers of English as a Second/Foreign Language by Dr. Mary
Sleator Temperley (English 388; the informal beginning of the Master's in Teaching ESL
degree)

1965: Creation of the Linguistics Department

1981: First non-credit ESL course offered for visiting scholars called "American Language and
Culture"

(Timeline developed from Goodman, 1997).

The History of Language Policy at UIUC: 1906—1997

My main research on language policies at UIUC begins in the 1940s, but that is not to exclude the fact that UIUC has been hosting multilingual international students for more than a century. As it is written on the “Illinois-China History” fact page of Illinois International’s website (the website of the umbrella department at UIUC for all things “international”), UIUC’s President Edmund J. James formed a close relationship to the Chinese Minister to the United States, Wu Ting-Fang, in the early 20th century. A true visionary, President James established the first office for foreign²⁰ students in the United States, and began then a tradition of welcoming students from other countries to UIUC to pursue higher education. He saw the potential and mutual benefit of the exchange of scholarship and student mobility between the U.S. and China in a journal article he wrote in 1906: “...the nation which succeeds in educating the young Chinese of the present generation will be the nation which, for a given expenditure of effort, will reap the largest possible returns in moral, intellectual, and commercial influence” (University of Urbana-Champaign, 2017c). Convincing President Theodore Roosevelt to create a scholarship program, (in part funded by China), to bring Chinese scholars to study in the U.S. after the 1901 Boxer Rebellion, James was a part of bringing a new demographic of students to UIUC—Chinese scholars. UIUC hosted one third of all Chinese students coming to study at a higher education institution in the U.S., and today, partly because of that legacy more than 100 years ago, UIUC hosts the most Chinese students of all universities in the U.S. My primary research focuses on students from three different countries (not only China), but the long

²⁰ The term “foreign” here is according to the records of UIUC during the early 1900s. “International” replaced the now-pejorative term “foreign” many years later.

history of UIUC welcoming and educating students from all across the globe is important to note, as this land-grand university has a century-old precedent of seeing the value in educating multilingual international students.

This change in UIUC student demographics in the early 20th century no doubt would have come with some type of language policy work on the part of the institution. According to a 1997 collection of memoirs from the 50th anniversary celebration of the Division of English as an International Language (DEIL) department at UIUC (1997), the first mention of English language policies at UIUC that is documented is in the 1907 University Senate minutes (Davidson, 1997) and likely refers to the large delegation of Chinese students studying at the University. While I am certain that, even in the early 1900s, language policies existed at the institutional level at UIUC (language policies as enacted beliefs about language always exist, even by the absence of an explicit policy), my interest for the purposes of this dissertation begins with English language policy in the 1940s at the creation of special English courses for multilingual international undergraduate students.

Solving the “problem” of language through ESL courses. *First ESL courses.* The first creation of an English course for multilingual international undergraduate²¹ students at UIUC came in the academic year 1946-1947 in the form of a special section of Rhetoric—Rhet 9a—in the English Department. Mary Hussey, one of the original ESL instructors at UIUC, wrote in the DEIL Memoirs (Goodman, 1997) her perspective of why ESL courses at UIUC were created:

²¹ Presently at UIUC, there are a wider variety of ESL courses offered to graduate students, but originally, ESL courses were created for undergraduate students.

“...Helen Brennan [an instructor in the department] and I were having one of our frequent conversations about our students in freshman rhetoric at the U. of I. Among other observations and problems was the especially knotty one that we—along with other Rhetoric instructors—had in our classes some non-native speakers of English²². Not only were they non-native speakers of English but they showed varying degrees, in levels, of knowledge of, and facility in the English language. How to deal with the problem?!” (p. 3-4).

In another essay in the same memoirs, Mary Kay Peer writes:

“Fifty years ago there was a need to help the foreign²³ students who had enrolled in the University of Illinois. Obviously Rhetoric 101—or even Rhetoric 100 – could not fill the need. There was born a few courses to teach English as a Second Language. ... Gradually more courses developed, more examinations were given to test the needs of students, more faculty was added. ... Like Topsy, English as a Second Language grew” (p. 1).

Jean Praninskas, in her essay “Something Special” from the memoirs, recalls that during “the very early fifties”, the ESL courses “consisted of a few dozen disoriented foreign students (*foreign*²⁴ was not yet a pejorative word) who were eager to increase their facility with the English language as quickly as possible so they could get on with their lives, and a sparse

²² Non-native speaker is a common term used in the field of Linguistics and Second Language Acquisition to describe a person who uses a language that they have learned during the adult stages of life, usually around puberty or later. Inside these two fields of academic study (where TESL research is commonly located), this is a technical and non-pejorative term.

²³ The term “foreign” in reference to students from other countries is now seen as pejorative, but it was not so during the time of the creation of ESL courses, and the timeframe for which this memoir was written to recall.

²⁴ Italics hers, not mine

handful of teachers who thought we knew how to help them do so” (p. 5). She goes on to describe a conversation she had with Helen Brennan about the students and this perceived language “problem”:

“She [Helen Brennan] explained that, despite the best efforts of Admissions officers, an increasing proportion of the foreign students arriving at the University lacked even the most basic English language skills necessary to benefit from our offerings. This I already knew. So? ‘I’ve convinced the administration to let us offer, on an experimental basis only, one section of intensive language training. Since you have recently taught in an intensive program, I’ve decided you are the logical person to do it.’ You wonder that I quote after 47 years? Those words changed my life!” (p. 5).

Mary Hussey notes that Helen Brennan “had had some experience with this situation at the English Language Institute at the University of Michigan, which was perhaps the first U.S. university to recognize the problem and to offer in its curriculum separate courses for the non-native speakers of English registered in that university. This plan had been quite successful So Helen and I decided right then and there in a corridor of Lincoln Hall that that was what we needed here at the U. of I” (p. 3).

These quotes show a prevalent attitude then towards multilingual English language learners that I argue persists today at the University: there is a language-as-problem orientation. The “problem” referred to here had to do with the international undergraduate students and their ability to understand and learn the content of the mandatory University Rhetoric course—a course that is still required for all university undergraduate students to this day, and perhaps even the problem of their English language proficiency preventing them from

being successful in American academia. The English Rhetoric instructors saw themselves as champions for the international students, helping them to gain access to a special course that would meet their language needs and solve their language “problem”.

It is noted by Mary Hussey that they knew they would need to convince University administration that ESL courses were necessary for their students, saying “...we agreed that she [Helen Brennan] should be the one to approach our superiors and plead our case, and that I would help with any necessary arguing, badgering, imploring and begging...” (p. 3). She explains that it was a difficult process meeting much resistance from the administration. She quotes the “Heads” of the Rhetoric and English Departments: “The foreign students can take the same courses that the Americans do. They have to show the same proficiency etc., etc., etc.” (p. 3). Strikingly, this sounds much like the conversations that persist today on the campus of UIUC that I have witnessed myself; conversations that oscillate between thinking that there is a “problem” with international student English language proficiency, but questioning whether the University itself has an obligation to do anything about that “problem”. Eventually, “the Department Head was worn down—and out—and grudgingly (not approvingly) consented to this new arrangement, the Head of the English Department subsided” (p. 3).

The ESL courses began officially in 1947, and were, according to Hussey, “non-credit and remedial, a term highly despised now” (p. 3). They offered a course in grammar and sentence structure and a course in pronunciation, which then expanded a few years later to also offering special for-credit writing courses that substituted for Rhetoric 1 and Rhetoric 2 which were required for all undergraduate students. The writing courses came about because “the entire staff at last realized that we could more adequately prepare our students for regular course

work in the University by teaching them how to write in English” (p. 3), showing again the self-proclaimed motivation of the instructors who were teaching, creating, and fighting for the courses—they wanted to help the international undergraduate students be successful in American academia, and the students’ English language proficiency was interfering in that success. Thus, for quite some time, the ESL department offered non-credit courses for foreign undergraduate students in grammar and pronunciation, and two for-credit courses to meet the Rhetoric requirement for all undergraduate students, and the English language policies “from above” at this University were born.

English Placement Test as policy. The offering of non-credit ESL courses in grammar and pronunciation and for-credit ESL courses in academic writing (the equivalent of Rhetoric 100 and 101) also came with English language proficiency assessments for every admitted international student (both undergraduate and graduate), and thus the expansion of English language policy at UIUC. Hussey notes:

“By this time [the early 1950s] our placement test was reasonably well developed and was given each semester to all newly arrived foreign students who had not passed the TOEFL²⁵ test (or any similar test) before leaving their home country. The U. of I.

Departments required this of foreign students registering at the U. of I. Our tests, now in the graveyard, consisted of four parts: (a) an oral interview, which provided us with the student’s background information as well as his/her pronunciation level; (b) an objective

²⁵ Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) is an internationally-recognized, privately funded English proficiency exam used as an admissions gatekeeper for multilingual international students at higher education institutions particularly in the United States. Other English-speaking countries use the TOEFL or another similar proficiency exam called IELTS (International English Language Test)

test in oral comprehension, using the University of Michigan test; (c) an objective test in structure, also the U. of Michigan test; and (d) a composition the topic selected by the student from a list of topics given by the examiner. As time went by, Helen, another member of the faculty, and I devised our own objective tests. And so it went, from year to year, with occasional additions and deletions in our program and with steadily rising numbers of students to be placed in our courses or to be sent on to the regular Rhetoric courses with the native speakers” (p. 4).

This description of the early English Placement Test (EPT) required at UIUC is close to the current EPT that UIUC requires for all incoming international students (graduate and undergraduate). The policy structure also remains the same: there is a set score on the TOEFL that prospective students must reach in order to gain admittance into UIUC, and the score is set by Department or College level, thus making the primary gate-keeping English language policy at UIUC quite decentralized.

As Fred Davidson notes in his essay in the collection of 1997 memoirs:

“ESL testing at UIUC... has endeavored to stay true to the goal of reliable and valid measurement of English proficiency of international students. At the same time, [UIUC] has actively innovated language testing. We have sought to produce ESL tests via the latest and best methodologies and to interpret them with the latest and best analytical means. We have created and maintained an ESL testing database at the service of UIUC administration. We have sought a productive and collegial relationship with our testing clientele. Staying true to reliability and validity is an active process. It is not static. It cannot vegetate or become moribund. We know that no good test is ever done. A test is

a reaction to changes in demographics, politics, theory, curriculum and a large range of other pressures. It answers a mandate, but the mandate is often hard to define or in a state of flux. The hard bit of language testing is to remain true to the old demands—reliability and validity—while also being true to the need for change. That is the ongoing challenge of ESL testing for DEIL’s next half-century” (p. 51-52).

The language-as-problem orientation towards multilingual international students at UIUC in its early stages seemed to come from keeping the students’ best interests at the forefront. a position of keeping and after reading the memoirs and hearing stories of these people being told by my interviewees from the department, they certainly meant to do only good and not harm. The memoirs seem to repeat themselves in a single narrative: The foreign students had a language proficiency problem; this language proficiency problem prevented them from succeeding in American academia like other American students; offering ESL courses would help solve this language proficiency problem by helping them improve their proficiency so that they can be more successful in American academia.

This language-as-problem orientation becomes disruptive because it prioritizes English as the only language necessary for success, and de-emphasizes the importance and benefit of a student’s other languages in their repertoire. This language ideology says, first of all, that there is a specific dialect of English that is the standard for success—the American academic English dialect. Secondly, this mindset says to the multilingual international student, “Your English—your proficiency, and your English dialect—are not sufficient to be successful in American academia”. One can argue that indeed, American academia, in the 1950s and 60s and even today, did not and still does not embrace multilingualism, and the reality is that students must

adjust their own language to match that of the institution that is American academia if they hope to find some measure of success. The English instructors knew this language ideology existed in the 1950s at UIUC, and the remedy that they initiated was to change the language of the students, but not the attitude of the institution. It was a practical solution, and one that carries through at UIUC (and other universities like it) until present day, not only in the U.S. but around the world.

Current English Language Policy From Above: Language Management Efforts

Part of language management efforts in the overall English language policy today at UIUC includes 1) English language proficiency requirements for admission to UIUC; 2) the English Placement Test required for ESL courses; and 3) the ESL courses themselves. The scope of this dissertation only includes English language policies that are relevant for international undergraduate students, excluding policies for graduate students, which are different.

Enrollment and EPT. Due to the campus-wide increase in international student enrollment, enrollment in ESL Service Courses has subsequently grown. Approximately 200 students are now enrolled each semester in ESL courses, and the number of students that have taken the EPT have gone from 448 in 2006-2007 to 1091 in 2011-2012²⁶ (UIUC, 2012). Enrollment for each ESL course is generally capped at 12 students, and the number of sections offered each semester are based on need and available resources.

The English Placement Test at UIUC is developed, researched, and implemented through testing specialists through the Linguistics and Educational Psychology Departments, in conjunction with the ESL Service Courses. It is specifically designed for placement into ESL

²⁶ More recent exact figures were unavailable at the time of writing this chapter.

Service Courses, and is currently required for undergraduate students who score below a certain range on larger English proficiency tests (the TOEFL—Test of English as a Foreign Language or the IELTS—International English Language Testing System), or those who wish to enroll in an ESL course. Though there is no official information easily located on a website regarding a student’s minimum TOEFL score to be exempt from taking the EPT (there is one Admissions blog post discussing the information), an administrator in the Office of Undergraduate Admissions at UIUC told me that for the 2016-2017 school year²⁷, students must score a 103 on the TOEFL with a minimum of a 25 on the Speaking/Writing subsection of the exam, or a score under 7.5 on the IELTS (under a 7 on the Speaking or Writing sections) in order to be exempt from taking the EPT (Longtin, 2017).²⁸ If a student scores lower on the TOEFL, or if they do not submit a TOEFL score, they are required to take the EPT and a hold will be placed on their student account blocking them from registering for a Rhetoric course that is required for graduation (students must meet Composition requirements through either Rhetoric courses or ESL courses). If the student scores high enough on the EPT, the hold would be removed and the student would be eligible to register for a Rhetoric course; otherwise, the student would be required to register for an ESL writing course in order to fulfill the Composition requirement (unless they have AP credit for the Rhetoric course). The EPT lasts almost five hours in duration, and has high validity, both in course content and implementation (UIUC, 2012).

²⁷ It is unclear as to whether or not these were the same exact exemption scores during the 2015-2016 school year, when my field research was conducted, as these scores are not officially published and none of my research participants knew this specific information.

²⁸ Some of this information came from an informal phone conversation with an Admissions administrator.

Once the students have taken the EPT, they are either required or given the option to take a course that meets their composition requirement for graduation: If the EPT score is below a certain point, they take two writing courses—ESL 111 and 112, taken in succession from one semester to another; if it is above a certain point, they are given the option to either take the ESL 115 course (a one-semester Rhetoric course equivalent) or the Rhetoric courses in the English department. If a student wishes to take ESL 115, they must take the EPT first, even if their TOEFL score was high enough and they were not required to take the EPT.

English language proficiency requirements for admission to UIUC. According to UIUC's Office of Undergraduate Admissions website, all incoming students must "Prove your English proficiency" (<https://admissions.illinois.edu/Apply/Freshman/process>). Under that particular heading on their graphic-driven website, it is further explained: "You need to demonstrate a command of the English language. If your first language isn't English or you're attending high school in a non-English-speaking country, we recommend you submit a TOEFL (code 1836) or IELTS score from a test you've taken within the past 2 years" (last accessed on UIUC's website on March 29, 2017). It also states, "Are you an international student? You should also be aware of some additional requirements", which links you to the page <https://admissions.illinois.edu/Apply/international> under the heading "International: Join a global community". Under this heading, no language exists that points to an English proficiency requirement. There is an option to explore a Transitions to Illinois one-month program before the Fall semester starts, but nothing under that heading suggests that students should attend that program to meet English proficiency requirements. On the FAQ page for Freshmen

international students, they write, “the TOEFL or IELTS is strongly recommended for all non-native English speakers but isn’t required”.

The website also further says, “English proficiency requirements can be found on our admissions process page” and links to the page that I described in the above paragraph (<https://admissions.illinois.edu/Apply/Freshman/process>). In sum, there exists an explicit policy statement (“You need to demonstrate your command of the English language”), but it is actually quite vague, leaving room for Admissions to make decisions on a case-by-case basis for particular students. In all of the Admissions pages, there does not exist any explicit statement that absolutely requires any freshman student applicant to submit a TOEFL or IELTS score, or any other sort of process for “proving” English proficiency.

That the TOEFL or IELTS is not required for admission to UIUC came as a surprise to me, even though I have been teaching and working with international students at UIUC for over 10 years. In order to confirm what I read on the website, I called UIUC’s Office of Undergraduate Admissions and spoke to several Admissions counselors on the phone. Two people were unable to confirm whether or not that was true, and one person was able to confirm that this policy (to not require a TOEFL or IELTS score) has been in place at UIUC since 2015. Another person said that they thought the policy had been in place for several years (perhaps five years ago or more). I was unable to confirm any of the statements about when this policy came into effect, but it is definitely true: undergraduate freshman applicants to UIUC are not required to submit a TOEFL or IELTS score.

For undergraduate transfer students, it is somewhat different. There is a special page for Transfer International Student applicants: <https://admissions.illinois.edu/FAQ/applicant->

[transfer-international](#) . On that page, there is a statement about English proficiency: “If I attend an institution in the U.S., do I need to take the TOEFL or IELTS? English proficiency requirements can be found on our admissions process page” (which links to <https://admissions.illinois.edu/Apply/Transfer/process>). On that page, there is a section entitled “Prove your English proficiency”. That section states,

“You must meet 1 of the following conditions to satisfy our minimum English proficiency requirement. In many cases, the standards needed to gain admission will be much higher, so it’s worth submitting all test scores showing a high level of English competency, especially if you don’t meet the ACT or SAT minimums. These scores must be dated within 2 years of your enrollment.

- Complete all secondary (years 9 through 12) and post-secondary schooling in Australia, Canada (excluding Quebec), certain Caribbean countries, Great Britain, Ireland, New Zealand, or the United States (excluding Puerto Rico).
- Score at least 25 on the English portion of the ACT or 550 on the Critical Reading portion of the SAT I. Scores from the redesigned SAT released in spring 2016 will be reviewed on an individual basis.
- Score a minimum of 80 on the Internet-based (iBT) Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL; code 1836). The Colleges of Business, Engineering, and Media require a minimum total score of 100 iBT.
- Score a minimum total of 6.5 on the International English Testing System (IELTS), with a minimum score of 6 on all 4 modules. For Business, Engineering, and Media, the minimum total is 7.5, with a minimum score of 7 on all 4 modules.”

(<https://admissions.illinois.edu/Apply/Transfer/process> , accessed March 29, 2017).

According to an Admissions administrator that provided general information to me over the phone, the Office of Undergraduate Admissions prefers to make a holistic admissions decision for each student, and that does not have to include a TOEFL or IELTS score. They said that they look at the English sub-sections of an ACT or SAT score. For the ACT, they prefer a minimum of 25 and closer to a 27 on the English sub-section, and for the SAT, they prefer around a 600 or higher. The administrator stated that this information does not exist online because different departments around campus can set their own requirements and can even choose to fight for admission of a particular student who does not meet the standard minimum scores for the Office of Undergraduate Admissions.

Nowhere on any of the main Admissions pages does it discuss requiring an English Placement Test (EPT). In fact, the EPT is not mentioned until I click on an optional “International Student Checklist” link (http://iss.illinois.edu/students/incoming/checkin/next_steps.html) that is found buried in the International Student Check-in page (<http://iss.illinois.edu/students/incoming/checkin/index.html>) that was linked from the Admitted International students page (<https://admissions.illinois.edu/Apply/admitted/international>) under a heading all the way at the bottom that says “Check in before classes start”. The English Placement Test is described on this Checklist page in this way: “Students are often required to register for the EPT. Review your admission letter to confirm if you are required to take the test. Failure to complete EPT testing may result in a hold on your course registration for future semesters”. This paragraph

links to the Linguistics Department webpage for the EPT

(<http://www.linguistics.illinois.edu/students/placement/>).

On the Linguistics Department EPT page, one of the first sections is entitled “Who Takes the EPT?”. That section explains:

“Many newly admitted University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign international students are required to take the EPT according to their pre-arrival scores on either of two international ESL tests: the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) or the International English Language Testing System (IELTS). Further details about TOEFL and IELTS requirements are given at the following websites:”

It then says, “For undergraduate students/applicants, undergraduate transfer, and undergraduate non-degree students/applicants: http://admissions.illinois.edu/apply/tips_freshman.html (look under “*English Proficiency*”)”. I described the vague policy statement above in previous paragraphs, so I will not describe it again. However, it is important to note that according to that general policy statement, in conjunction with the official Linguistics Department statement on who takes the EPT, no admitted undergraduate international student would be required to take the EPT based on the “Prove your English proficiency” policy. However, the Linguistics Department page does go on to say, “In addition to the requirements as explained at the above two websites, individual departments and/or advisors may require or encourage students to take the EPT, and students themselves may elect to take the test so that they can enroll in ESL courses at UIUC.” So, it is stated here in this small paragraph on the website that the EPT is required in order to enroll in an ESL course, but it is not done so very plainly.

The Linguistics Department EPT website also has a link to an FAQ page about the EPT (<http://www.linguistics.illinois.edu/students/placement/eptfaq.html>). On that page, there is one section that refers to the official English language policy statement:

“Why am I required to take the EPT?

The EPT is given to international students whose admission dossiers do not meet the English proficiency requirement of UIUC. This requirement is established by the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Senate. However, individual departments may set higher standards.

Further details about the requirements are given on the following websites:

For undergraduate students/applicants, undergraduate transfer, and undergraduate non-degree students/applicants:

http://admissions.illinois.edu/apply/tips_freshman.html

(look under "English Proficiency")”.

That particular website was already explored in a paragraph earlier in this section, which only has the vague policy statement about proving English proficiency but not requiring the TOEFL or IELTS.

After reading the policy statements on all of the websites that students would be directed to, I would not conclude that the EPT is a requirement for many international students, nor would I know just exactly what would qualify my English proficiency as “not sufficient” so that I would be required to take the EPT. The admissions letters that students receive, however, do state whether or not a student is required to take the EPT.

However, according to the Admissions Blog for international students, some students receive this statement on their admissions letter: “You will be required to take the English as a Second Language Placement test prior to registration for purposes of Rhetoric placement. Information on times and dates of the exam will be provided later”

(<http://blog.admissions.illinois.edu/?p=24583> , accessed March 29, 2017, published February 1, 2017). In fact, this blog post, entitled “What is the English as a Second Language Placement Test?” has the most concrete policy statements surrounding the EPT and TOEFL scores for international students that I have seen in over five years of research on English language policies at UIUC, and certainly the only place on the UIUC website that I have seen actual mention of specific TOEFL scores and specific requirements for who is required to take the EPT. I spoke to UIUC Admissions over the phone to confirm the information on the blog post in March of 2017, and they confirmed that this blog post has correct information. So, who exactly is required to take the EPT now at UIUC, and when did this begin?

According to Admissions, international students (i.e., students who are not U.S. citizens) will be required to take the EPT starting in 2017 if they fall into one of three categories:

- “Did not submit English Language Proficiency (so didn’t send us TOEFL or IELTS scores)
- Submitted TOEFL scores under 103 or had a 103 TOEFL with either Speaking or Writing scores under 25
- Submitted IELTS scores under 7.5 or had a 7.5 IELTS with either Speaking or Writing scores under 7”.

The blog post goes on to say: “Notice, there is no mention of where you are currently studying or what language you speak at home. That is because even if you are studying

in the United States or another English speaking country, you may still have to take the English Placement Test”.

The policy requirements for the English Placement Test are remarkably only explained in a blog post buried in an Admissions blog post website. The implications of this are that students may not (and my research indicates that they do not) understand why the EPT is required of them and what the purpose of the EPT is, which may (and my research indicates that it does) lead the student to believe that they have unfair and undue extra requirements placed on them by the University.

Language Ideologies of the Institution: The Hegemony of English

The language management efforts of the institution—the requirement to “prove your English proficiency” (using discourse that says students are not required to submit a TOEFL or IELTS score, but functionally requiring them to submit those scores) and the subsequent requirement to take the English Placement Test (and then perhaps being required to take an ESL writing course, or two, in place of the required Rhetoric course, or two)—are all products of the institution’s language ideologies, particularly to do with assumptions and beliefs about English language “proficiency” and students who are not U.S. citizens. That is to say, the institutional beliefs about language and its use in University spaces affect how the institution strives to manage the language of multilingual international students (“non-native English speaking” students from “non-English speaking countries”, to use the terms of UIUC’s Admissions website).

On the main Admissions website, they give no further explanation of why a student must prove English proficiency, nor do they explain what exactly is meant by “English

proficiency”. On the Admissions blog, however, there is a specific statement regarding the purpose of the English Placement Test, giving a clue to the language ideology behind the language management effort of proving English proficiency. The blog post states, “At Illinois, we have students come to our campus from around the world. Our number one goal is always to make sure they are successful when they get to campus. In order to do this, we need to make sure students are placed in the correct classes” (<http://blog.admissions.illinois.edu/?p=24583>, accessed March 29, 2017). This statement reveals the belief that students need to have a certain level of English proficiency in order to be “successful” on campus. Thus, English is the language of success in the university spaces of UIUC, reflecting a general attitude agreeing with the hegemony of English—a position that intrinsically benefits the linguistic majority of the campus (those whose dominant language is English that conforms to Westernized “native speaker” ideals), and devalues the multilingual student whose dominant language (or “native language”) is not English (Guo, Y., & Beckett, G. H., 2007; Canagarajah, A.S. 1999b).

Language Management Efforts: English as a Second Language Courses

Part of the language management efforts of UIUC as an institution is to provide special English language instruction for international students, and even requiring some students to enroll in those courses. Today, the majority of international undergraduate students, if they take an ESL course, are enrolled in an ESL writing course. The ESL writing courses at the undergraduate level are meant to be equivalents to the Rhetoric courses that are needed to fulfill the Composition requirement for each undergraduate student at UIUC. The ESL writing courses are limited only to students who have taken the English Placement Test, but the Rhetoric courses are open to every student that has “proven English proficiency”, either by

having citizenship in certain countries as proof, or by scoring certain numbers on institutionalized exams (the TOEFL, IELTS, the SAT, or the ACT).

The first two sections of ESL courses at UIUC in 1946-47 had only ten students in each section—20 students total. While best-practices in the field of Teaching English as a Second Language still maintain that smaller class sizes are ideal for language learning and instruction, and indeed, the ESL courses are still relatively small in size at UIUC, today there are multiple sections of ESL writing courses (and one or two sections of an ESL pronunciation course) for multilingual international undergraduate students, with approximately 15 students per section, per fall and spring semesters, in addition to approximately 15 undergraduate students in ESL pronunciation courses per fall and spring semesters. The magnitude and reach of the ESL courses has certainly grown, but the purpose of the courses has remained steady: to help students improve their English language proficiency and be successful in an American academic setting through the improvement of American writing skills.

ESL service courses²⁹. The Linguistics Department at UIUC (created in 1965, 18 years after the first ESL courses came to be³⁰), now houses the ESL courses (called the ESL Service Courses program), which offers ESL courses to multilingual international students learning English at UIUC, including undergraduates, graduates, visiting scholars, and postdocs. The ESL Service Courses are divided into three categories:

1. The ESL Writing Course Sequence (ESL 111, 112 and 115 for undergraduate

²⁹ Most information for this section came from a combination of my own knowledge of and working in the program, short meetings with faculty, and the Linguistics website: <http://www.linguistics.illinois.edu/students/esl/>.

³⁰ This was discussed in the “DEIL’s 50th Anniversary Memoirs” collection in several essays.

students and ESL 500, 501, 502, 503, 505, 507 for all others).

2. The General Oral Course (ESL 110/510; undergraduates enroll for 110, and all others enroll for 510; this is the Pronunciation course).
3. The International Teaching Assistant (ITA) Courses (ESL 504, 506, and 508 for graduate students only).

[\(http://www.linguistics.illinois.edu/students/esl/\)](http://www.linguistics.illinois.edu/students/esl/)

Purpose of ESL courses. The ESL writing courses at UIUC are offered to undergraduate and graduate students who are nonnative³¹ English speakers, as well as, in some cases, visiting scholars and postdocs who are nonnative English speakers. The majority of writing courses and sections are dedicated to assisting international students complete their Composition I requirements (for undergraduates) or English proficiency requirement (for graduate students). Other 500-level courses are to assist in ESL writing (and general language) proficiency in an academic setting.

ESL 111 Intro to Academic Writing I and ESL 112 Intro to Academic Writing II, as well as ESL 115 Principles of Academic Writing, are all non-credit courses that fulfill the Composition I requirement for undergraduate degree seeking students. Based on English Placement Test (EPT) scores (which is a requirement for registration for any ESL course), undergraduate students are placed into either a two-sequence course (ESL 111/112) or a one semester course (ESL 115). ESL 111/112 is the course sequence for those with lower EPT scores, and starts with

³¹ I use the linguistic term “nonnative English speaker” throughout this section because this is how this population of students is referred to in the Linguistics Department and in the field of linguistics. Elsewhere in this dissertation, I refer to this group of students as multilingual international students.

basic paragraph development and rhetorical analysis, as well as the development of oral skills. ESL 112 introduces the larger research paper (conducting library research and synthesizing sources) as well as continuing with writing style. The course content for ESL 115 covers research paper writing, rhetoric and discourse, as well as the American writing style process (including peer feedback). Undergraduate students may also earn James Scholars honors credit in these courses.

The General oral course. ESL 110/510 English Pronunciation for Academic Purposes is a semester-long course for all undergraduate, graduate, postdoc, and visiting scholars who have taken the Oral Proficiency portion of the EPT. Due to high demand and limited space, enrollment is prioritized based on those who have scored “required” or “recommended” on the spoken portion of the EPT, then to those whose department or advisors request it on the student’s behalf. After that, others may electively take the course, as long as they have completed the Oral Proficiency portion of the EPT. 110 (undergraduate) and 510 (graduate) are taught together, and sections are self-selected by students based upon scheduling needs. Students are not allowed to pre-enroll for the course; rather, they should attend during the first three classes, and then will be given permission (or denied) to enroll in that section of the course. The course content is “designed to improve the international student's ability to speak and understand English at normal conversational speed and to give the student the ability to continue improving pronunciation skills after the course is finished. Focus on the rhythm, stress, intonation, and sounds of natural speech, and the use of ordinary English spelling to guide the pronunciation of newly encountered words (<http://www.linguistics.illinois.edu/students/esl/Pronunciation.html>).

Other ESL Service Courses department services. In addition to providing ESL courses, the ESL Service Courses department also provides information and other ways for students, postdocs, and visiting scholars to receive ESL help and instruction. A tutoring list of qualified tutors holding at least a Master's degree in TESL is available and kept current. Courses and seminars can be offered on a case-by-case, per request basis in ESL for departments and units across campus. The MATESL Program hosts a free Special English Course once per academic year that is fully taught by students enrolled in an English as an International Language instructional course, and is available to any nonnative English speakers who are not students at UIUC and who place into the course based on a brief English proficiency exam. Additionally, the department is currently developing a new resource called i-ELF—Illinois English Language Forum-- <http://www.ielf.illinois.edu>. This online resource is for ESL learners and teachers and provides content on academic English and culture.

Instructors. Instructors in the ESL Service Courses have four different levels—full-time faculty in the MATESL Program, lecturers, visiting lecturers, and TAs. Full-time faculty in the MATESL program provide course supervision as well as instruction in some sections of the ESL courses. Lecturers and Visiting Lecturers are instructors with Masters degrees in MATESL (or a related field) and that have experience working with international students at a higher education institution. Those with the lecturer title also provide teaching supervision and have course administrative roles. TAs provide instruction for the majority of the ESL Service Courses, and are all graduate students in the MATESL Program, Linguistics Department, or have related experience and educational background.

Policy from Above in the Observed ESL 115 Course

Institutional English language policies do not stop at admission or even at the enrollment of an ESL course. There is also a level of institutional influence in policies related to the ESL classroom space itself. The ESL Service Courses department, inside the Department of Linguistics and adjacent to the Division of English as an International Language (the Master's in Teaching English as a Second Language program), has an institutional influence that I still consider as "English Language Policy from Above". The department gives out standard syllabi to their instructors with policies related not only to homework and grading, but also to how language should be handled inside the classroom.

The teacher I observed, Elise, gave me electronic copies of the syllabus and "First Day Handout" that was handed to her by the Service Courses department to use for her ESL 115 course. The documents give this description of the course, entitled "Overview":

"This course is designed to introduce undergraduate international students at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign to the practices of research-based writing for American academic audiences, such as developing a research question, searching library databases, creating an annotated bibliography, synthesizing sources, and drafting and revising research papers. Strategies for avoiding plagiarism will also be introduced and practiced in this process. General principles of academic writing, such as awareness of audience and purpose, coherence and unity, clear thesis statements, PIE structure, and formal academic style, will be also discussed. Readings are used as a stimulus for discussion of a topic and/or as a source of support in writing assignments. Although oral skills are not the main component of this course, students can expect to practice oral

English through group discussions, collaborative writing tasks, and peer review.” (ESL Service Courses, 2016)

At the beginning of the semester, the ESL 115 instructors are given a version of the syllabus that has a portion of the syllabus colored in red. These red sections may be changed by the instructor according to their classroom management preferences, and the rest of the syllabus should remain standard for all ESL 115 courses. The sections that can be changed are ones regarding teacher information and office hours, information entitled “Course Management System” (discussing where students can find homework assignments, where those assignments should be submitted, and general submission deadlines), and a section entitled “Student Participation”. The first paragraph of this information has to do with language use and electronics use during class, stating that a deduction of the 10% participation points is possible if this policy is not followed, while the second paragraph deals with expectations of discussing homework assignments and readings during class, as well as absences and late homework:

“This is an ENGLISH language class. Everyone is here to improve his/her language skill. You must therefore stick to speaking in ENGLISH at all times in the classroom. You are also not allowed to use any electronic devices (e.g. laptops, cell phones) while lectures or activities are in progress. Violating this rule will result in confiscation of your device until the class is over. Frequent violation of these classroom policies will result in a 0-point mark for your participation grade.

Homework and reading assignments may be given daily. Students are expected to come to class prepared to discuss homework and readings. Participation in class discussions and activities is expected and will contribute to the final grade—this includes encouraging the participation of others. A grade of zero will be given to all work missed due to an unexcused absence. Late homework may not be accepted or will be marked down.” (ESL 115 Syllabus, 2016, emphasis theirs).

There are implications related to the language ideology of the ESL Service Courses Department that can be found in the first paragraph and in this decision to allow individual instructors to change this information. Firstly, it shows that the department does not take an official “English Only” stance in regards to language use in the classroom. By allowing individual instructors to make the choice to reword this section, they are allowing for a variety of philosophies regarding language use and language policy inside a classroom. If an instructor does not want to make a strongly worded and punitive statement on the syllabus regarding students and language use, they are not required to do so. It also reveals the department’s preferred “English only” philosophy and stance on language use in an ESL classroom. While an instructor is allowed to reword this section of the syllabus, the example provided, it can be assumed, is one that the department would allow and even endorse as a “best-practice” for ESL classrooms. This demonstrates that the department itself, while perhaps revealing a preference for an “English-only” policy and philosophy of language learning, allows for their informed and educated instructors to hold differing positions on this issue. This contributes to policy in that while the department subtly tries to direct the language use of their classrooms to be English-

only in an enforceable way, they allow for a range of ways that language can be used inside an ESL classroom.

Student Experiences with and Perceptions of English Policy From Above

SAT and TOEFL requirements for admission. Regarding the gatekeeping function of UIUC's English-policy from above, some students have the impression that requirements for their test scores (SAT/ACT) are higher than domestic students and they think that is unfair. It is actually true that UIUC requires higher scores for international students on the SAT and ACT, as confirmed by a phone call I had with an Admissions administrator in Spring 2017. Though not articulated anywhere on UIUC's website, students had this perception. All of the participants in this study scored between 1900-2200 on the SAT. The standardized test scores of these students show that their scores are either below or in the middle of the campus average for the 2016-2017 class (information on the 2015-2016 class was not available)³². The student participants in this study are already admitted, degree-seeking students at UIUC, and yet several of them expressed the opinion that UIUC has unfair and higher test-score standards for international students than for domestic students.

Additionally, although the TOEFL is was not required for admission (for the freshman student participants), the students never expressed to me that they thought it was not required. Instead, they spoke about their experiences taking the TOEFL and submitting their scores to UIUC. Some of them, because of perceived TOEFL and SAT requirements, held back

³² The middle 50 % score for the campus—1340-1480— is only available without the SAT writing score, so no comparable information is available. Additionally, this information is for the 2016-2017 class. This information came from the Office of Undergraduate Admissions website: <https://admissions.illinois.edu/Apply/Freshman/profile> .

from initially applying to or gaining admission for the major of their choice, as well. Quite a few participants hoped to change majors in the following years through obtaining a high enough GPA. My overall assessment is that the language management efforts of language policy from above at UIUC seem to hold students back from intellectual challenges and their own intellectual pursuits.

One example of this was Kirstie³³, a focal participant.

Kirstie: I intend to transfer to accounting department in business, and you know the

Accounting Department in our University is very good, so I chose the U of I. But now I'm in Mathematics.

Natalie: So why didn't you start in Accounting?

Kirstie: Because my score is not very high. SAT. So I'm afraid that I can't be admitted in the Accounting.

Natalie: Did you try?

Kirstie: No.

Natalie: Why not?

Kirstie: Because we can only apply one major in the application process. ... I'm afraid.

So I just didn't try.

Natalie: Did you know what SAT score they required?

Kirstie: Uh, I don't know if you know the application for international students is very competitive.

³³ All names have been changed to preserve anonymity of my participants to the greatest extent possible, unless where explicitly stated that they gave permission to use real names.

Natalie: So tell me about it.

Kirstie: So do you know what's the average SAT score for instate students? I think it's maybe uh, 1800. But for international students, maybe 2200. 20 or 21. And we also should have the TOEFL score.

Natalie: What about TOEFL?

Kirstie: I think the average score for international students is about 100.

Natalie: What was yours?

Kirstie: 99. Laughs.

Natalie: What was your SAT score?

Kirstie: Maybe 2000 and uh, 60. 2060.

Natalie: What do you think kept you from getting a higher SAT score? Because of math skills

or English skills or science knowledge or...?

Kirstie: Um, I think I'm good at math so my math score is 800. And uh, I think the critical reading is the most difficult for Chinese students. Because the article is really long and there are many difficult words in it. The words that we can't, maybe we never used in life. So we need to recite a lot of words during the preparation for SAT and I think it's very easy to forget during the test because we are nervous. And I think grammar is not difficult for Chinese students because we learn grammar from very young age. Maybe younger than American.

[Laughs]

Natalie: Yeah. So, how are you gonna transfer to Accounting? What do you have to do?

Kirstie: Uh, we need to write I think three or four essays about your leadership skills, about your interest and why you want to transfer to the college of business before May 20th. And submit application and maybe we will get feedback in June or July. I hope I can.

Natalie: Have you written all your stuff?

Kirstie: No actually. [Laughs] GPA is very important. We need at least a 3.6 I think.

Natalie: How is your GPA right now?

Kirstie: I think it's good, it's 3.97.

As a freshman in her second semester with a 3.97 GPA, Kirstie is clearly a bright student.

I went with her to an Economics class, and she understood the material that was being presented very well, as well as was able to understand and process the lecture that the professor gave (we spoke about this after the class). She also spoke critically about the professor's lectures, expressing that he oftentimes has a very nationalistic perspective of Economics and approaches the course only from an American perspective. Kirstie is a critical thinker, a hard working student, and performs well in the American university setting, and yet, she feels that English language policies at UIUC hold her back from being the kind of student that she desires to be.

Another student, Sally, expressed her displeasure at the SAT and TOEFL "requirements" for international students at UIUC. Sally attended high school in the U.S. and was under the impression that the TOEFL was required for her. She also commented that, from her perspective, standardized test scores do not truly reflect a student's ability to be successful at university. However, she notes towards the end of this conversation, that she thinks the TOEFL

score was not a primary decision-making factor for the Admissions Office, saying “You don’t know what the Admissions Office think about”.

Natalie: Did you have to take the TOEFL?

Sally: Long. I feel like all the American tests is so long. SAT, like, every test is so long.

Natalie: When did you take the TOEFL?

Sally: Last...um, one year ago. In August.

Natalie: How’d that go?

Sally: Fine.

Natalie: Score?

Sally: Like, 98. I was like, cause I think my oral English is really good and I think I know a lot of American stuff cause I been here for like three years, the thing... like, many of my Chinese friends they took TOEFL like 100, 110, and I just randomly take it and it’s 98. I feel like it doesn’t really represent your English level. But I don’t care.

Natalie: Did you study?

Sally: Yeah, I hated it.

Natalie: Didn’t study that much?

Sally: No I studied, but I still hated it.

Natalie: Did your friends study more?

Sally: Yeah, you know like for Chinese students once they decide to go to America for college, they will just stop their schoolwork and like really focus on SAT and TOEFL. Did you know that? They will like not go to class anymore. They just study

TOEFL and SAT. But for us, although we need to study TOEFL and SAT we still have our school going on. Still have midterms, quizzes, tests, exams, projects, homework. Yeah we don't have that much time as them studying for TOEFL and SAT.

Natalie: What did you get on SAT?

Sally: 1900...? Whatever. Yeah I was like...actually the funny thing is I came here with that TOEFL score [she meant SAT], and a lot of my friends around me, they have like 2300, 2100...and they came at the same college with me.

Natalie: What do you think about that?

Sally: It feels fine.

Natalie: Why did you bring it up? What do you mean. So they got ...

Sally: I think one reason is that they are from a Chinese high school, with a different level of school. I am from an American high school. I was the class president of my high school. I think it's just they feel like, besides TOEFL, I have more stuff. Yeah you don't know what Admissions Office think about.

Natalie: So are you saying they should've gone to a better school or you shouldn't have gotten in?

Sally: I'm saying that TOEFL score doesn't matter to an American college.

For both of these students, the English language policies at an institutional level at UIUC were confusing to them, and the process did not seem transparent to them. It caused Kirstie to not apply for the major of her choice, and caused Sally to spend time studying for and taking an

exam (the TOEFL) that was ultimately not necessary for admission to UIUC, taking time away from her other ambitious pursuits during her high school years in the U.S.

English Placement Test and ESL 115. To try and separate student experiences with and perceptions of the English Placement Test from those of ESL 115 proved to be difficult, because the two are very intertwined. Thus, below, I present excerpts from interviews where I asked student participants about their experience taking the EPT, their thoughts about that exam, and then about ESL 115—why they are enrolled in ESL 115 and not Rhet 105, and what their general impressions about the course were.

Below is an interview excerpt with student participant Yangjin. Yangjin attended his freshman year at a different university and had already taken a similar writing course, but UIUC did not count it for credit. He thought the EPT was “really stupid”, and thought that the TOEFL was “much harder”. He thinks that the ESL 115 class is “fine” and “not very hard”. He did not recall being given a choice to take ESL 115 or Rhet 105.

Natalie: Did you have to take the EPT?

Yangjin: Uh I think I already took it. In the fall.

Natalie: What did you think when they had you take it?

Yangjin: I think just...that’s really stupid. Yeah cause, uh, the first thing is I already finished ESL once and I got an A, but they don’t accept that credit, so I have to take it again. And the second thing is I think the TOEFL is much harder than the English Placement Test. I don’t know why we already finished a harder test and when we come to school we have to take an easier test. I don’t think that’s necessary.

Natalie: So what do you think about the class then?

Yangjin: Eh, I think it's fine. Maybe not some people...

Natalie: The content...

Yangjin: I think it's not very hard. I think it's ok.

Natalie: Do you think it's a waste of your time?

Yangjin: Not really. I do learn some stuff, cause I took ESL one year ago, and I just forget some stuff, yeah, it's very good to relearn these things.

Natalie: Do you have any suggestions for ESL writing class?

Yangjin: Uh, no.

Natalie: Did you have a choice to take Rhet 105?

Yangjin: 105?

Natalie: Rhetoric 105 or ESL 115? You should've had that choice right?

Yangjin: I don't know.

Natalie: You just automatically got enrolled in ESL 115?

Yangjin: Uh, I passed the EPT, and if you didn't pass you have to take two ESL classes, yeah and if you pass you can only take one, and that one is ESL 115, so I just registered.

Natalie: So no one told you you had an option to take Rhet 105?

Yangjin: No, I didn't know that.

Another interview excerpt from student participant Anna, shows a common response that participants gave me when asked why they chose to take ESL 115, when they had a choice:

because they heard it was easier than Rhet 105. Even though she went to high school in the U.S., she did say that she learned some things in ESL 115, and that it was “pretty fun”.

Natalie: So you had to take the TOEFL, you submitted your scores...what about EPT?

Anna: I don't have to, because my TOEFL is above 100, so they are like you just need to take Rhet...Rhetoric. People say it differently, even Americans so I'm confused.

But everyone is saying that Rhet is really hard. My friend, he is super good at studying, he got all straight as last semester except Rhet. He got a C in that class.

[Laughs] So I'm like, probably I will just take EPT to take ESL instead of Rhet. If they are basically the same level I will prefer ESL obviously.

Natalie: Why do you think he got a C?

Anna: He hates writing. Plus, I've heard there's a lot of work for that. For Rhet.

Natalie: Did he do all the work?

Anna: I think he did considering he got all straight As except for that. He hates writing.

But, people don't really care about the things they don't like.

Natalie: So you were concerned about your GPA?

Anna: I'm not...like, you know some Chinese students really think 4.0 is really important for them? I don't think so. 3.8 is good enough for me. So, I'm considering it with it. But also I know Lina [another student in the course] before this semester so we were thinking of taking the same course so we were like ok we're gonna take ESL instead of Rhet.

Natalie: What do you think the differences are? You said you heard Rhet has more work.

Anna: Because they're the same level, but Rhet—people are just saying that it's harder.

I don't know why it's harder but since everybody is suggesting me to take ESL, I'm just taking ESL 115. And considering I already took EPT just for fun, I don't really care.

Natalie: So you don't care if ESL's easier?

Anna: It's one of the advantages, but I do want to improve my English because you know if I'm considering to be a lawyer my English has to be really good. So I'm considering picking up a minor like Philosophy or Political Science—something like that to improve my English. Philosophy, it's about logic and the thinking and you know...or Communication or English...but I don't really want to choose English as my minor. It's too...bored. You know, it's just a language. So, I haven't decided yet. I'm just a freshman.

Natalie: What do you think about the ESL writing course?

Anna: Uhhh, ummm I don't know, I think it's pretty fun in the class. We do group discussion. So, yeah, because like, my other classes, because I study Science, Mathematics, something like that, so it's small classes and you don't really have discussing in the classes. ESL has discussion parts and group study parts and I think it's good, and they are teaching something I don't know before, like how to write a real paper. Like, it's not the format...it's the structure. Like, she would tell me the first sentence, normally it's about introduction, and then examples, and then statement, something like that.

Natalie: So you didn't know that before?

Anna: Uh, I kind of know that before when I look at others' writing. But, like, in China

we don't write like that. It's like, it would be super bad if you write it in Chinese like that. It's super super bad. At first when I wrote in English, I would write like that, I don't know what I was talking about. Yeah. Eventually, I would get used to it.

Natalie: How does it make you feel when you write in the English style?

Anna: The logic is so clear. The logic. Like, I would know the first sentence is the introduction, so just put the introduction inside it, and then two examples into it, and then a conclusion. Done.

Natalie: It seems too simple?

Anna: It's the structure...it's kind of simple. But the language is still a problem. How to use the appropriate word for it.

Natalie: Like vocab or prepositions?

Anna: Vocabulary. My English vocabulary is not that much. Because I don't really like memorizing vocabulary. Yeah. Like, you know in Math, if you know how to do a problem you can do it. You don't really need to memorize it once you know what's going on. But when it comes to English words you have to memorize it a lot.

Participant Bo said, also, that he chose to take ESL 115 because he heard that it was easier than Rhet 105, and called the class "Easy, easy". He also said he thought the EPT was "much easier" than the TOEFL. He "really appreciated" the spoken portion of the EPT.

Bo: That's how I got to ESL 115.

Natalie: When?

Bo: This semester. Easy, easy.

Natalie: Why?

Bo: Because I want to get into ESL course to fulfill my general requirement.

Natalie: Why?

Bo: General requirement.

Natalie: You could have taken Rhet 105?

Bo: Because I heard from somebody it's difficult. That's why I took ESL 105. I think like many people told me it's easier, so I want to take it. Then they told me like you need to take EPT test before you take the class, so I went to take EPT test. It took me like four hours but it's much easier than the TOEFL. Easy, easy. It's pretty much like TOEFL. I really appreciated the speaking process. Like, you actually talk to someone. For TOEFL you talk to a computer, but in EPT test you talk to a real person which can alleviate your nervousness, your anxiety. I mean, each time when I think about new words, natural words, oh I have a sense of achievement.

Participant Nancy thought ESL 115 was "very interesting", and likes it because she is able to ask questions to the instructor and feels comfortable in the class. She said the course content was, for the most part, "very repetitive" as she had already done a lot of English writing in Malaysia (she feels more comfortable writing in English than in Malay, but still did feel that her writing improved because of the course.

Natalie: So, tell me about ESL 115. What do you think?

Nancy: I think it is very interesting. I like it because I engage with the interests very

closely I think, because I have the other math classes I think, and they are very big, and they are very hard to even ask a question. Because I don't really have the courage to in the finance class, like 200 I think, which I would just like email the professor. I always feel like, didn't he already explain that, or I should know it before. So, I just settle it by speak with my nearby friend. And I notice that some of my classmates they would get annoyed if you ask in the lecture that was already mentioned before. Sometimes I got lost, if I remember what should I eat today, then suddenly I was like ok, I wasn't paying attention.

Natalie: So how's that different with ESL?

Nancy: Because we have like smaller class, and I notice that everyone also ask directly when they don't understand, even though Elise already mention that before, so I think that give me the courage to ask. And I would say probably other people also missed that. [Laughs]

Natalie: So just something about the feeling and how other students interact with her?

Nancy: Yes. Kind of like favorite class, because I really like when I can engage with the instructor.

Natalie: What do you think about the content of the class?

Nancy: Because I learned the same thing back in Malaysia, so it is not new, but still interesting, because now we are focused to research paper. Back in Malaysia we learned to write an essay very well, but we don't learn to write a research paper, and I find that very interesting. I think she could really help. I mean, she initially, we did the dynasty essay, and she could tell which part is off with my essay, and

Oh, I didn't see that. That is why I like it when I can engage with my instructor, so she can help me one to one.

Natalie: In Malaysia, when you learned to write, did you learn to write in Malay and English?

Nancy: Um, yes. We have four different classes. Some is for Malay language and Malay writing class, and some goes to English, English and English writing.

Natalie: What do you learn in Malay language?

Nancy: Just how we construct the sentence, some very basic things. And our literature. It's mainly literature.

Natalie: Grammar?

Nancy: Yeah, mostly like that. The structure. The ones we learned um, how to construct or speak in official way, professionally in southern Malay.

Natalie: So teaching you southern dialect?

Nancy: Yeah, the official language. And literature.

Natalie: Is literature all in Southern Malay?

Nancy: Yeah, all in Southern Malay.

Natalie: Ever have a class in Northern Malay?

Nancy: No.

Natalie: With Malay writing, any differences between Malay and English writing?

Nancy: Um, I would say English writing is very direct, very straight to the point. But

Malay, we are like, introduction and some interesting stuff, before we get to the point. We get to the point in the middle of paragraph C. Something like that.

[Laughs]

Natalie: How many paragraphs in a Malay essay?

Nancy: Depends on the type, but mostly one to two pages, is what we learned.

Natalie: Which do you feel more comfortable writing in? Malay or English?

Nancy: I would say I write better in English but I speak better in Malay, because we don't speak what we write in Malay. Because it is very official and a very linear use of the language. We don't speak that way. It's like very formal. I actually feel very awkward when writing that.

Natalie: Why do you feel more comfortable writing in English?

Nancy: Yes. Because I read English novels, and I know the sentence structure and stuff.

But I don't read Malay novels. I think I just speak Malay. Even in our school in Malaysia, we learn mathematics and science in English.

Natalie: So what do you think about what Elise teaches in ESL 115?

Nancy: Um, I appreciate the content. I mean, it really um...she really teach us how to write properly, but probably because I think I learned that before it's kind of like repetitive and I just want to get to the point. We already did like, did during the pie...um, it's the illustration and example. I learned that since high school so it's kind of repetitive. So my friends, my Chinese friends, they just know it. They only learn it now, 'cause they didn't learn it in China.

Natalie: What's the most interesting thing you think you've learned?

Nancy: What to use and not to use in research paper, the formal words maybe. Because I started writing diary when I was in primary school, so it's very informal and very...yeah, conversational. Now I like, have to really do it.

Natalie: So she corrects your vocabulary choices?

Nancy: Yeah.

About taking the EPT, Nancy remarked on how jetlagged she was, how she was unaware of how long the test would be, and that she feels the test was redundant to the TOEFL, so she did not understand how it would help place her into the correct ESL course. She would like to see the EPT be shorter, and to see more information about it beforehand.

Natalie: What was it like to take the EPT? What did you have to do?

Nancy: It took me like five hours because they have something like reading, and peer reviewing, and that was kind of boring for me, because I did that in TOEFL and I had to do it again, but I got interested in the essay part, only the essay part, because I thought EPT was only about your essay. But they tested us in our like, listening and speaking skills also. Probably because I did that in TOEFL and I had to do that again, so I was like, oh ok I see.

Natalie: Why do you think they had you do the EPT?

Nancy: Because they want to put me in the right class for my level of English. Like some of my senior they actually had to take 112, then only they take 115, so they told me do EPT, like do it properly so you don't have to take two English classes, so you don't have to spend too long, two semesters, for your English requirement.

Natalie: So they were really disappointed?

Nancy: Yeah, because they had to take two classes.

Natalie: Did they think it was helpful?

Nancy: I guess, yeah? And also about the plagiarism. That really helps a lot. I know plagiarism is a big thing here. It wasn't a big thing back in my country.

Natalie: Walk me through taking the EPT.

Nancy: So I arrive here on 11 January and my EPT was on 14. I was still jetlag on that time, but yeah I still forced myself. I skipped the orientation day cause I slept through it. I was still jetlagged, I mean, I woke up something like two every day, so I actually like forced my senior to just like wake me up on that day. It was really hard, I was really dreading to go to the EPT. So when I go there they told me we have two sections, the listening, the peer reviewing, and also the essay, and also the interview on the interview. And I seriously think it just took me too long. I thought it would end when they sent me the essay, and then they told me we have an interview with um, at the FLB, the foreign language instructor interviewed us.

Natalie: Did you take the written part at the FLB too?

Nancy: No it was at Lincoln Hall. Just on a paper.

Natalie: What'd you think about that?

Nancy: Uh, I think it was just ok, but they gave us too much time. It's like, they gave us the topic, then they let us read the passage. I think we had...I honestly forgot about it, but I think we had to take a side and make an argument about this one

topic. So they gave us like 10 minutes, and then write the point down. And then another ten minutes choose your side and why, then write that down, then another twenty minutes start drafting your essay, and then another period after that start writing your essay. I think it just takes too long. Just give us one period and let the students settle. You don't have to walk the students through it. Probably it was ok for other students who had never been taught how English writing is.

Natalie: Are you used to hand-writing essays?

Nancy: Um, yeah.

Natalie: So that wasn't different for you?

Nancy: No.

Natalie: Did they tell you how long the EPT was going to last?

Nancy: Um, no, they didn't. Because it was like 8am to 11am, and then we break and then my interview was at 2:30pm. So I took a break for lunch, and I was still new, so my friend had to wait for me so that I don't get lost on campus, so I said I'm so sorry to make you wait, I still have an interview after this. So we went to lunch and settle some stuff, cause I was still new, and then go to the interview.

Natalie: So if you had any recommendations for changing the EPT format, what would you say?

Nancy: Make it faster, especially the writing part, cause you just write one essay, but then they made you talk with our peer about the topic. They make you draft. But for me, some people they just write it straight, but for some people draft it first,

so it really depends. SO just make it shorter and faster. And how long it's gonna be, so people can allocate probably the whole morning and afternoon for that.

But luckily I didn't have any plan on the afternoon, so I was like thank God.

Natalie: Did you know you had to take the EPT after you arrived?

Nancy: Yeah.

Natalie: But you didn't think about jet lag?

Nancy: I already thought it through but I didn't know that after three days I was still jetlagged. I was like, when will I stop jet lag? [Laughs]

Natalie: Did you have a choice to take Rhet 105 or ESL 115?

Nancy: No, I was assigned to only ESL 115.

Natalie: How did you feel about that?

Nancy: I feel good cause I didn't have to take the two classes.

Natalie: ESL 111/112?

Nancy: Yeah.

Natalie: So you never thought you'd take Rhet 105?

Nancy: No. Is there really a difference? I heard my senior talk about it but I really didn't get it.

[I explain]

Nancy: Ohhhh.

Natalie: Do you think the campus could do anything else as far as ESL classes? Would you like to take more ESL classes if you could, or you think this one would be good, or...

Nancy: Um, I think this one would be already good, cause it really focuses on writing a research paper, which will help us in future, so yeah.

Natalie: Do you have any ideas about how the University could change any rules for international students? DO you have any suggestions or recommendations?

Nancy: Uh, probably just evaluate our TOEFL, instead of having us take the EPT on campus. Cause I think the TOEFL get already measure the English skill, cause we did the writing, listening, and everything, so like EPT is pretty much doing the same, which makes me think like oh, did my TOEFL doesn't prove anything?

To summarize the above transcript excerpts, the students who took the EPT felt unclear about why they were taking the exam. They said that the exam was easy (much easier than the TOEFL), as well as too long. Those who voluntarily chose to take the EPT did so because they wanted to be placed in ESL 115, as they heard from their peers that it was easier than Rhet 105. About the course itself, students overall felt that their writing had improved, but not by much. Most students said that the most helpful part of the course was learning about citation and plagiarism (and some students remarked on academic style, like Nancy). They didn't feel that ESL 115 was challenging, and some felt regret at not taking (the rumored-to-be more challenging) Rhet 105, as they thought they might have learned more. Overall they were pleased with their experience because of their interaction with the instructor, their peers, and their grade.

CHAPTER 5

Language Policy from Below: Linguaging and the Languagers

In this chapter, I discuss UIUC's English language policy from below by describing the data that I gathered while observing an English as a Second Language (ESL) writing course interviewing and spending time with 15 main student participants and three instructors over the course of the Spring 2016 semester. I posit that although the institutional English language policies (English language policy from above) have a language-as-problem orientation, English language policies from below, (policy that is enacted in the classroom by the ESL 115 students and instructor and elsewhere in official campus spaces), is shaped largely by individuals' own language ideologies and past experiences with language policies outside of UIUC, and have more of a language-as-resource and language-as-right orientation, with some exceptions. I give particular focus to a few key participants' own views, experiences with, and ideologies regarding English language and English language policies at UIUC, and more specifically in ESL 115.

English language policy from below exists in multilingual international undergraduate students' everyday lives in official campus spaces. As they interact with each other during class, with their instructors, and complete assignments, they are creating, enacting, and experiencing English language policy. For this dissertation, the first place I observed English language policy from below was in the ESL 115 writing course. The instructors of the ESL courses as well as the students themselves create, enact, and experience language policies, both at the official institutional level (policy from above) and at the classroom or individual level (policy from below). The language policy from below is reflective of both the students' and instructor's

personal language beliefs and ideologies, as well as the language beliefs and ideologies of the institution itself. The first section of this chapter presents the enacted language policy that is within the ESL 115 classroom. The section after that explores language policy that students experience in other spaces on campus (within other classrooms and among other University stakeholders). Finally, I'll present my findings on student participants' language ideologies and discuss how that affects language policy from below and how they experience it.

Language Policy in the ESL 115 Classroom

I observed an ESL 115 course, "Principles of Academic Writing", in the Spring 2016 semester at UIUC. The instructor, Elise³⁴, was a participant in a pilot study I conducted during the Spring 2015 semester, as well, and I knew that hers would be an excellent course for observation. Elise, like most other ESL instructors in the ESL Service Courses department, has experience living abroad and learning second languages herself. She valued getting to know her students personally, as was evident by her greeting each student as they walked in to her classroom and chatting with them about the weekend or things happening in their lives. She would arrive early, get set up on the computer and projector for the day, greet each student as they walked in, and promptly began class as the bell rang.

Instructors' naming of students. When she greeted students or called on them during class, she would use a mixture of Chinese, Indian, or Malay, clearly attempting to pronounce the students' name according to the phonetic norms of the student's first language. As a phonetics instructor myself, I could see the effort she had put into listening carefully to the

³⁴ All names have been changed to preserve anonymity of my participants to the greatest extent possible, unless where explicitly stated that they gave permission to use real names.

students and the attempts she made to alter her pronunciation when saying their names. While not native-like in her pronunciation, she made an effort. When I asked her why she called some students by an English name and others by a name from a different language, she stated that she asked during the first day of class what the student preferred to be called, and went by their preference, as well as spending a little time during that first day to work on correct pronunciation of their names. Thus, the students called themselves by these name preferences during the course of the semester, as well, either to each other during class, or to me when they were talking about their classmates. Her letting students choose their own names shows an openness to translingual communicative practices in the classroom, where she wants the students to feel that their linguistic repertoires and language backgrounds are welcomed and appreciated.

This is not just an issue that instructors of ESL courses at UIUC face. A Rhetoric 105 instructor at UIUC that I interviewed, Adam, also told me a similar story about his approach to using names in his class and seemed to have a similar openness to naming and language as Elise. I met him at a University training session for faculty and staff that were involved in international student education, and as I interviewed him later, discovered that he was there because he wanted to improve his ability to give specialized instruction and attention, as needed, to the international students in his Rhet 105 courses. He also told me that he had accepted a position through UIUC to teach Rhet courses in English at a Chinese university during the 2016-2017 school year (a new partnership between UIUC and that university), and was interested in knowing more about students from different countries and how to best serve them as an instructor. When he explained how he dealt with names of students, he told the

following story in a way that sounded humorously self-deprecating, noting his lack of ability to pronounce Mandarin, and his students' reaction to that:

Adam: Three-fourths of my international students had English names that they went by.

They didn't even use their own names...or, I mean, they used their English names.

Natalie: So you asked them "What do you want me to call you"?

Adam: Yeah. I'm trying to think...only a couple students went by their Chinese or Korean names.

Natalie: Did they ever say anything about your pronunciation?

Adam: No. I remember kind of asking, "How do you say it", a little bit, and not, you know, I can't think of specific cases, but students definitely not being excited to teach me how to say their names, you know what I mean? They were like just kind of...[he makes a smiling face here]..."Yep that's it...great"...just, totally wrong...they're like, "Awesome job, please leave me alone" [he laughs].

Elise, when asked about what names she uses to address her students, told me a similar story:

Elise: I messed up one student's name one time at the beginning of the semester, but I had a piece of paper that I just wrote down their names so I could just visualize their names and where they were sitting. A seating chart, and I did it at the beginning of the semester, and that just helps me to learn students' names, and I make students keep their name tags out all year.

Natalie: How did you choose what to call them?

Elise: If they put down an American name. So at the beginning of the semester I had the students write down their names, their Chinese names, along with their emails, it's like first day of class you do this. I say write down your name and your...your full name, and if you prefer to be called something else, write that down, and that's where a lot of students would write down their American names, their English names. And so then I just called them whatever they put down on their paper. So some people did not put it down. So Huang didn't change names. That was what he wrote down. And then you know, Sally and Gillian, they put that down, so that's what I would call them, based on what they put down as what they would prefer to be called.

Natalie: Did any of them give you like a pronunciation lesson or something?

Elise: On their name? Mhhmmm [meaning yes].

Natalie: Did they ever correct you?

Elise: Mhmm [meaning yes]. On the first week of class, I asked them, I'll say, "Am I saying this correctly?". When I'm saying their name I'll say "Am I saying this right?". The problem is they're so polite. That I don't think they always correct me. [She laughs.] So I'll say their name wrong all semester, [laughs], and I'm like well, I asked! [Laughs], and you didn't say anything, [Laughs], so here's what I'm calling you. [Laughs]. You know and so it's never meant to be like "I'm just not gonna work to get your name right". It's that I'll say their name the first week of class and I'll say "Am I saying that right? Is this how you say your name?" Nobody

has ever said no, actually. Like maybe one person is like “Oh no, you say it like this, it’s a ‘sh’ sound instead of a ‘s’ sound. You know, but besides that everybody is like “Yup”! You know? [Laughs]. So you know, I offer it every semester, and then I just try my absolute best to pronounce it right, and if I get it wrong and they don’t correct me, I’m like “Sorry, I’m being a stupid American”. I don’t know what else to say. You know?

Though these instructors are in different departments and do not know each other, the stories, and the way they told them, are strikingly similar. The laughing and giggling and self-deprecating humor with which they told me these anecdotes are practically the same and tell the same narrative: They, as the instructors, recognize that they come from a primarily monoglossic background in which many people choose not to learn other languages, and they want to attempt to embrace the multilingualism in their university classrooms by at least giving a primary attempt to pronounce their students’ names correctly. However, the students themselves find this a difficult endeavor (perhaps even impossible, as I will describe below), and do not put forth the effort to help the instructor pronounce their names precisely, leaving both parties (the instructor and the student) feeling a sense of awkwardness in the initial interaction regarding something that is a basic and simple introduction to the class: the students’ names.

The decision to invite students to choose what names they will be called by in a class is not specific to classes with multilingual undergraduate international students, but is a practice that can be found in many classes around UIUC (as a student I experienced this myself). That the instructors, Elise and Adam, attempted the correct pronunciation of the students’ names shows the instructors’ willingness to embrace, in part, their students’ multilingual backgrounds

and multiple language repertoires, to the extent that the instructor asks the student to be the phonetic authority in the pronunciation of their names.

In some cases, perhaps the challenge is not that instructors are not trying, but that effort is thwarted, to some degree, by the students' feelings of uncomfortableness (and past unsuccessful experiences) in trying to teach the phonetic pronunciation of their name to a person in authority over them. One student participant who went by the English name Chris³⁵ in ESL 115 (he also goes by Christopher), and who's Chinese name is Hong Yao, talked about the issue of naming in ESL 115 during our interview:

Natalie: What is your Chinese name?

Chris: Yao Hong. [He tells me his name with his given name first and family name second, as is customary for names in the U.S.]

Natalie: Which is your family name?

Chris: H-O-N-G [He spells it out].

Natalie: What do your friends call you?

Chris: That's how they call me. You mean the Chinese friends? Chinese friends will call me Hong Yao. American friend...I don't know. Some call me Yao, some call me Christopher? I don't know. I don't know, I think they usually know both of the names, they just, I don't know... which one they prefer.

Natalie: Ok, and your teacher calls you Chris? Why?

³⁵ These names are pseudonyms, but I assigned pseudonyms that would still be appropriate for the functionality of his actual names in this anecdote (i.e. Christopher could be split into Chris or Christopher, and Hong Yao is how a person would be called in Chinese with these two names, with Hong being the family name and Yao being the given name).

Chris: I don't know, cause I also have another class called Public Speaking, and the professor knows both of my names and she prefers to call me Yao, so I don't know why.

Natalie: Did you give your teacher both of your names?

Chris: Um, I think they knew my official name because it is on my, everywhere. Class list. And also I usually will give them my English name so they will know both of them.

Natalie: When did you give your teacher your English name?

Chris: I don't know. Beginning of class?

Natalie: When you write things for class, do you use your Chinese or English name?

Chris: It depends. For this class [ESL 115], I think I...I think Chris, because it just depends on how they call me. If they call me Chris, if they call me Yao I'll say Yao.

Natalie: So you let your teachers decide what to call you?

Chris: Yeah. Laughs. I can't force them to call me which name, so. It's their decision.

Natalie: Which name would you prefer?

Chris: I prefer Chris, actually. Because, a lot of people cannot pronounce my Chinese name correctly, and you know, in Chinese we call both of the last name and first name together, and if they just call me the first name it actually doesn't mean anything, so.

Natalie: So why don't you tell your teacher to call you Hong Yao?

Chris: That's so weird.

Natalie: Why?

Chris: Because, American people will not do that.

Natalie: Why?

Chris: Because usually they just call the first name, so you don't call people the last name. If he or she is your friend.

Natalie: So you think it's too much trouble to explain?

Chris: Yeah, too much trouble. Because, when I went to the Career Fair, I also talked to the advisor and they also suggest to me to have an English name on my resume, so it's easier for the recruiters to remember me, so I think it's necessary to have an English name. I don't know.

Natalie: Who told you that?

Chris: It's like the business career services.

For this student, he shows remarkable tolerance and deference to others' preferences of naming him, perhaps showing his desire to make others comfortable with his linguistic background and own multilingualism. His is not a unique case, as other students told me similar versions of naming stories. The student participants in this study, like Chris, demonstrate an awareness of the discomfort that others have with their language backgrounds. The discomfort can be seen in the laughing and giggling and humor that the instructors used when telling me stories about naming students. Chris also demonstrates a sociolinguistic and pragmatic awareness of American English naming norms, describing that Americans only use first or given names for friends, contrasting that to Chinese sociolinguistic and pragmatic norms of almost always using the family name and then the first name together. The instructors at UIUC that Christ talked about, though trying to accommodate student preferences for naming, seemed

unaware of those sociolinguistic or pragmatic differences, and Chris knew that they were unaware.

That being said, Chris also expressed that he did not have the desire to be the phonetic authority for his Chinese name, nor did he feel comfortable teaching (or know how to teach) non-Chinese speakers about Chinese pronunciation, resulting in him frequently asking to be called by an English name. These multilingual students make strong efforts to accommodate the dominant language group and dominant monolingual orientation to languages on campus, without being given the recognition that they are doing so. To allow someone to assign a name to you based on the other person's comfort level of your own language background is a powerful accommodation, indeed, and shows a strong leaning towards language-as-resource orientation.

On the "First Day Handout". Language policy from below starts at the very beginning of the course, with how instructors choose to address students and how students choose to identify and name themselves. Apart from naming in a classroom on the first day of the class, language policy from below becomes explicit in a very key way. It is crucial to understand that language policy is not just what is written on a document, but there is an important document that is involved in language policy from below: the syllabus. In ESL 115, the syllabus (or, the "First Day Handout", which is the title of the document given to students that contains syllabus-like information), as I explained above in an earlier section, have elements that must stay consistent across all classes, and ones that can vary. The section on "Student Participation" is where language policy becomes most salient. The "First Day Handout" gives an example of what instructors could use for the language of "Student Participation", and even though Elise

could have changed that section, she chose not to. Her handout reads as the department's original copy does:

“This is an ENGLISH language class. Everyone is here to improve his/her language skill. You must therefore stick to speaking in ENGLISH at all times in the classroom. You are also not allowed to use any electronic devices (e.g. laptops, cell phones) while lectures or activities are in progress. Violating this rule will result in confiscation of your device until the class is over. Frequent violation of these classroom policies will result in a 0-point mark for your participation grade.

Homework and reading assignments may be given daily. Students are expected to come to class prepared to discuss homework and readings. Participation in class discussions and activities is expected and will contribute to the final grade—this includes encouraging the participation of others. A grade of zero will be given to all work missed due to an unexcused absence. Late homework may not be accepted or will be marked down.” (English as a Second Language Service Courses, 2016, emphasis theirs).

This section of the handout clearly sets up language policy for the classroom: students will only use English at all times, no matter what, and will be punished (in the form of a lower participation grade) if they violate this policy. That is one part of the language management aspect of the policy. (Other aspects of language management include how language is *actually* used in the policy space, and that will be discussed a few paragraphs below).

The language ideology, or beliefs about language, exposed here is the notion that in order for a language learner to improve in the language that they are learning, the learner

should strive to use that language for communication as much as possible, and might even go further—that the use of the learner’s primary language in the language learning environment could be detrimental to the process of language learning. This is a common belief about language learning in the ESL world, and is partially based on personal experience of language instructors themselves (something like, “When I was a student studying abroad in Spain, my language didn’t really improve until I made Spanish friends and stopped speaking in English”).

However, according to Dr. Lonna Dickerson, a Second Language Acquisition professor at Wheaton College in Wheaton, Illinois, that belief is based primarily from ideology coming from days when the audiolingual method of instruction was considered the best way (for adults) to learn a second language. The audiolingual method is where an instructor says a series of words and phrases and the students are expected to repeat those words and phrases out-loud several times. This was often performed in a language lab where a proficient speaker of the language being learned may or may not be physically present, but the students would listen to the target language through recordings coming through individual headphones (think of the old black and white photos of students with large headphones repeating phrases in a foreign language). This method is still popular in foreign language classrooms around the world, and was made more popular through the Monterrey Institute of Linguistics, run by the U.S. military. This belief about language learning that comes through a combination of personal experience and handed-down “best practices” results in a sort of folk-lore about language learning: one must eliminate first-language use in a second-language classroom for the best language learning results.

This folklore belief is in direct contrast to research that has emerged regarding multilingualism in bilingual classrooms, and the use of translanguaging (the use of translingual communicative practices in the classroom). That current research demonstrates the benefits for the language learner when one's dominant, or first, or primary language is allowed to be use simultaneously in a classroom that is conducted in a different language. According to Garcia and Wei (2014), "Translanguaging not only promotes a deeper understanding of content, but also develops the weaker language in relationship with the one that is more dominant" (p. 64).

Language Management in ESL 115: English-only?

Because there is a written language policy on the ESL 115 First Day Handout of the class I observed, one might assume that there would, for the most part, be only English spoken and used in the ESL classroom. However, that was not the case. In fact, students in the course on a daily basis would use translingual communicative practices with each other during official and unofficial class time (during group work or speaking to each other during a lecture). Translingual communicative practices is when languaging occurs simultaneously using the multiple languages in one's repertoire to communicate. This meant that during the ESL 115 class, I daily observed students using languages other than English in combination with English to communicate to one another, both on group work that was assigned by the instructor and during chats or quiet conversations to one another about other subjects. That there was an official written statement against doing this did not deter Chinese students from using translingual communicative practices (i.e. mixing Mandarin and English) as well as using their primary language (Mandarin) to communicate with each other. It also did not lead Elise, as the

instructor, to perform “language police” duties and tell students to not use languages other than English, though she could clearly hearing them use other languages frequently.

I asked Elise about this phenomenon. Here is a partial transcript of that conversation:

Elise: Yeah, the thing with using English-only? Yeah I leave it on there for the students, who if they want to look through it but I don’t enforce it because, like if they want to say oh she wants English, I’m going to really try and use English, but I never actually say that like hey guys I want you to use only English. I don’t say that. I think one semester I might have said that but I was like, no I don’t really like that, I think probably of the first semesters I taught. But I was like yeah no, that’s not what I want. So I leave it on there to allow...maybe that students need a push, and some students just want to practice their English, you know, but yeah I don’t really enforce that. Not with them.

In this excerpt, Elise explicitly states that her beliefs about language use in the classroom have evolved over time, from the first time she taught (two years prior to my research). She allows the written policy to encourage students to use English (“maybe that students need a push, and some students just want to practice their English”), but does not want, nor intend, to manage their language heavily in the classroom (“but yeah I don’t really enforce that”).

I asked her to elaborate on her beliefs about the English-only policy and practice:

Natalie: Do you think that it affects the way that they learn English if they don’t only speak English?

Elise: I’m sure that it does in some way and probably that’s why a lot of the teachers

choose to do the English-only, because they can only improve, and only gonna help them be a better student and better English speaker and English writer if they only speak English, and I'm sure that...you know...

Natalie: Do you think that it's true?

Elise: I personally don't, because I think again, maybe if they're lacking the word and they're trying to figure out, well how am I supposed to do this part but I don't know how to ask that or I don't know how to...I just think that it can prevent them from really gaining something, if they aren't able to ask each other or talk to each other about something, and they're just maybe limited in English in this specific sense, to maybe ask this question and then I answer but it didn't really answer the question they had, I just feel like it puts a lot of limitations on them. and I just don't think that's...

Natalie: So you think it impedes learning?

Elise: I do! Because I mean, I think about when I was learning [a foreign language] and when I was in these [foreign language] classes and she was just speaking at us in [the foreign language] and she keeps going and I'm like, wait what was that part, could somebody tell me what she just said, and I'd be like ok got it, so I was there, and I very much needed to use my native language to understand stuff, and who am I to say for someone else that they are not the same, you know?

In another place in an interview, Elise spoke further about her own language ideologies and perceptions related to multilingualism and language management:

Elise: I think about if I'm in another country, and I'm in this class that completely a second language to me, and I'm you know, maybe struggling with something, I just could say hey, how do I do this, could you just tell me how to do this, and it's just a quick thing, and why would I want to take that away from them if they still would need that and still need it to be comfortable and understand something, I don't want to take that away from them. I think that's disrespectful, because English is not the end all, and although I wanna encourage them to use the language, they are in America, that means they had to go through all the processes anyway so I am sure their English is pretty wonderful as is. The fact that they could get into a school here in the states and everything, I want to give them the freedom to communicate and understand however best they understand.

Here, she emphasizes again her belief that using one's first language in a second language environment could enhance learning. She also discusses her personal ideology regarding English: "English is not the end all". This reflects a larger belief that does not conform to the more popular hegemonic view of English, that even some students embrace themselves.

In these excerpts, Elise gives two main reasons for not enforcing the written policy that is on her handout and first-day handout: her own personal experiences learning a second language, and a belief that enforcing such a policy (not allowing students to use their native language) could actually hinder students' learning. Her beliefs, or language ideology, about second language learning are based on the same underlying reasons as the department's language ideology, which also results in a sort of folk-lore approach to understanding and

enforcing language use in a second language classroom. That Elise's own experiences and beliefs about language have a strong influence on language policy in her classroom agree with the general literature on language policy, as well.

From my observations, I did not ever observe Elise managing language by asking students to use English instead of another language (the only other language used in the classroom, as far as I observed, was Mandarin, though the students had many other languages in their repertoires). I never observed her enforcing the English-only policy that was explicitly stated on the handout, nor did she point out students' use of other languages during the class at any time. The students did occasionally manage their own language, and that will come later in another section of this chapter.

Overall, the language policy from below in the ESL 115 course is contradictory, which fits the norms of all language policies everywhere. Though there was an explicitly written English-only statement in her handout, Elise, the instructor, admitted that she did not enforce that policy because she herself did not believe in it. She also said that she felt that the department had given her the freedom to handle the language use issue in whichever way she preferred, and expressed her appreciation for that freedom:

Elise: ...I've never heard anybody, like when they're [the department] saying here's what we're looking for... Because when they say here's what we're looking for in the class, they are looking for are you having groups, are you having teacher time, ...I don't know if they care too much about each teacher's preference in language usage.

Natalie: So you really feel like it's a preference and they let you choose?

Elise: Yeah I think they let me choose and I think that's very kind of them, because you know I'm not the kind of teacher that is going to be so rule set on those kind of things that a student doesn't feel comfortable...you know? I want them to have that comfort.

Whether or not the department prefers language management practices in the classroom that enforce an English-only policy, the written expectation from Elise's supervisors is that she can choose how to manage language in the classroom. I did hear, from spending time in and around the department and people in the department, that some think that the official policy from the department is in fact English-only, and that they enforce that during instructor observations. However, I have no official statements on record from interviewees claiming this to be true, so it must be assumed that how Elise managed her classroom in terms of language use is acceptable from a departmental level, as well. The fact that Elise (and perhaps other instructors) have a written language policy and enacted language management practices that contradict one another align with all literature regarding language policies in all types of institutions and spaces where language is used, and came to me as no surprise.

Students Managing Each Others' Language

During the individual interviews I had with students, students were split on whether or not there was an official English-only policy in class. Some students thought that there was no such policy, and some knew that one existed, but all agreed that the instructor didn't care to enforce it one way or another. They all acknowledged that Mandarin Chinese was spoken in the classroom much of the time, but there were inconsistent responses on opinions about whether

or not this was ok. It then follows that there were different language practices, depending on the student, when it came to using either English or another language.

One incident in particular highlights the tension among students that sometimes came with making language practice choices. This incident happened during a group work session (something that the instructor required of the students almost every class period). There were four Chinese students in this group that I observed and recorded (Ying, Bo, Lina, and Christopher), and their task was to research a certain topic on websites and write a summary of their findings. Ying, one of the focal students, and Bo, another student that was very interesting to me during the study, had a tense moment regarding language choice during this group activity. The four students—two females and two males—were sitting in the back corner of the classroom near where I was sitting that day. The two females (including Ying) and one male were working together more closely on the activity, while Bo was working mostly by himself on his computer in front of him. They all were looking at individual computers.

As was common for a group with only Chinese students, they were translanguaging with Mandarin and English (a practice of intentionally mixing two or more languages together), with Mandarin standing out as the most frequently used language during the activity. I began to notice during this group activity that Bo was primarily only speaking in English, while the other students were primarily speaking in Mandarin, though all students mixed the two languages to some degree. Christopher asked a question to Bo in Mandarin and Bo replied back in English. Then Lina asked Bo a question in Mandarin, and Bo replied in English. Ying then makes a comment out loud in English, something I couldn't clearly hear, but the group got silent. As the

group work went on, I heard Bo make remarks to himself under his breath in English, but no one replied back. Then, as time was running out on the group work, this incident occurred:

Ying: “Whyyyyyyyy whyyyyyyyy?!” (in English)

Lina leans over, points at Ying’s screen, and says something in Mandarin.

Ying: “Why is it a problem?” and as she says that, she leans over and looks at Bo.

Bo then starts to answer in English, but Ying interrupts him by putting up her right hand in a sort of “stop” motion as she types what he is saying with her left hand. Then she says a little loudly and looking directly at him, “Slow down please! You can just explain to me!” in somewhat of a forceful tone. The others sit very still and quiet, and Bo looks surprised. He then leans over to speak to her quietly in Mandarin. For the remaining 10 minutes of the group activity, they all continue to translanguage in Mandarin and English. This incident illustrates how students managed each others’ language in sometimes overt ways.

Bo had this to say about that incident and about English and Mandarin in the classroom during our one-on-one interview:

Natalie: I’ve noticed in your ESL class, when you work together in groups, and if there’s only Chinese students in the group, you use Chinese.

Bo: Yep that’s true.

Natalie: Tell me about that.

Bo: I mean, I didn’t use Chinese to talk very much. I didn’t. THEY use Chinese to talk, so that’s why. You know, some Chinese students in my group, they don’t even know the is ic issue. They don’t know the serial issue. [He’s speaking about grammar rules and word morphology here]. I feel like, oh ok. So like, normally,

during the teamwork I just type my own things, I don't talk to them because they're all speaking in Chinese. I feel like I don't want to be a part of them.

Natalie: So Is that why sometimes you speak to them in English?

Bo: It's English class. And also, if you speak some language your teacher doesn't understand, that other people don't understand, it's kind of weird, because that's not what you're supposed to do. It's ESL class, at least you should speak English. I mean, if you don't read the materials ok that's fine, but you should at least speak English, I mean it's ESL class after all.

Natalie: So how do you feel when you DO speak Chinese with them?

Bo: I feel like I compromised.

Natalie: Yeah, I noticed that happened the other day. You're working in a group and this girl asked you a question and you responded in English, and she says "just explain it to me", and then you told her in Chinese. Were you kind of forcing them to speak more English?

Bo: No, I'm just doing what I SHOULD do. Actually, I don't even care how their English is, like I don't even care whether they use English. As long as I can practice it, as long as I do what I should do what I'm supposed to do in the English class.a good student definitely should speak English, and in English use the whole class.

For Bo, he wasn't trying to manage the other students' language, but he was going against Ying's attempt to manage his language. For Bo, the classroom should be English-only, and he

felt that he was compromising his own language ideologies and standards when he used Mandarin.

Language Practices: Translingual Communicative Practices in the Classroom

When I asked the students about this issue of language use in the classroom, some of them were aware of the written policy on the First Day Handout and others were not, but all agreed that they did not think the instructor cared much about what language they used. In fact, it became obvious to me during my very first observation that language use in the classroom was not restricted to English-only. The students employed a strategy Canagarajah (2012) calls translingual communicative practices—the mixing of languages in one’s repertoire during communication.³⁶ While I’m referring to students in plural, translingual communicative practices only happened in the class among Mandarin-speaking students and only with Mandarin and English. Students did not use other languages in their repertoires for translingual communicative practices (or any other type of communication during official classroom spaces), nor did the students who do not speak Mandarin appear to use that strategy in any way during class (they did tell me of this practice in other university spaces, and that will be discussed further in another section later on in this chapter).

Jottings from my classroom observations often looked like this one, from February 29th, 2016:

“The group of students sitting next to me are speaking to each other primarily in

³⁶ The literature on translingual communicative practices differs from, among other terms, translanguaging, code-switching and code-meshing (both linguistic terms that are also used in the field of second language acquisition). More can be found on this in Chapter 3.

Mandarin, but are also using English words peppered in their speech. I just heard the words ‘credibility’ and the phrase ‘Are we finished?’ All students in the group are Mandarin speakers from China.”

I used a recording device and placed it in different spots in the room to catch group conversations (during group work) during some of the classes. I asked a Mandarin-speaking student (not from this ESL 115 course) to transcribe the recordings for me, and most of the recordings from days with group work looked like this excerpt, from March 2, 2016, below. I have the Chinese characters written when speaking was in Mandarin, and notice the emboldened words where the speaker switched to English. The transcription into English is below each phrase.

Most of the time, students would use select English words in the middle of Chinese phrases.

Kirstie: 它（网站）这个是好还是不好啊？

Is it (Website) good or not?

Ying : 那就是好吧，因为...是 **action based**.

It should be a good one because (Pause) it is action based.

Chris : 我觉得挺靠谱的。

I think it is pretty reliable.

Below is another example of translingual communicative practice in the classroom from March 14, 2016. In this conversation, Gillian and Yangjin talk both about the assignment they are doing together for group work and about personal plans for spring break.

Gillian: 要死了！

I'm dying!

Yangjin: 马上就要放假了！

The spring break is coming!

Gillian: 放假还要上网课

Although it's spring break, I still have to take my online course.

Yangjin: 为什么放假还有课啊？！

Why do you still have class during spring break?!

Gillian: 因为它就是八周的课，还把 **spring break** 含在里面，这周开始。

Because it's an 8-week class, and it includes the spring break, starting this week.

Yangjin: 这很蛋疼啊

This is a bit painful!

Gillian: 第一次！你要 **edit** 你的 **main point**，要放你自己照片，要写一个

introduction，还要，还要 **action-based**，对啊！还得回人家，就是，为什么还要写什么...这种东西。我去上网课就是不想去上课，不想去认识人，你现在还要我干这事儿。

It's my first time! You need to edit your main point (not sure), put your photo on the website, write an introduction about yourself; and, and action-based.

On March 16, 2016, this was a transcript of group work with Anna and Lina:

Anna: 就是那个 **water project**, 他应该是...

It's that water project, it should be...

Lina: 看看别的小组在做什么。

Let's see what are other groups doing.

Anna: 有一点不同，但是基本方向是差不多的。

It's a little bit different, but the main goals are similar.

Lina: 那这个在哪里找？我可以直接 **copy** 嘛？

Where can I find this? Can I just directly copy it [from the site]?

Anna: 就是看那个 **description**，看他在讲什么。

We should look at that description, figuring out what is this solution talking about.

On April 6th, translingual practices happened between Sally and Gillian, involving a mixture of personal and academic topics:

Gillian: 他家也在北京？他家也在北京么？

Does he come from Beijing? Or does he lives their also?

Sally: 在山西，但是他在北京有房子。

It's Shanxi, but he do have an apartment in Beijing.

Gillian: 但是我突然想到你男朋友要是来的话就可能 **high** 不了了。

But I just realized that if your boyfriend came, he might not able to be quite high staying in [Champaign]

Sally: 什么不了？

Why not?

Gina: 就是不能去 **bar** 啊不能去 **party** 啊。

Because he is not able to go to either bar or any party.

Sally: 哈哈 **correct**.

Haha, that's correct.

Gina: 就是还没有到**18**, 哦不 **19** 岁。

We are not 18, well 19 yet.

Sally: 作为一个 **party queen**.

You? As a party queen?

Gina: 不不不我根本就不去 **party**。

Nah, you must be kidding me, I barely go to party.

Then, later during class, talking about when the writing assignment is due:

Sally: 周日 **due** 么?

Is it due Sunday?

Gillian: 周五 **due** 吧。

It's due Friday.

Sally: 要写多少字?

Is there a word limit?

Gillian: 一千多吧。我写了一千八百多字。

Around a thousand. I wrote 1800 words.

Sally: 卧槽你好屌。

What?! You are brilliant!

Students using translingual communicative practices was so common in this ESL 115 classroom space that it was impossible to record or overhear every instance. It is important to note that this practice only occurred among the Mandarin and English speaking students during

ESL 115 class. The two students in the course who did not speak Mandarin (Dipti and Nancy) did not share another common language, apart from English, with anyone in the class, so there were no observed instances of them using languages other than English during class, though I did observe Annausing translingual communicative practices with her friend during my observations and interview times spent with them. Nancy also explained to me that she and her Malay-speaking friends (both Northern Malay and Southern Malay) used translingual communicative practices (she did not name it that) in informal spaces around campus, and that it was a difficult thing for her to understand and manage her feelings around those instances. Whether students are doing it for building relationships among each other or for ease of communication, they have a very fluid way of utilizing their linguistic repertoires in both official and unofficial spaces around campus.

Students' opinions about using translingual communicative practices in ESL 115.

Some students were comfortable with using translingual communicative practices in ESL 115, and some students were not. The Mandarin-speaking students in the course who used those practices all had the same five things to say about it:

1. It is more convenient for communication to use both Mandarin and English.
2. They do not like using both languages when they are doing group work with one of the two non-Mandarin speakers in the course.
3. They were split as to whether or not they thought it was allowed or should be allowed, but they all thought that it is impossible for an instructor to manage their language in such a way that forces the class to be monoglossic, mostly because of the

social pressure they feel to speak only Mandarin to other Mandarin-speaking Chinese students.

4. They had the impression that U.S. universities, and UIUC in particular, had an English-only policy for official campus spaces.

5. They often tried to manage each others' language use (whether or not to use Mandarin, translingual communicative practices, or English-only) based on the feelings and perception of the other students and the instructors, referring to a notion of respect and politeness.

Below are three excerpts from interviews. The first is from Ying, a focal participant. The second is from Guohua, who was also a focal participant. Another is from Yangjin, the student that I quoted in the preface. All three of these students have similar perspectives that echo the perspectives of the other Chinese speaking students in the course.

Ying: I know that ESL is English as a Secondary Language, but I didn't expect them all Chinese...maybe didn't have English as their native language, but they are from different countries. But, I know that there are so many Koreans on this campus, but I never see them. But they took class together and Chinese took class together, so I think that for ESL, it's better for students that are not native speaker but they can't communicate with each other without English. But obviously in the ESL classes they can communicate with each other and when somebody say Chinese to me, yeah I can't just say English back...it seems weird. In Chinese culture, if people think you are not really good...if you wanna like, speak English, language other than Chinese when you can speak Chinese, it's not

really good...people think you don't like china, and you are not normal Chinese. And that's pretty much just like during World War II when those Chinese people betray their country and they just sell the information to Japanese...something like that...people will think you are a bad person if you don't speak Chinese. In the most optimistic cases, people may think you are showing off. But in most of cases, people think oh you love the United states, and you love English, you don't love china but you are born in china, so that make you a bad person.

Natalie: How do you know this?

Ying: Common sense. It's pretty much, it's like in China, when there are all Chinese people, you just simply eat together, you can't be with somebody else, otherwise you are a bad person. If your class, if there are a couple of Chinese students and there are like a couple of other students, if you don't wanna play with Chinese, in most of cases they are not all people that you like in your class, but if you don't play with the Chinese students and you play with the people from other countries or from the united states, people may think that you are...just...you hate china...you think china is a not good place so you don't want to be with those Chinese.

In my ESL class, you Remember Bo? He always speaking in English, right? He always do that. He's those kind of those boys...who want to show off...he has that kind of feel...to us...girls in the class just don't like him. That sounds a bit harsh, but if you like, inside a bunch of Chinese and you don't really need to speak English but you speak English, you appear that you are not welcome, you

are not popular here. So, it's like ...it's interesting that in some circumstances even here, in the United states, like, for Chinese people, they gather together, they are not supposed to say English. They are together so they are supposed to say Chinese, even though they want to practice their English, they are not supposed to do that if they want to be accepted by others.

Natalie: So, let's stick to ESL class. In ESL 115, when you're in a group with Chinese people, it's an unspoken rule that you should speak Chinese?

Ying: Yes. Sometimes I understand that it's a little rude. There are also other people who don't understand Chinese...like there are two students...but Chinese people still speak Chinese. Like, it's really awkward for us, and strange for us and weird, like, between two Chinese people they speak English...it's just weird. So, it's just like a rule.

Natalie: Have there been any instances where you did speak English to Chinese people during class, or lab, or discussion session?

Ying: No.

Natalie: In ESL class, do you ever speak to the other Chinese person in English?

Ying: Sometimes, during group works, there are people, you know, there are people from other countries, they don't understand Chinese, and in that group circumstance we generally speak English. If there are 3 Chinese people in the same group, you can even hear them speaking Chinese. So it's like, If there are all Chinese people, people will definitely speak Chinese. But If there are some

people don't understand Chinese also in that group, people will like explain to each other in Chinese when people don't understand.

Natalie: So it's for clarification if you do that when non-Chinese people are there, but if non-Chinese people are there, you make an effort to speak English?

Ying: Yes and I think in ESL class, the class atmosphere is really friendly. You know, people, they are not...I don't know whether people from Malaysia or people from India are like, native speaker in English, but just people don't have this American accent...so if all people don't have that American accent, people will feel, you know, more comfortable to speak English. But if they are just classes other than ESL, because ESL is really special class because it is secondary language, but if it's in the class with first language are English with all those people around, like, you know, people who are not native speaker of English, they generally get afraid of it...they are afraid of their grammar, or their accent, or their fluency, like, so many things, so people just don't speak anything. In so many classes that I've ever been to, like, people, Chinese people, don't speak for like throughout the whole semester.

Natalie: So, When Carrie lets you speak Chinese in ESL 115, what do you think would be the best situation. Like, are you happy she lets you speak Chinese? Do you think she should? What do you think.

Ying: I think that, you know, in ESL class, they shouldn't supposed to be having all the

students in the same country, but it's really hard to split it up, I understand that, because Korean always choose to join one section, and they just leave all other sections to Chinese, because there are no other students on this campus who need to take English as a secondary language. I think for Indian, their first language is English, right? For India...So I think this is a special situation for Chinese people. But it's kind of good for people to, you know, speak Chinese during class, like, the teacher doesn't care about it, because sometimes, it makes me feel a little bit uncomfortable when there are certain rules, like, when there are all Chinese people there in the classroom and the teacher just set the rule that you are not supposed to say any other language other than English.

For Ying, in addition to practical reasons of making it easier to communicate with other speakers, translingual communicative practices in the ESL 115 course are based on sociolinguistic issues related to consequences of languaging in multiple languages among Chinese Mandarin speakers.

The student below, Guohua, agrees with some of Ying's points and makes some of his own.

Natalie: So ESL 115, you guys speak in Chinese there.

Guohua: Right.

Natalie: What do you think about that?

Guohua: I think that, I mean, I know. [Laughs]

Natalie: No, you know [Guohua], I don't have an opinion, I just want to know your opinion.

Guohua: My opinion is that like, in class, we are talking in Chinese part of the reason is that like, we are Chinese students. Yeah we are not like American born Chinese. I understand that American born Chinese are usually talking in English. And it's right, I will talk to them in English as well, once I know that they are ABCs, but for Chinese students I think it's easier to communicate in Chinese, so, yeah, that's what I do. I'm just trying to find the easier way to communicate with each other.

Natalie: Do you think it's ok that you speak Chinese in ESL 115?

Guohua: Half and half.

Natalie: Tell me.

Guohua: I know in English, like, in U.S. universities, we are supposed to speak English all the time.

Natalie: Really?

Guohua: I think so.

Natalie: Why do you think that?

Guohua: Cause it's easier for the teacher to control, as I said. I'm thinking about teachers' opinion as well.

Natalie: You think teachers would have that opinion?

Guohua: I think so. I mean they might, I'm not sure, but the thing is that the teacher must like, they should be, they are willing to know what we are talking about at least, right? Teacher want to know what we are talking about in class. I mean, it's not she wanna control something, but she's interested at least, like, because it's

in class, so, so I think it's...we should talk in English. But it's about Chinese students like, culture and stuff. It is hard to control, so.

For Guohua, he says similar things to Ying about using translingual communicative practices for ease of communication among fellow Chinese Mandarin speakers. He also expresses his observation that, in general, the English language policy from above at UIUC is English-only, and he does not go so far as to disagree with that perceived policy. Ying, on the other hand, outwardly expressed her disapproval of English-only policies. Guohua also said that he thought the ESL 115 teacher would want to maintain linguistic control of her classroom and be able to understand everything that is said, so an English-only policy was not unfounded in his mind. He then admits that having an English-only language policy is “hard to control”.

Like Guohua and Ying, Yangjin, below, says that he uses translingual communicative practices in the classroom for ease of communication with other Chinese Mandarin speakers. He also discusses his perception that there is an unofficial English-only policy at the University in general because it is “American”, and “many people think that”. Despite that perception, he thinks that it is ok to use Mandarin (and translingual communicative practices) in the classroom.

Natalie: Now, let's talk about ESL 115. I noticed that sometimes you speak Chinese, right

to...who sits next to you...Sally?

Yangjin: Yeah, Sally.

Natalie: Do you call Sally Sally? Not her Chinese name?

Yangjin: No.

Natalie: What does she call you?

Yangjin: Yangjin.

Natalie: When you talk to Sally, ... do you guys use Chinese, or do you sometimes use English? What's going on there?

Yangjin: When we doing work together, it's like when we're working the group, we will speak in English sometimes, but when we just talk, I will use Chinese.

Natalie: Ok. Why do you use English sometimes when you are working in the group?

Yangjin: Cause it's in the class. And I think we are supposed to use English in that class.

Natalie: You think so? Why do you think so?

Yangjin: Yeah. Uh, I mean, I'm in an American classroom, so I think that we're supposed to use English. Yeah.

Natalie: Do you think it's ok that you use Chinese when you talk about some stuff?

Yangjin: Yeah.

Natalie: Why do you think that?

Yangjin: Cause it's our native language. It's more easy for us to communicate.

Natalie: Do you think it's ok if you use Chinese when you're working on group work or homework?

Yangjin: Uh I think when we are out of class, we can use Chinese to do our work.

Natalie: But when you're in the classroom...

Yangjin: Yeah, I think I am supposed to speak English.

Natalie: Do you think it's a rule?

Yangjin: It's not a rule, but it's a rule in your mind. Many people think that.

Natalie: Why do you think many people think that?

Yangjin: Cause I went to ESL back in [another U.S. university] but the credits doesn't

transfer. During the discussion in other classes, although you have team members in Chinese, but you will still speak English.

Natalie: Did somebody tell you to do that?

Yangjin: No, just everybody does it. Nobody talks about it, everyone does it.

Natalie: So what do you think about in ESL 115 where she lets you speak in Chinese...do you think that's ok?

Yangjin: Yeah I think that's ok.

Another participant, Anna, told me that she uses Chinese in class for ease of communication, and to help them perform "better" on their assignments and in-class tasks, as well.

Natalie: Do you ever write anything in Chinese?

Anna: Uh, yeah, like, um, the...how to say...diary? I wrote that.

Natalie: What's the difference when you write in English and in Chinese, how do you feel?

Anna: Definitely more comfortable when I was writing in Chinese. It's my mother language, although I spent three years in America, Chinese is still better for me.

Natalie: So I noticed you guys speak in Chinese in writing class. Tell me about that.

Anna: Not all the time. If they are all Chinese, we will probably speak Chinese. If there is a person from other countries, we would definitely use English. It's showing respect. Like, when there is four people, there is only one person from other country who don't understand Chinese, if you still talk in Chinese, I think she would get mad. I will.

Natalie: So, in your writing class, Elise lets you speak Chinese. Right? Did she ever say?

Anna: I don't remember if she ever said that before.

Natalie: What do you think she thinks about it?

Anna: I don't know. Because, Um, Probably in Chinese we can understand each other better, maybe...I don't know. I don't really think she cares because she never mentioned this. If she told us like, you guys have to speak English in this class, it's a class about English, you guys have to, then I think we'd all speak English. I would think she is probably forcing us to improve our English in the class. As a class rule. You know. I don't really care about it. You know. I don't really care, you know, English, Chinese, they both work for me.

Natalie: Other students?

Anna: If it's a class rule, I think people will understand that... it's an English class, right?

Natalie: What about official group work and assignments?

Anna: Official group work. Uh, we use Chinese sometimes when there are only Chinese in the group, so it's easier, you know, to communicate to each other, but when we represent them, definitely English. Even if there's only Elise is American, or if all the other students are Chinese, we'd still talk in English when we present to the whole class. It's individual and the whole group. It's different.

Natalie: So working with students and a Chinese TA is different? For some reason you feel like there is some kind of rule like hey, only English in class, but when with Chinese students, it's ok, it's different, even though you are working on an official student.

Anna: Yeah, because what we are doing is talking about the assignments. If we can make it better if we use Chinese, why not. You know, it is not affected.

Student Experiences with Language Management Efforts in Other Official Campus Spaces

Chinese teaching assistants and Chinese students. One of the most interesting aspects, to me, of student experiences with English language policy-from-below at UIUC is what they described in other official campus spaces, outside of ESL 115. Namely, the most interesting thing came from the Chinese students who talked about their experiences with Chinese instructors. In those instances where a Mandarin-speaking Chinese student had a course with a Mandarin-speaking Chinese instructor (whether it was a TA, adjunct instructor, or professor), the Chinese instructor would manage the language of the Chinese students by asking them to not speak Mandarin during official campus spaces. Some students thought this might be because of an official English-only policy at UIUC that the instructors were familiar with, and they had differing opinions about this phenomenon.

Bo talked about this occurring with a math TA:

Bo: We do have one class where we are not allowed to speak other languages. TA session of Math 220. The TA himself is Chinese. We have like three or four Chinese students in that class. So like other students are all American. So when we are asking him some questions in Chinese, he will always say like please don't speak Chinese, speak English. But I know...I can understand it...cause, yeah, it's just for understanding. He wants like other students to understand our questions, so. It's during class, I used Chinese asking questions. I know I was kind of rude, but. But it's really difficult for me to say those professional terms in

English. For example, how to say those like...X plus...polynomials? Something like that? But before I didn't know the word polynomial. But later he taught us it's called polynomial in English. You better remember that when you ask questions. Please don't speak Chinese. I just felt shameful, but I appreciate it actually, because I was the one who shouldn't do that, because other people they cannot understand Chinese, and after all, this is an American university, you've got to speak English in class. Yeah, I appreciate this actually. It helped me improve my English and now at least I understand a lot of mathematics words!

Natalie: Do you think you should be able to use Chinese in spaces like that? Do you think it would be helpful if you could?

Bo: I mean, if you're talking about like the efficiency in communication, then definitely yes. Like Chinese is my native language through which I can like solve problems more quickly, more efficiently. But for like understanding, for like common understanding...yeah like if it's not in the class but if it's like after class asking questions, I definitely appreciate Chinese.

Natalie: Do you talk to him in Chinese after class?

Bo: Yeah of course.

Natalie: And he allows that?

Bo: Yeah.

Natalie: Did you ask him first or just did?

Bo: I just did. He didn't correct me.

Natalie: What do you think the ideal situation in a class like that for you for

language...what would be the best...if you could make the best rule?

Bo: I still appreciate English. Because that's basically what I come here for.

Natalie: What do you mean?

Bo: I come here to pursue a degree, to learn knowledge, but also I want my English to improve. So I do appreciate that we must speak English during classes. I think that's good for everybody, because most of the students are local students whose native language is English, so I do appreciate that. But like after class, after school, then of course we can speak whatever language we like.

Natalie: What if the TA let him speak Chinese to you during class, how would you feel?

Bo: I would feel good or I would feel nothing, because it's natural for Chinese people to use Chinese to communicate. But other American students, they may feel I'm closer to the teacher or something like that. I don't want to trigger some misunderstanding. That's why I really appreciate English speaking in class.

Natalie: Do you ever use Chinese for writing, writing to TAs, or...

Bo: Normally, if I send an email, I just use English.

Natalie: If you send an email to a Chinese teacher or TA...

Bo: I think I use English, right? I think I use English. But, like, no matter English or Chinese, it doesn't make a difference to me. Because I'm not using English to talk about some different questions where I may not know how to use English to express. What I send through email is some really easy simple questions, so it really doesn't make a difference.

Bo's experience with his Chinese TA in a math course show that even within an individual, there are contradictory ideas about language policy. At first, Bo tried to embrace multilingualism, languaging in different repertoires for ease of communication and understanding in the course. The TA did not allow this, however. Then, in the interview, Bo tells me that he feels that official campus spaces in the U.S. should actually be English-only, and that he is grateful for being made to use English so that his English proficiency can improve (citing that as one of the goals for studying in the U.S.). The question is, did he have this same view of language policy at UIUC before the TA managed his language and enforced an English-only policy, or did that come about after he experienced those language management efforts? Additionally, Bo's attitude towards English and English speakers is revealed in what he says about the other students being able to understand what he says with his TA during class. He defers to the English speakers as "the norm" in class, adjusting his own speech and learning opportunities for the benefit of his English-speaking peers (he calls them "American students").

Another student, Sally, said that something similar happened when she tried to speak to a math TA in Mandarin (Bo and Sally attend different math discussion sections so presumably, this is a different TA):

Natalie: Do you think there's a common language policy at U of I?³⁷ What do you think it is here at U of I?

Sally: I don't think so. Not much. Cause our campus is really like various people came

³⁷ I use the term "common language policy" because Sally, just a few minutes before, told me about her "common language policy" experience at the U.S. high school she attended, where "common language policy" is another name for English-only.

from all around the world. I can walk on Green St. and you don't know how much languages you're gonna hear by just walking on Green St.

Natalie: What about in your classes?

Sally: Well like cause I'm freshman I have a lot of lecture big classes so my only small class is ESL and my math discussion.

Natalie: Math discussion?

Sally: It's just math. I don't really speak. It's called a discussion but no one really discuss. It's just listen to TA to solve some problem.

Natalie: Ok, so you don't have any people that you sit by that you talk to?

Sally: I have a girl from the same dorm as me she's Chinese of course we talk in Chinese. Cause it's a discussion class it doesn't require much attendance, not everyone go.

Natalie: What about your teacher for the math discussion?

Sally: He's a TA, he's Chinese. He talked in English of course. When I ask him question, he has to reply in English.

Natalie: He has to? Why?

Sally: Cause I think it's a rule.

Natalie: Why?

Sally: Cause he's teaching.

Natalie: When have you asked him a question before?

Sally: One day after class I asked him a random math question, he has to reply in English.

Natalie: Did you ask him in Chinese?

Sally: Yes.

Natalie: You did. Was it just you and him?

Sally: No, there's an American girl around too.

Natalie: So what made you talk to him in Chinese?

Sally: Cause I have his Wechat³⁸. [Laughs]

Natalie: Why do you have his Wechat?

Sally: Cause he's Chinese. Every Chinese has a Wechat.

Natalie: So you just looked for him and added him?

Sally: No, I didn't look for him. It was just the first class, I know he's Chinese, I was like, hey, do you wanna Wechat? If I have any questions I can just ask you. He's like ok whatever.

Natalie: Oh so you went up to him after class. Did you ask him in Chinese?

Sally: Um, I forget. It's the very beginning of the semester.

Natalie: Have you ever talked to him on wechat?

Sally: Mmm not really, but you know those posts on Wechat, I liked before.

Natalie: And he posted in Chinese?

Sally: Yeah.

Natalie: So after class you went up and you asked him a question in Chinese, cause

³⁸ WeChat is a mobile phone talk and messaging app that has social networking capabilities, as well.

hello, he's on Wechat, he uses Chinese on Wechat, you know he's Chinese. So you say blah blah my question in Chinese, and he replies to you in English. Did he say anything to you about it?

Sally: [Laughs] Yes. He's like uh, I have to talk English. And then start talking. [Laughs]

I included the information about Wechat here because I think it's important to note that Sally had experienced a space with this TA where he used Chinese, and she remarked on that as the reason she felt comfortable approaching him in person using Chinese. Though the TA refused to communicate with Sally in Chinese, Sally did not take this to mean that classroom space was completely English-only, saying that she spoke in class to her friend in Chinese. In fact, she assumes that there is no English-only or "common language policy" at the University.

Math class with Guohua. I met Guohua for his statistics course in a medium-sized lecture hall in the math building on campus. He was friendly, smiled, and seemed happy to let me accompany him for this class. As we chatted at the beginning of class, Guohua started to talk about the TA that would be giving the lecture, focusing on what he perceived to be the TAs English proficiency. The TA, he explained, was from China, and according to Guohua's perception, was difficult to understand. "What makes it difficult to understand him?", I ask. "He's speaking in Chinese, but using English words. He uses Chinese structure", Guohua explained. I immediately knew what he was trying to say, as that is a common language issue for many (if not all) adult second language learners—they focus their language on the correct vocabulary, and even grammar and pronunciation (formal linguistic competence³⁹), but neglect

³⁹ Communicative competence, first introduced by Dell Hymes (1972), includes formal linguistic, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competencies.

to think about (or have never been taught about) discourse structure and how it varies from language to language (discourse competence).

Guohua was telling me, in his own way, that he felt it was the TAs discourse—the structure of his sentences and the structure of his lecture—that made the TA difficult to understand. This can make a very big difference in intelligibility of the speaker. What surprised me most was that Guohua—a native Mandarin speaker himself—would find it difficult to understand another native Mandarin speaker. However, Guohua went to high school in the U.S. He had learned the majority of his math knowledge in English from native English speaking instructors in the U.S. In other words, he found it difficult to listen to someone try to explain these mathematic concepts without using English discourse.

As the TA took the podium, he began his lecture abruptly. In fact, it was so abrupt that I had a difficult time following what the TA was trying to teach on that day. As an ESL instructor and second language acquisition professor myself, I am used to evaluating a speaker's proficiency level and am able to break down what the speaker of a second language might need to learn or work on in order to be more intelligible. In my professional opinion, Guohua's evaluation of his Mandarin speaking TA's English was correct—his speech did not follow predictable English discourse patterns. That is, he did not give an introduction about what was going to be talked about during class, did not make clear transitions from one topic to another, and did not summarize his instruction in the anticipated places between topics. His pronunciation wasn't the barrier to understanding, nor was his grammar incorrect, nor did his vocabulary seem inappropriate for the space he was occupying as a math instructor; it was simply that, in Guohua's words—he was speaking in Chinese using English words.

After class, I asked Guohua if he had ever interacted with his TA after class. He said that he had never tried to himself because he had never had any questions to ask. However, he had often listened in on times when other Chinese students in the class went up to the instructor after class. According to his memory, they might have tried to use Chinese once or twice, but the TA would always respond back in English. The TA of this statistics course, for some reason, did not feel comfortable using Chinese to speak to a fellow Chinese-speaking student in an official university space (the front of the classroom, after a lecture).

Ying had similar observations about a Chinese TA in economics, but with a different outcome. She noticed some problems with her TAs English abilities, and to her, he looked uncomfortable when speaking English. With her economics TA, they corresponded over email using Chinese and would communicate in class using Chinese. One of the most interesting remarks she made was, "Just, you know, if you don't want to speak English here, you have the opportunity to never speak English here if you don't want. Because people, they even find their ways to speak Chinese. Even during the classes."

Ying: In my Psychology class there is only me [who speaks Chinese]. For my other classes, people don't generally talk, because they are huge classes. Actually in Psych 201, my teacher is from Singapore so she could speak Chinese so if I like, I could speak Chinese to her. And my roommate, she is in Advertising 310, that course the TA is Chinese, so actually my roommate just speak Chinese to her. Just, you know, if you don't want to speak English here, you have the opportunity to never speak English here if you don't want. Because people, they even find their ways to speak Chinese. Even during the classes. Last semester

When I was taking Economics 103, my TA was Chinese as well, and I don't need to speak English to him, because he has really bad English as well. He can't even speak it fluently, so.

Natalie: What makes you think that?

Ying: He can't get his grammar right. He can't even speak it fluently. He was like speaking with words, but not with sentences. So, for my TA, I think he prefers to speak Chinese language.

Natalie: How'd you know?

Ying: Because, it looks like he is really struggling, hard on his face, when he is speaking English. But when he is speaking Chinese, he's like, he's like really relaxed. So I don't think speaking English is really comfortable to him. It might be a stressful thing to him.

Natalie: Did he ever tell you?

Ying: I just kind of tell from his face.

Natalie: So How did you know you could speak Chinese to him?

Ying: I can see it from his face that he's Chinese.

Natalie: Did you speak to him in Chinese during class?

Ying: No, but I could email him in Chinese.

Natalie: So you just tried?

Ying: Yes. Because I heard from my classmates that they said this TA is Chinese and it's totally fine if you email him in Chinese. Also for my EALC 120 (East Asian Civilization), the TA is also Chinese. And my roommate took that course last

semester, and he was my TA as well, and although my roommate hates him, but they talk and communicate and they know each other in Chinese. It's like they don't say anything, just email him.

Natalie: You went ahead and emailed him in Chinese...was that your trying...your first try-out? Did you put it both in English and Chinese?

Ying: No, just Chinese. Then he responded back in Chinese.

Natalie: Face to face?

Ying: No, but I heard my friends ask him questions after class, and they just ask in Chinese.

Natalie: And he answered back in Chinese?

Ying: Yeah.

Natalie: Assignments?

Ying: No assignments, but, four quizzes on the discussion section, and two exams on the lecture sections...several essay questions in total. But for the TA, if you don't understand it in English, he will explain it to you in Chinese, but you will need to translate it back to English when you are doing his exams. But sometimes, like, even though translating from Chinese to English is hard, it's more hard to understand the concept in English. There are like so many words that, in general, all the theories, it's hard. He explained it to my friends in Chinese.

Natalie: Did you ever write in Chinese on your quizzes or exams?

Ying: It's an English exam. Here is the United States, and Chinese is not the official language in the United States, so...

Natalie: So, the writing was official, but the email was unofficial?

Ying: Yes.

Ying has a specific opinion about official and unofficial spaces, and how language could be used in those spaces. For her, exams have an English-only policy as official space for languaging, but emailing and asking questions during class are considered unofficial spaces where translingual communicative practices are acceptable. She goes on to say:

Ying: Like after class, I think we are allowed to use Chinese because, after class, it's personal time. I SHOULD be able to. And my TAs, according to the rule, they are like yeah you can speak Chinese AFTER class. It's not like the rule because it would be unfair to them to talk Chinese inside the class because you know it's America and most of the students are still Americans so you better use English. I think it's a problem of respect too, you know, on the other hand. They didn't tell me [I could use Chinese after class], but I think it's a common rule that everybody understands. Inside the class, if you have a problem to ask when you would raise your hand, you would just use English. But after class when it's just you and the TA, you could just ask him, like you can use English and probably you could use Chinese too. They won't care.

Natalie: With your Chinese TA what language do you use?

Ying: Inside class, I use English. After class Chinese.

Natalie: You immediately start in Chinese?

Ying: I would just ask him in Chinese directly, like hey, how do you do this problem, of

course in Chinese. Because you know it's easier for us to understand Chinese. It's our mother language. So yeah.

Natalie: So have any TAs like ever said hey use English?

Ying: Inside class, yeah. My CS TA. Inside the class, I tried to ask him a question in English. He understood what I was talking about. It was basically...we just do problems during the class you know...uh, when we have problems we raise our hand and the TA will come to you. I don't know how to do this problem so I ask him in English and he tried to answer me in English back, but, laughs...his English is you know, kind of confusing to me in some way. So I'm like would you like to explain it in Chinese maybe? I said that in English. Nobody was listening because we are all of us were writing, like solving problems it's just when you have problem you raise your hand. And then he's like, probably not. After class yeah we can speak in Chinese. I'm like yeah, sure. It is pretty fine to me. Uh, it's because I ask him in English too. I know the rule, you know.

Natalie: You know there's some kind of unsaid rule?

Ying: Yeah, because it's in America. We are studying in America and most of the students in the class are Americans, right?

Ying, like Guohua, felt that she could pinpoint language problems that her TA had, saying "his English is you know, kind of confusing to me in some way", as well as noting his uncomfortableness speaking English. However, she had mixed responses from her TAs when requesting (directly or indirectly) to use translingual communicative practices with them. In the first instance with her economics TA, that TA was willing to communicate using Chinese during

class and over email. In the second instance with her computer science TA, like Guohua's experience, her TA refused to use Chinese during class, but said that it would be ok after class (making a distinction between official and unofficial spaces for languaging). This is perhaps why Ying thinks that in-class is an official space where English-only is the policy, even though she attempted to use translingual communicative practices. She goes on to say that the policy makes sense to her "because it's in America. We are studying in America and most of the students in the class are Americans, right?", revealing her assumption that American students are monolingual English speakers and that there is a preference (or even policy) to accommodate the monolingual American students. Ying doesn't argue against this policy, but states it as a fact. She also mentions that having an English-only policy in official campus spaces is a matter of "respect", presumably respecting the comfort of monolingual, English-speaking Americans.

Not only did Ying experience the enforcement of a language-from-below English policy set by their Mandarin speaking TA, but she also felt that she had been discriminated against by another Mandarin speaking TA in another class. She talked to me about a Chinese Mandarin-speaking TA she had for her Asian Language and Culture course. Ying felt that that TA had graded her more harshly on her assignments for that course based on grammar mistakes she had made in a paper. Ying asserted that she had not felt that same discrimination from other instructors at the University, but fully expressed that the only time language came to be an issue for her and a grade was in this course from another Mandarin speaker.

The next transcription excerpt is one of my favorite anecdotes told from a student participant, Kevin, about how he uses translingual communicative practices as a Chinese

student with a Chinese math TA. The Chinese TA in this anecdote does not enforce an English-only policy, and allows Kevin to use Chinese with him. I had begun to speculate that the Math Department perhaps had an English-only policy, since many of the student stories I heard had to do with mathematics courses. However, Kevin's story seems to indicate that there is no such policy in the Math Department. The reasons that Kevin gives for using translingual communicative practices are similar to what other students said for why they would use translingual communicative practices if they could: primarily, it is (or would be) for ease of communication. Kevin also speaks about the importance of wanting to respect the instructor and being mindful of the English-speaking American students that might overhear during class, but with a twist: he believed that using Chinese instead of English, in some instances, accomplished those goals better.

Natalie: Which TA do you usually communicate with?

Kevin: It depends. When they have time. Every is ok, just when you have time. Cause TAs they are so busy.

Natalie: Is there one you prefer going to?

Kevin: The Chinese TA in my session. Yeah. It's easier for me to communicate. Especially when I encounter a very tough issue. I always will go to him. If I am speaking in Chinese, it's easier for me to, you know, solve the problem.

Natalie: He lets you speak Chinese?

Kevin: Most of the time he will speak English. But then I speak Chinese, he will reply in Chinese. Yeah.

Natalie: Did that Chinese TA ever tell you any rules about when use Chinese or English?

Kevin: Rules, in lab? No, no such a rule. Is there? Is there any rule?

Natalie: I have no idea. Probably not. Think about when you first met him, did you talk in Chinese or English?

Kevin: To the Chinese guy I would say Chinese. Always.

Natalie: Does he ever correct you and say speak in English?

Kevin: No, he will focus more on the problem, not on me, not on my speaking.

Natalie: Have you ever spoken English?

Kevin: Yeah, sometimes I try to practice my English so I'll speak English to him. Try to practice my oral English because I know sometimes my oral English is not so good, especially when sometimes for my spoken English you're native Americans, they will not, they cannot understand what did I say.

Natalie: Has that happened to you before?

Kevin: Often. It happens often.

Natalie: So you're like oh, I should practice my English, maybe I won't speak Chinese, maybe I'll try to speak English. When you speak English, he replies?

Kevin: In English.

Natalie: When you speak Chinese, he replies?

Kevin: Chinese.

Natalie: He follows your lead and never corrected you?

Kevin: Yeah. No.

Natalie: During lab when that happens?

Kevin: Yeah, during the lab. Other students are around. Lots of times I would drag him to

one corner without anyone surrounding me and I will speak Chinese to him in a very low, soft voice.

Natalie: Why do you do that?

Kevin: I don't know. I have no idea. Just, like uh, no, I have no idea. I don't know why did I do that. Maybe because I sometimes I feel other people will feel embarrassed if I, if we can talk in Chinese and you couldn't you probably couldn't join us, so for other students, it's kind of unfair for them. I want to avoid that embarrassment.

Natalie: Does he also reply back to you in a whisper?

Kevin: Yeah.

Natalie: Are there other Chinese students in your lab?

Kevin: Yeah, but most of them are Americans.

Natalie: And what about your TA?

Kevin: My TA he is Chinese. He is a Chinese. That's why.

Natalie: What do you mean that's why?

Kevin: So when I have a difficulty, when I got a problem in my daily course, I will just ask him in the discussion. If he cannot understand...because, you know sometimes for our Chinese students, and American students, they are thinking a different way in Mathematics. So, Chinese students could understand each other easier.

Natalie: So he told you in the discussion that you could speak Chinese to him?

Kevin: No, just my personal decision. It looks just flows out of my mouth. You know when you in a different country, a foreign country, and you met sometime, cause it looks like most of people around you is not in your group...is not your

native...um, how do I say that...it's not in your group that they didn't say the same native language as you. So when you meet someone speaking the same native language like you did, it feels really comfortable. So, you will like to speak your native language with him. Yeah, that's basically what I think. Maybe that's the reason.

Natalie: How many people were in that Math 220 discussion?

Kevin: You mean Chinese or American? Total, 30 or 40.

Natalie: And then, did you talk to him in Chinese during class?

Kevin: Yes.

Natalie: Can you tell me about it? Explain to me one time when you talked to him. What was it like?

Kevin: I...hmmm, you know, for me, you know, I thought I was not doing properly in my last semester discussion class. I just spoke Chinese direct to him. During the class. When he was talking about some questions. Now, for me, it likes um. When he's talking about a problem from the lecture, or a problem in the quiz, and sometimes he will make a mistake. And I will just point it out in Chinese.

Natalie: Why would you point it out in Chinese?

Kevin: It's so direct. So direct. Straightforward for me.

Natalie: Easy you mean?

Kevin: Yeah. Cause you know if I want to speak in English, point out, I will have to

explain. Cause I'm afraid most of time Americans won't understand what you are talking about. So to avoid that embarrassment I will most of the time talk in Chinese to point it out.

Natalie: To avoid embarrassment for him? Saving face for him?

Kevin: Saving face? [Laughs] I have never considered about that.

Natalie: You were avoiding embarrassment for the TA by telling him, hey your bottom line is wrong.

Kevin: Yeah sometimes. It look like not...you did that moment not for just one purpose.

So I thought it is a combination. Both for me and the TA.

Natalie: One for you it's easier to say...

Kevin: And one for him, it's not embarrassing.

Natalie: And what would he say when you did that?

Kevin: He will erase that arrow. Correct that arrow. Pretend that nothing happen.

Natalie: He didn't even reply? You said something in Chinese, he erased it, and moving on?

Kevin: Yep.

Natalie: Did that happen a lot? It happened more than once?

Kevin: Um, he's a smart guy, so...he seldom make mistake. It just happens so...rare. More than once.

Natalie: More than twice? Three times?

Kevin: Yeah. More than three times? I have no idea. [Laughs]

Natalie: Did you ever ask him a question or make another comment to him directly in

Chinese in front of the whole class?

Kevin: Yeah I did. It's a point I find improper now.

Natalie: Why?

Kevin: Same reason I try to avoid the embarrassment. Just, cause you know, you are a small group, and here is the TA. He is a professor. So it will look like that...if you have got a Chinese professor. Suppose you've got a Chinese professor, in front of the whole class you speak directly to him in Chinese, don't you feel it's like weird, because we are in America. We are in the U.S.A. You cannot just speak Chinese cause it's not a popular language here. Just, you have to worry about that. About other students, what they are thinking about. What are you talking about? I don't even understand? Why do you talk in Chinese?

Natalie: Did people say that to you before?

Kevin: Oh no no. No, I just. For me I just, I will thought, what they would think about me. Cause it's unfair to them if I speak directly to him, to the professor or to the TA. I'm trying to avoid this.

Natalie: What made you change? So you did it last semester, sounds like all the time?

Kevin: All the time? Yeah most of the time. Yeah.

Natalie: Ok. So, what made you change? You know, obviously, like you did it last semester and then now you're saying oh I should try to avoid that. What changed?

Kevin: For the most part I just want to try to practice my oral English...my spoken English. Yeah.

In the above transcript, Kevin gives three reasons for why he uses translingual communicative practices in official campus spaces: 1. Using Chinese with a Chinese-speaking TA helps him better understand course content, so it is for ease of communication. 2. Sometimes he chooses to use English because he wants to practice his “oral English”. 3. Sometimes he will choose to use Chinese during class for the benefit of the Chinese-speaking instructor (helping correct mistakes the instructor makes on the board). Kevin’s attitude towards non-Chinese speaking, English-speaking peers and their comfort level with the linguistic atmosphere of the official campus spaces was the same as the other students: he deferred to their preferences and comfort, as demonstrated by taking his Chinese TA aside to a corner and whispering in Chinese when he had a question, or when he says that “We are in the U.S.A. You cannot just speak Chinese cause it’s not a popular language here. Just, you have to worry about that. About other students, what they are thinking about.”

He did not express an assumption that classrooms are English-only spaces, however, as the other students did; he just admitted that one needed to be concerned about what others are thinking when other languages enter the classroom space. The Chinese TA with whom he communicates in both Chinese and English did not implement an English-only language management policy, and instead allowed translingual communicative practices between himself and Kevin.

This was different from the other students in the study who said that their TAs would not allow students to use Chinese with them in official spaces. This leads me to speculate that if students are allowed to use translingual communicative practices, they would have different

language ideologies about the nature of the linguistic space on campus; that is to say, students might view campus spaces as more heteroglossic than monoglossic (Bakhtin, 2010; Blackledge & Creese, 2014), helping them move more towards language-as-resource and language-as-right orientations. Additionally, for Kevin, being allowed to use translingual communicative practices did not mean that he only wanted to use his primary language for communication; instead, he felt free to choose which linguistic resources in his repertoire to use for different communicative purposes. It did not stop him from wanting to use English in the classroom, nor did it seem to hinder him from improving (and wanting to improve) his spoken English language proficiency.

These and other student participants who had similar experiences with language management on campus all demonstrate a desire to respect and not disrupt the presumed monoglossic atmosphere of the American university. So many times, the student participants talked about respecting teachers or the American students (meaning English speaking), and that if they language in an official campus space where there were others nearby who might not understand the language they were using, they would defer to English—the language they assumed that others would be more comfortable with. Kirstie directly said this:

Natalie: Ok uh, in your math section that you have discussion section in, is that this semester?

Kirstie: Last semester.

Natalie: So there were some Chinese people in that discussion section?

Kirstie: A lot of.

Natalie: So tell me...your TA...did your TA ever say anything about what language you

should or shouldn't use or could or couldn't use during...

Kirstie: Actually no. And uh, she's very nice. But, Uh, when she assign us to our subgroup, she will, for example, there will be four people in one group, she will match two Chinese students and two American students.

Natalie: On purpose?

Kirstie: Yeah. I think Chinese students are more good at math than American students because we study very difficult math problem in China. And um, our math skills is better than them. So they can teach us the way to express the solution in English. I think we can help each other. I think maybe this is why she assigned us this way.

Natalie: Did she ever say that?

Kirstie: Uh, I think no.

Natalie: So, in math class, when there were like two Chinese and two Americans, what language did you use, or how did you use language?

Kirstie: Um, we would try to use English. But if there is another Chinese student ask me some questions and the other two American students is not working on that, I will tell her in Chinese. Because I can explain it more easily in Chinese. And she can understand it better.

Natalie: Have there been any other classes that you've taken where a teacher has told you, 'you can use Chinese' or 'please don't talk in Chinese'?

Kirstie: Uh, I think no. I think American university gives us a lot of freedom. I think

Chinese university is much like senior high school. They have very strict rules, and...but...and the instructor told them how to choose class, what class they should choose. But here we can choose our class, according to our interests.

Natalie: So you think because there's that freedom, you have freedom to speak Chinese when you want?

Kirstie: I think I can speak, but I will speak English as much as possible. I think it is respect to teacher.

Whether between two students or between students and a TA, the Mandarin speaking students experienced the most language management from fellow Mandarin speakers. The question that remains is “why”. Why did TAs feel that they had to only communicate with students in English? Was it language policy from above or language policy from below? Did this mandate come from the department itself, an administrator, or was it written somewhere in a handbook or communicated verbally through a meeting of some sort? Or, was this language management practice a result of policy from below, where the TA himself, with his own language ideologies and experiences, assume, or feel some sort of pressure from others that it should be the case that in “official spaces” in the University, only English should be used? This is an area for future study in language policies at the university level—what is the drive behind language policies from below, and where do instructors (especially multilingual TAs) find the impetus for creating and implementing language policies that reinforce the hegemony of English?

Language Policy from Below: Student Language Ideologies

The aspect of language policy from below that is discussed in this section is language ideologies of the student participants of the study. The students' language ideologies (beliefs about language) are important to the entire framework of language policy (as set up by Spolsky 2004), as language ideologies affect how language is used and thus how language policy is formed and enacted. First, I will show examples of students' ideas about what it means to "know" a "language" through presenting how they explained their own language backgrounds. Then I will show that the students' experiences with language policies prior to attending UIUC influence their current language ideologies and the way that they create, interact with, and enact language policy at UIUC. Finally, I will argue that the students have a hegemonic view of English, which heavily influences how they interact with English language policy at UIUC.

What it means to "know" a "language": Student language backgrounds. As each interview with the student participants progressed, one thing became very clear to Natalie: the students' ideas of what it means to "know" a "language" are varied. I use "know" in quotes because students had varying definitions of what it means to truly know a language (did that mean being able to speak it and with whom, being able to understand the spoken language and in which genres, reading and or writing proficiency, grammar rules, or having "native-like" proficiency). In other words, I had to ask different questions to get past their own views of legitimacy in "knowing" a language to what I was trying to understand: which languages are in their repertoires, and to what degree of proficiency do they have in communicative competency.

This complicated view of “knowing” a language is discussed by Jan Blommaert (2010) when he coins the term “truncated repertoires”. This concept describes the complicated way that one uses language and calls into question the idea of communicative competence. He says that when one languages (Swain, 2009), it is always truncated, using language in a certain way for a specific purpose. He argues that we never reach complete communicative competency in any language—even our mother tongue—because we are constantly learning new ways of languaging in different contexts. However one languages for whatever purpose, it will always be in a truncated way, using whatever language resources one has for specific purposes, without having to fully know that language in all contexts at the highest proficiency level. I use “language” in quotes in this section because the students were often reluctant to label some of the languages in their repertoires as legitimate languages, and instead referred to them as dialects. There are perhaps political and linguistic reasons for their differences in these two terms “language” and “dialect” and how the students used them, and I will discuss those in this section as well.

Identifying discrete languages in their repertoires. As I spoke to each student participant, I asked a variation of this question: “What languages do you know?” Sometimes the student would offer up this information at the beginning of the interview as they spoke about themselves, but more often than not, I had to ask that direct question, and I would get an answer that made it seem like each student knew two languages: English, and whatever the national language is for their country. Dipti, the Indian student, had no problem identifying the four languages in her repertoire: English, Hindi, Madwardi, and French. Nancy from Malaysia did not right away identify that she had three languages in her repertoire, and it took a lot of

questioning from me to get this information. For the students from China, they all told me “English and Chinese” (or “English and Mandarin”, but even if they just said “English and Chinese”, they meant “and Mandarin”). There are a few exceptions, but this was the norm.

The problem with this answer is that I knew that most of them would have more than two languages in their repertoires, so I would have to reframe my question. Sometimes I would ask them if they knew any other dialects, and that would elicit a resounding, “Yes, I know [a dialect]”. Then, they might go on to speak about that dialect in terms of a “language”.

Sometimes, I would ask about their family life, and what language or languages were spoken in their homes. That would often lead to them saying, “Oh, my parents and grandparents speak to each other in [a dialect]”. Then, I would ask if they understood that dialect, and the student would either say “Yes, but I don’t speak it very well” or “No, I don’t know it”. If they answered yes, I would ask to what degree they understood, and about what topics they could speak in that dialect. If their answer was no, then I would ask if they understood that dialect, which they would say “Yes, I understand it, some of it”, and we’d try to get at what percentage of the spoken dialect they estimated that they understood. Below are several examples of this happening in interviews.

Nancy from Malaysia. Below an excerpt from my interview with Nancy, who is Malaysia. Notice how she says that she does not know other languages besides English and Malay, the national language, but then as I press further and ask about her friends, she says that they have different accents or dialects.

Natalie: What’s your first language?

Nancy: It’s Malaysian. Our national language. I think I’m better in Malay language

compared to English.

Natalie: So in your home, you mainly speak Malay?

Nancy: Mainly Malay.

Natalie: Do you know any other languages?

Nancy: No not really. But my siblings they plan to take Mandarin class, so trying to learn our third language.

Natalie: But no other local language or something like that that your parents or grandparents spoke? Just Malay?

Nancy: Um, no just Malay.

Natalie: Do you have friends who have other languages?

Nancy: Um, no, I think probably because the difference are the accents, like the dialect, how they speak the Malay.

Natalie: What does that depend on?

Nancy: The area, like southern or northern or the east, it's very different. I think for someone that just learned Malay language they'd probably just settle at the Southern, because Malay language I would say is not upgraded...they don't just add stuff to the words so it won't confuse the learner.

Natalie: Southern is pure Malay?

Nancy: Exactly, the official one. I speak Northern Malay. I can just switch cause it's just like adding some letter in the end of the word, so it's like, yeah.

In the transcript above, Nancy seems to suggest that Southern Malay and Northern Malay are so similar that everyone can understand it when you learn "Malay language"

(meaning Southern Malay), and that there's no difference except perhaps in pronunciation ("like adding some letter in the end of the word"). However, when we speak further about language use among her friends, she indicates that not all of her friends—native Southern Malay speakers—can understand Northern Malay, and switches to talking about the two as if they were discreet languages.

Natalie: So the friends you went to Chicago with, your closet friends, what do you speak?

Nancy: We speak Southern Malay. Cause I would say all the Malaysians can speak Southern Malay. Only the northern part can speak Northern, and the eastern part speak Eastern. They are from Kuala Lumpur, in the south. I can speak their language but they cannot speak my language, because it's only spoken in the northern part of Malaysia. They can understand a bit, if I talk fast then they would have just lost everything.

Natalie: So you have two dialects that you can speak, but they only have one?

Nancy: Mmhmm.

Natalie: Do you have other friends who speak Northern Malay?

Nancy: I do, but we pretty much settle with Southern Malay here because everyone can understand it.

Natalie: So even just one on one?

Nancy: Yeah sometimes the word, just the Northern word would come out and we would be like, oh when was the last time we used that? [Laughs]

Natalie: Do you know who's from northern Malaysia?

Nancy: I know because sometimes they accidentally say the Northern and then I'm like
oh you're from Northern, and then we totally switch. [Laughs]

Natalie: So there are some people on campus that you know when you see them, oh we
can speak Northern Malay so you just speak Northern Malay, and those who
speak Southern, they can't understand?

Nancy: Yeah.

Natalie: What about in a big group of friends, and you're with a Northern Malay friend,

Nancy: If I only speak to that person they I would just speak Northern, but if someone
else like joined us, then we would definitely switch so that person can
understand as well, because like, it happened a lot of time when my friend kept
asking, like, what do you mean by that word? What do you mean by that word?

Natalie: So how many languages would you say you know?

Nancy: Um, Northern Malay, Southern Malay, English?

Natalie: So three?

Nancy: Yeah.

Natalie: So what do you speak in your home?

Nancy: Northern Malay.

Natalie: Do you ever switch to Southern Malay?

Nancy: Um, no, it's like, I think it's because of culture, because if you speak Southern in
Northern, you would be like, uhhhh, are you from south? [Laughs]

Natalie: Oh, kind of like a "better than you" attitude?

Nancy: Yeah yeah. They would be very judgmental, because like, for us, if you are from

northern, and you are at north, you better speak Northern Malay. You don't look like southern people. Just settle with Northern. Even my family. If I say this one word in southern way, they would be like um, um, Nancy⁴⁰? And I would say ok. [Laughs] Because I spent two years at southern part of Malaysia so it kind of influenced my dialect.

Notice that she not only explains that there is not universal understanding of Northern and Southern Malay among those who speak just one language or the other, but she also assents to knowing three “languages”, when I again ask the question about how many languages she knows, after she had gone through the explanation of the different Malay “dialects”. Additionally, she talks about how there is an indexicality of Southern Malay to her family who are from northern Malay and speak Northern Malay in the home. Nancy has a framework for attaching social judgements to a person based on the language they are speaking and in which culture they are speaking it, and expresses a need to switch repertoires depending upon which cultural situation she finds herself in.

Yangjin from China. In an interview with Yangjin from China, the conversation with Nancy regarding discreet languages is mirrored. As the interview progressed, I discovered that he knows three languages: English, Mandarin, and Anyanghua. He goes from labelling Anyanghua as a dialect to a language, and also distinguishes what he sees as the difference between a dialect and an accent. Below is the progression of this discovery:

Natalie: What languages can you use and understand?

Yangjin: English and Chinese.

⁴⁰ Name changed here to her pseudonym.

Natalie: By Chinese you mean...Putong...

Yangjin: Mandarin...

Natalie: (overlaps) ...Putonghua?

Yangjin: Yeah, Putonghua.

Natalie: Do you know any other dialects?

Yangjin: Yeah, Anyang dialect that sounds completely different from Putonghua.

Natalie: Do you speak that and you understand it?

Yangjin: Yeah. It's my native language.

Natalie: What language do you speak at home with your parents?

Yangjin: Uh, Putonghua. They didn't want to teach me the dialect. Cause they want me to study, to speak Mandarin all the time. Yeah, cause it's more convenient to live in the bigger city after you grow up.

Natalie: So, both of their native languages is Anyanghua?

Yangjin: Uh, not really, but it's very near, cause they all grow up in an area near Anyang. It's not really the same, but it's similar.

Natalie: So do you speak any other, or understand any other dialects?

Yangjin: Mmm, no. Yeah.

Natalie: What do your grandparents speak?

Yangjin: Also Anyanghua. Or Henanhua.

Natalie: Is it different?

Yangjin: Yeah, it's different. Cause Anyanghua is kinda hard. Yeah, it's if you cannot

speak Anyanghua and when you hear that, you really can't understand. Yeah, it's a whole different language. But Henanhua, it's kinda, everyone can understand it, it's very simple. It's just accent, it's not dialect.

Natalie: So how do you know Anyanghua?

Yangjin: I grew up there. [Laughs] Everyone speaks that. [Laughs]

Natalie: Did you speak it in school?

Yangjin: Yeah.

Natalie: Tell me about that. When you were on the playground with your friends, what language would you speak?

Yangjin: Anyanghua.

Natalie: What about in the classroom?

Yangjin: The teacher would speak Putonghua, and when you answer questions, you will speak Putonghua. But after class and when you talk to your friends you will use your dialect.

Natalie: Or when you're whispering to your friend, you'd use Anyanghua?

Yangjin: Yeah.

Natalie: Did everyone speak Anyanghua?

Yangjin: Most of the boys speak Anyanghua but not most of the girls. I don't know why. It's very interesting but I don't know why.

Natalie: How did you know they wouldn't speak it?

Yangjin: Cause they didn't speak it. They don't use it. Everyone can understand it, but they prefer not to speak.

Natalie: So you remember trying to speak to the girls...

Yangjin: Yeah, but they would answer you in Putonghua. I think it's fine. I just got used to it. And these two are my native languages so I'm fine.

Natalie: Did you feel closer to your friends when..

Yangjin: When I speak my dialect? Yeah, that's very, yeah, that will make you feel close. So after, when I study in Beijing, and sometimes I hear people speak Anyanghua, it's like, ah we are from the same town. Then I would talk to them. Yeah.

I later tried to determine what Yangjin's proficiency level was in Anyanghua. Below is the discussion:

Natalie: Can you talk about everything in Anyanghua?

Yangjin: Yeah.

Natalie: So you only speak to your parents though in Putonghua?

Natalie: Yeah. They don't know I can speak Anyanghua. Yeah. I just, cause, you have speak Putonghua to them for 18 years, and then you just feel shy. It's very shy to speak dialect.

Natalie: What about to your grandparents?

Yangjin: Uh, still Putonghua. When I am home I speak Putonghua.

Natalie: Do your grandparents every speak Anyanghua to you?

Yangjin: They cannot speak Mandarin. They don't know how to speak Putonghua. Cause during their time, the internet and television, it's not very...they're like living their own circle, it's little circle. So they only know...They can only understand what Putonghua is but they cannot speak it very well.

Natalie: What do they speak?

Yangjin: They speak Anyanghua. They speak their dialect.

Natalie: So when you're communicating with your grandparents...

Yangjin: I use Putonghua, they use Anyanghua.

Natalie: Really, (yeah). Even though you can speak Anyanghua?

Yangjin: Yeah, I just feel shy, cause you never speak that to them. Cause...yeah.

Natalie: What about your dad. Does your dad speak Anyanghua to his parents?

Yangjin: Yeah, they speak dialect.

Natalie: They speak the dialect.

Yangjin: Yeah. Cause during the time when my dad was growing up, they live in a village,
everyone speaks the dialect, so they will speak dialect.

Natalie: Ok. And Does your dad ever speak dialect to you?

Yangjin: Yeah sometimes, cause when I ...they don't speak dialect to me when I was
young cause they don't want me to learn it.

Natalie: Did they say that?

Yangjin: Yeah they say that. But uh...

Natalie: What did they tell you? Do you remember a conversation about that?

Yangjin: Uh, not really. They just told me that we won't teach you that, but if you can
learn by yourself, then you can learn, but we don't want to teach you that. Cause
they think it's better for me to fit in the bigger city after I grown up.

Natalie:Ok. What do you think?

Yangjin: I think they underestimate my ability to study language.

Natalie: (laughing hard) Yeah. So if you had your perfect way in the world, what language would you speak to your parents?

Yangjin: Still Putonghua, cause I get used to it. It really makes me comfortable.

Natalie: Do you know anyone here at U of I that speaks Anyanghua?

Yangjin: Yeah there are some guys from my town.

Natalie: are you friends with them?

Yangjin: Yes but I think they just graduate. But I know some people from my province.

We are slightly different dialect but we can talk in our dialect.

Sally from China. In an interview with Sally from China, we also discussed the difference between language, dialect, and in which languages she was able to communicate:

Natalie: How many languages do you know?

Sally: Two. English and Chinese. I wish I know more. That's why I took French last semester.

Natalie: Ok, so one semester of French. Do you speak any other dialects of Chinese?

Sally: No, we all come from Chinese.

Natalie: You speak, what...

Sally: Mandarin.

Natalie: How would you say it in Chinese?

Sally: Putonghua.

Natalie: Is that what you speak at home?

Sally: Yeah.

Natalie: your family from Beijing?

Sally: Well my parents work in Beijing. My mom moved to Beijing start with her primary school. My dad, he's originally from Dongbei. Cangchun. But he went to school in Shangdong, but he got a job in Beijing.

Natalie: So their relationship is only in Putonghua. What about your grandparents?

Sally: Well my mom's mom knows Shanxihua. Shanxi. But it's really similar to Putonghua...it's not like a totally different not like Shanghai or like Cantonese, totally different language.

Natalie: Ok so when you talk to your grandma, your mom's mom...

Sally: Just regular...Mandarin...

Natalie: What about her talking to you?

Sally: I remember when I was really little, she would use some dialect, but I mean right now I think she also speak Mandarin but with a little bit of accent...with an accent.

Natalie: So she never uses Shanxihua when talking to you? Do you understand it?

Sally: No. Yeah it's pretty much the same, only with different words, to call things.

Natalie: So different vocabulary and accent? Can you speak it?

Sally: No. It's just kind of really similar to Mandarin.

Natalie: What about your father's parents?

Sally: They're from Dongbei. So they have strong accent. It's really funny. Donhbeihua, all the vocabulary and way of staying stuff is like Putonghua, but they have different accent to say it. Like in Chinese we'll say Dongbeihua, Shanxihua, but it's all Mandarin.

Natalie: So there's nothing you don't understand, it's not a different language...

Sally: No.

Huang from China. Another Chinese participant, Huang, had a similarly difficult time discussing which languages were in his repertoire, and the differences between language and dialect:

Natalie: What's your first language?

Huang: Chinese. Mandarin. Yeah, I can speak Cantonese too, but that's what I learned after primary school and I'm not very good at it. Learned Cantonese in primary school. In Guangzhou, not everyone, but some local people speak Cantonese, and if you play with them you just learn from just talking with them. I don't know if you are interested in it or not, but for different part of Guangzhou, people speak different language. For the older part of Guangzhou people speak Cantonese more often, and the local people, if they are from gz or more cities next to Guangzhou, but for the newer part of Guangzhou, people come from all kinds of other places, other provinces so they don't speak Cantonese. My family come from Anhui, yeah, so my family my parents can't speak Cantonese but they can understand it since they have been in Guangzhou for 20 years. So they can't speak, I mean it's a little harder for older people to learn a new language, but.

Natalie: So you used to speak Cantonese on the playground in primary school? Starting in kindergarten?

Huang: Guangzhou, yeah. I don't really remember. Yeah kind of I think I started speaking it in kindergarten but I don't speak much in the primary school because

it was in the newer part of Guangzhou, but my middle school was in the older part of Guangzhou, so I get that impression from. So...there's people are...saying Cantonese in middle school like in my dormitory, 8 people dormitory, the other 7 speak Cantonese and I am not very good at it, so I have to learn.

Natalie: So you learned it?

Huang: Well I'm trying to talk with them. I'm not really like this, from 1 to 10, I can scale my proficiency in Cantonese I can get like maybe 5. I can understand it and I can talk some things in Cantonese but I cannot talk it pretty fast or things like that.

Natalie: What do you think understanding 1 to 10?

Huang: Maybe 8.

Natalie: Speaking of languages, do you speak Anhuihua?

Huang: No. I can't speak it. I can understand it. Well it's a little bit weird. It's like. Uh, There's no one Anhuihua, I mean, there's different hua, they speak different dialect and for my part they speak a really different dialect than...I would call them accent for most part of the Anhui people. They just speak Mandarin with an accent, and for my parents they speak another dialect.

Natalie: What's it called? In Chinese you can just tell me.

Huang: Manzi

Natalie: Manzi hua? Is it a minority language?

Huang: No it's just a one language. It's not a language I would say. It's a dialect, or a much stronger accent. You know cause in most part of China like west and the north, it's the Mandarin. Their mandarin is like with a little bit accent. For the

southwest they speak a stronger accent but for the east coast, of China, I would say dialect.

Natalie: Dialects are really popular?

Huang: No I mean they are different from Mandarin, so I would call them a language.

Like for Cantonese, and Minnanhuan, the Taiwanese.

Natalie: So what about Manzhua, would you say different language?

Huang: No, it's just an accent. Strong accent.

Natalie: Do they have different vocab words?

Huang: No.

Natalie: Can everyone understand?

Huang: No, but everybody from the local village. (if not from) I think they don't can understand the first point, but they could understand after a month, two weeks maybe. It's not that hard like Cantonese, you have to spend like three months listening to Cantonese, Tv shows and things like that and you can start understanding it. Though they are using the same word system, I mean, the writing system is the same, but the sound of each word is a lot different from normal Mandarin. And Manzhua, it's not that much.

Natalie: So your parents speak that dialect? Speak, understand it fluently? What about you? On a scale from 1-10, understand.

Huang: 7. 6. 6 to 7.

Natalie: A little less than Cantonese? Can you speak it at all?

Huang: Not really.

Natalie: Are you only child with you and mom and dad at home? Do they ever speak
Manzihua?

Huang: Oh yeah, there's one problem I forgot to mention. My parents speak different
dialects. So that's the reason why I cannot speak, cause they speak Mandarin to
each other. Yeah it's like my mom speaks Anhuihua. My father speak Aanzihua.

Natalie: So they speak mandarin to each other, and to you?

Huang: Mandarin.

Natalie: Ever speak Anhuihua or Manzihua?

Huang: My parents have Anhui accent, but...I can't tell if that's a dialect. Cause...a little
bit? I was a little bit influenced by their accent. For Chinese people I can notice
for people who are from southern part of China, you can notice their accent in
Chinese and English both. But for me, my accent is different form the local
Cantonese people. I thought that's the influence of my parents.

Natalie: But in your house, does your mom ever use Anhuihua?

Huang: Not really. Just speak Mandarin.

Natalie: So do you understand both Anhuihua and Aanzihua?

Huang: I mean, for Anhuihua it's just a dialect, it's not as strong. It's pretty I'd say.

Natalie: Do you think I could understand it?

Huang: Yeah.

Natalie: So it's just like an accent?

Huang: But Manzihua it's just a dialect. I mean, you were in Lanzhou right, they speak a
little different, right?

Natalie: Well they used to teach me vocabulary, I don't know about grammar or pronunciation, but I can't really understand it.

Huang: Anhuihua is not as strong as Lanzhouhua. I have heard it kind of. I can understand it a little bit. I mean, the dialect of all the west of China is similar, from Sichuan to Lanzhou, so if I can understand Sichuan, I can probably understand part of Lanzhou. It's a different story in the East Coast. They are talking in Guangzhou, but if you go a 100 miles to the east, you are completely lost.

Natalie: It's not Cantonese, it's not Mandarin, it's something else.

Huang: Yeah.

Natalie: So Manzhua is similar to that? Where it's really different, but not Anhuihua?

Huang: Yeah.

Natalie: I remember going to Kunming, I could not understand them.

Huang: Yeah, a little bit. Not 100%. Maybe from 1 to 10 I could understand 7 to 8 maybe.

Natalie: Would you call Kunminghua an accent?

Huang: Yeah. Maybe a dialect. Maybe a dialect.

Natalie: It sounded like I SHOULD be able to understand, but nope...I couldn't. Then someone told me, you know they're speaking a different language, right?

Huang: What are you thinking?

Natalie: Nothing.

Huang: think it's a little bit hard for foreigners to understand dialect but I think for us it's a little bit easier. It's like in the US, if someone from Texas is speaking super fast I cannot understand, but that won't be a problem for you.

Natalie: Well, that depends. It's just an accent. Like Australia. But not a different language. But you can understand. It's just pronunciation is different. And sometimes it's hard, but...

Huang: Ok, I think that's a dialect.

Bo from China. For the Chinese students, there are possibly political and historical reasons why they refer to minority languages as dialects. Consider the conversation, below, that I had with another student participant from China, Bo.

Bo: I'm from China. My main language is Chinese. Mandarin Chinese.

Natalie: Where are you from in China?

Bo: Sichuan⁴¹. ...but like my family is originally from Sichuan but they moved to Guangzhou [a different southern province] before I was born, so, actually I grew up in Guangzhou, but I DO recognize myself as Sichuanese instead of Cantonese.⁴² Yeah and I don't speak Cantonese. I mean, I'm able to speak it, I'm fluent in Cantonese, I do speak it, but it's not my mother tongue. My mother tongue is Sichuanese.

Here, Bo says many revealing things. First of all, he clarifies which Chinese he speaks—Mandarin. He later tells me that in China, they would commonly only be referring to Mandarin

⁴¹ Sichuan and Guangzhou are two different provinces in southern China.

⁴² People from Guangzhou refer to themselves as Cantonese because of the primary language there—Cantonese.

if they speak about “Chinese”, but that he’s learned, here in the U.S., that he has to use the modifiers Mandarin or Cantonese when speaking to an American. The conversation continues below. Notice how he takes the time to define what is a language and what is a dialect or accent.

Bo: I recognize some difference in the recognition of language here in the United States and in China. Back in China, if we say Chinese, we mean Mandarin. And then we say Cantonese or Sichuanese. We don’t recognize Cantonese as part of Mandarin, as part of that Chinese. But after we came here, people say like, ok what language do you speak, and I say Chinese, and they’re like Mandarin or Cantonese, I say CHINESE. Mandarin or Cantonese? Man, CHINESE. Like that. But here, Chinese means a lot of different languages, including those dialects.

Natalie: So you guys spoke Putonghua at home?⁴³

Bo: No, Sichuanese. Yep. Sichuanese accent. Linguistically speaking, Sichuanese is kind of part of Mandarin, however I don’t recognize this because like the grammar, grammatical rules and the pronunciation sometimes it’s really different, so I do recognize my Sichuan accent as an independent language from Mandarin. That’s my personal opinion.

Natalie: Do your parents have the same opinion?

Bo: Yeah, they do think so. And in our home, back at home, we only speak

⁴³ I often used the term “Putonghua” (Chinese for “Mandarin”, literally meaning “the common language”) during the interviews to build rapport with the students and to give them an early clue that I know some Mandarin. The hope was that they would feel comfortable enough to switch to Mandarin, or clarify things in Mandarin, if the need arose, which it sometimes did.

Sichuanese. Chuanyu. Guangdonghua and sichuanhua is considered like a dialect. The thing in Canton province, Guangdong people they are trying to persuade the idea that Cantonese is an independent language from Mandarin. They have some protests on the street saying we want Cantonese to be an independent language, it's so different from Mandarin. It's a language. Domestic pride. Because they're so proud. So, I think Sichuanese is an independent language.

This difficulty the students and I had in our interviews in identifying what is a language, what is a dialect, and how many discrete languages the student has in their repertoire can be attributed to several factors. Firstly, there is difficulty in general in defining what a “language” is, and where the lines are between discrete languages and how they are used. In fact, Canagarajah (2012) opposes using the term “multilingual” because of that very difficulty of suggesting that languages are whole entities that are stacked on top of one another in separate compartments “to form multilingual competence” and instead calls for a usage of the term “translingual” in the place of “multilingual” (p. 7). In order to keep this dissertation somewhat accessible to policy-makers and stakeholders in language policy at universities, I do not adopt that term in this dissertation and instead use the more pedestrian form—multilingual.

However, the point is well taken that languages are in fact not compartmentalized entities that can be stacked or layered as such, and there is much mixing and using of languages in communication that it is almost impossible to determine where one language ends and one begins (or even if a linear way of thinking about language in that way is helpful at all). For my purposes, I do draw those artificial (and somewhat linear) lines between discrete languages, but I recognize that it is not easily done nor always acceptable or appropriate to do so. If academics

have a hard time defining what is a language and what is not, then how could I expect the participants in this study to be any different?

One of the other difficulties in defining what is a “language” has to do with the political environments in which these students come from and in which their languages exist. In the case of the Chinese participants in this study, this socio-politically influenced language ideology dates back centuries, when Beijing was considered the political and cultural hub of China. Li & Thompson (1989), in their well-cited book *Mandarin Chinese: A Functional Reference Grammar*, point out that China (as in, the People’s Republic of China), did not have an official language until 1955, which is what we now know as Mandarin Chinese, or Putonghua. This language was established as the national language and based on the Beijing dialect because of the city’s political importance, but the idealized version of a uniform language “can exist only in theory, not in reality”, because of China’s vast linguistic diversity (p. 1). Additionally, this text states that it is “traditional to speak of the different varieties of Chinese as ‘dialects’, even though they may be different from one another to the point of being mutually unintelligible” and this is because they are spoken in the same country (p. 2). The authors give the example of the classification of Romance “languages” Portuguese and Romanian, where they can in some instances be mutually understandable, they are considered “languages” because they are spoken in different countries, whereas Cantonese and Mandarin are considered “dialects” because they are spoken in the same country (p. 2).

Therefore, when I wanted to know what languages students had in their repertoires, I knew that I would also need to ask about dialects. However, because there do exist dialects in China in the sense that they are mutually intelligible languages that perhaps have small

differences of pronunciation, grammar, or vocabulary, I did try to understand from the student if it was a case of unintelligibility or not. Also, it was interesting that in some instances, students themselves would switch from defining one as a “dialect” to a “language” during the interview process, perhaps due to my questions about intelligibility, and some students immediately, on their own, would talk about “languages” instead of “dialects” and sometimes even give reasons why they called it a “language”. When there was doubt, I erred on the side of counting the “dialect” as a discrete “language”, in order to emphasize the multiple ways of communicating that the students have in their repertoires.

Knowing a language: speaking with “native speakers”. Another aspect of the student participant’s language ideology involves their ideas about what it means to know a language. Some of the students made remarks that denote a belief that if one truly “knows” a language, one is able to talk about common topics in everyday life with “native speakers”. One student, Guohua, told me that his Chinese friends who also attended a private high school in the U.S. have language “problems” because they express difficulty in verbally communicating with their peers and have problems ordering in restaurants in English. He says that they probably have good grammar, but that their pronunciation is lacking.

Guohua: I know some of my friends from China, since they are from one of the best high schools in China, so, they got lots of knowledge. The only problem they have is the language. Despite of that, I think they can get good grades. I mean, they still need effort, but not as much as I do. Yeah so, usually I study for one test for four to five days. They usually need one day or so. Same class.

Natalie: And you mentioned their English, what do you mean they have problems with English?

Guohua: Yeah because I'm living here for five years, and they just get into college from the Chinese high schools, so it's a usual problem, right? I think people should know they are like probably a little afraid of talking to people, probably, because some of my friends from China like get into college from here, usually when I order food from restaurant, they usually let me do most of the jobs. So I know they might have good English grades in China but still the real life experience, like actually talking to people, they might good with grammar, sort of like that, but like when they really talking to people they might be a little afraid, so, like that.

Natalie: So their confidence?

Guohua: I mean, no, their grammar and their test skills are much better than I do. Yeah. But...

Natalie: How do you know?

Guohua: Cause my SAT score is 1900. And I get into this college. That's a little bit surprised for me. Usually students from China get over 2000.

Natalie: You're surprised they let you in?

Guohua: Yeah. I think probably because of my, some of my like community service hours, and some probably prizes from my math competition. Yeah. I know that like US high schools...a little bit...Chinese students in U.S. high schools a little bit easier getting into college than Chinese high school students. In China their GPA

is not as good as here, since, I think their averages are probably C or so, and they need really good SAT scores. I heard some students get 2300 and still get into this school. I know that if you are in US, you get 2300 you can get into much better schools, right?

Natalie: So you don't think it has anything to do with their English ability?

Guohua: Actually universities should usually know if a student is from other countries, more or less, they should have some problems studying in languages. That's why students from China they are letting them to take ESL 115 or taking EPT at least before they are taking Rhetoric 105.

Natalie: Because you assume the University assumes they'd have problems?

Guohua: Yeah. I think 8 out of the 10 people should at least like have some accent problem they need to fix. I know I still got some accent problem still, but usually students from China don't have opportunities to practice their language. They don't have opportunities to talk to people domestically, so that's why even though their skills like understanding the English is good but still they don't have much opportunity to talk to other people that are living here. Right.

Natalie: So you think that like talking to domestic English speakers, they improve?

Guohua: Right. Yeah, that's what I think.

Guohua seems to have quite a positive attitude towards ESL courses, in general, expressing that he believes most Chinese students would, indeed, benefit from extra language instruction once they arrive here. He essentially views ESL 115 as a remedial English course for those who have language "problems". And yet, he pointed out that the problems he thought

fellow Chinese students would have in English are pronunciation and using English when they're "really talking to people". He says that he thinks "their skills like understanding the English is good", so listening comprehension isn't the problem, "but still they don't have much opportunity to talk to other people that are living here". What he does not do is point out the disconnect between those English language needs and the course content of ESL 115. He also thinks that the only way students have to improve those spoken English skills is to talk to English speakers from the U.S.

Another student, Nancy, from Malaysia, also talked about the need for herself and other Malaysians to improve their spoken English, regarding being able to speak with American students as general competence in English, saying in order to "improve their English", she and other Malaysians need to speak with American students.

Natalie: How do you feel about your English language ability to be on class, and be on campus and do your assignments?

Nancy: I think that I really improved my English language, because my roommate is an American, not a Malaysian, so I have to speak English at home and that really helps me. ... And I can even compare with my friends that are staying with other Malaysians, and they find it pretty hard to improve their English, because like, half of the time there is a Malay at home, so they don't really experience like speaking in English. And even in class, either they don't speak or they only speak to Malaysians.

Natalie: So do you hear them talk about their English language ability, or are you just assuming their English probably isn't as good as yours?

Nancy: Um, usually, they say like oh um, were you always this good in English? Because we came from different preparation program, and the other preparation program have so many Malay, like our race, so they mostly speak in Malay, but for me we have a lot of Chinese and Indians, so we speak English. So I would say they really start speaking English when they come here, and it is really hard to really improve. But because I already started speaking English in Malaysia, that kinda helps.

Natalie: So they have said something to you, like why is your English so good?

Nancy: Uh huh, yeah, it's like, um, so if I want to order something, they are like you go over there, you have better English, or you go ask, you have better English...Ok, something like that. ... For me, because I want to improve my English, so I would want to optimize my time speaking in English.

Natalie: Ok, so do you do things to improve your English right now?

Nancy: Ummm, speak English even with Malaysians.

Natalie: Do you?

Nancy: Yeah. Like I have this one friend that, she would never speak Malay with Malaysians. She would always settle with English and I feel really comfortable with her. She has really good English because she was from private school in Malaysia, and private school only speak English. She has really good English and she live in dorm, and of course she can only speak English.

Natalie: So it is something you think about consciously? Like make sure I'm improving and not falling behind in English.

Nancy: Yes, exactly, because it kinda affect my confidence to speak with people. It is always a struggle for international students to ask questions, primarily because we don't have a good English. It is even addressed in my transfer LAS class, do you know the LAS class? For transfer students. And my lecture already addressed. If you are international and you think you are not good in English, just ask questions, even though you think your English is bad because we want to help, so and the only way to improve that is to practice. And, I think that affects also why my friend also always wants me to talk to, or wants me to ask at a shop, she wants me to ask, because she doesn't have that confidence to speak English.

Natalie: So do you sometimes not ask questions in class because you are afraid of your English?

Nancy: Sometimes.

“Good English”, for Nancy, means to be able to easily talk to Americans, ask questions in class, and perform daily-life communicative language tasks on and around campus. She notes that her lecturer in an LAS transfer class encouraged international students to ask questions, assuming that they would think they “are not good in English” and think that their “English is bad”. Her instructor for that course, as well as Nancy herself, believe that the only way to improve (their “English”) is to “practice”. Nancy also notes that it is an issue of confidence for her, personally—she wants to feel more confident when speaking English.

Lina, a female Chinese student who attended high school all four years in the U.S. and is a U.S. citizen talked about her identity as an international student and how that is linked to her English language proficiency. For her, even though she successfully completed high school in

the U.S. and is attending a U.S. university, there is something about “knowing” English that keeps her from being able to say that she is a competent English speaker. For her, truly knowing English means that English should come to her mind before Chinese does when speaking. She also, like Guohua and Nancy, believes that her true English proficiency lies in her ability to verbally communicate (and easily comprehend others) in everyday life.

Natalie: What does international student mean? Who’s an international student?

Lina: Cause I feel like I didn’t grow up here, and I feel like my English is not that good as native American. It doesn’t like American born Chinese. Like that, and kind of like my culture. It’s like, stick with Chinese. Stick with China. I didn’t like. I think my Chinese culture is like much better than the other culture. I know much more Chinese culture than other cultures. I Kind of like that. So like the news. Kind of like I follow the news...Chinese news. Kind of like that. It’s kind of like. Cause when I came here, I was 14 already, so my thinking of ways, should be like, more Chinese way. And then before I speak, kind of like. So the Chinese came out first and then I translate it into English. Kind of like that. I know I should not do that but it’s kind of like native. Cause it come out kind of slow like that, because you have Chinese thought first, Chinese sentence first then you have to translate. Compared to you just have an English sentence.

Natalie: Did somebody tell you that?

Lina: Yeah, my tutor. It’s actually my neighbor. They are tutors. The husband is doing the English tutor and the wife is doing the math. One of them is from Taiwan, and

the other is from actually Malaysia. But his parents are Chinese, but he moved to America really early, probably just elementary school.

Natalie: Interesting. So you said something about like my English isn't as good as...

Lina: Yeah. It's like, when they are talking sometimes I don't understand, and then, sometimes I cannot express myself use English. Kind of like that. Probably when they are talking a lot. Probably like in some professional classes, when the professor is talking I don't really understand, or when they are talking about probably some reality shows. Something like that.

Natalie: When did you experience that?

Lina: In high school. I didn't really know what Americans like, what is their favorite television show, something like that, because I don't really watch American TV shows.

Natalie: Are there times right now you don't understand?

Lina: Probably just the topic, or daily life stuff....like the way of using words.

Natalie: Can you think of a time and tell me when you didn't understand?

Lina: I don't really remember but like...I have a like...things is like I can talk to people, like who are Americans or, but cannot find like really actually like topics to getting deeper, to making the conversation deeper. Probably just several questions then we are done, like I don't know what to speak. During high school (was the last time), because my high school was all whites.

Lina chooses to identify as a Chinese student and international student, among other reasons, partly because of her own perceptions of her English language proficiency, saying "I

feel like my English is not that good as native American. ... It's like, stick with Chinese. Stick with China." She explains why she feels that her English language is lacking, telling anecdotes about not being able to understand a professor talking about a certain unfamiliar subject, or when Americans are talking about TV shows. She goes on to say that she can talk to Americans, but she just doesn't know what to talk about in order to connect with them on a deeper level.

Another student, Huang, talked to me about being a transfer student to the U.S. He was recognized as a gifted student in astronomy and physics in high school in China (through course work and winning international astronomy and physics competitions for high school), and was recruited to the top science and technology university in China. He then decided to transfer to UIUC. I was trying to understand his educational background and path to UIUC, and it became apparent to me that this was a special case; this student was quite gifted (has been recognized multiple times as such in China and internationally), and now is a student here. I would describe him as quiet and shy. He almost never spoke to other students, sometimes would choose to stay quiet and not answer the instructor's questions directed towards him during class (as if taking time to think through his answer or because he didn't know the answer, though the actual reason for his silence was unclear to me), and he always sat in the corner of the room in ESL 115.

He told me about his multiple awards in science competitions and his passion for those subjects, and then talked about his part-time job on campus working in a physics lab. During that discussion, I made a comment about how smart he must be. Then, he immediately brought up his English proficiency, as if to correct Natalie:

Natalie: So, you're like just super smart.

Huang: Yeah, maybe. But I'm not good at English. I just...I have trouble in writing. And speaking. For TOEFL there's four part right? Speaking, reading, writing, and listening. I did pretty well in reading and listening, but not that good in writing and speaking. ... I actually experienced difficulty in talking to people and writing essays.

Natalie: So how do you feel? Who do you talk to?

Huang: Not much.

Natalie: Yeah, but when have you felt a difficulty?

Huang: I can...sometimes I cannot express myself. ... And it's different from time to time, sometimes I can talk fluently and sometimes I just don't know which word to use, and.

Natalie: Do you feel like people know you are as smart as you are when you are working in the lab?

Huang: No.

Natalie: Why?

Huang: Part of the language problem I guess. Sometimes I don't feel like talking cause I'm not good at English, which will make them like, I sometimes I understand the concept they are talking about but I just don't response to it.

Natalie: But you understand everything they are saying, in the lab you work in?

Huang: Yeah.

Natalie: Do you think it's important for them to know? [how smart you are]

Huang: Yeah, I think it's pretty important for them to know. I try to speak as much as I

can.

Natalie: So you think if you could speak better English you'd have better success?

Huang: Yeah I think I would do better.

For Huang, although he is arguably one of the top physics students at UIUC (and in all of China), he remarked on his English ability in a way that sounded like he believed himself to be inadequate in a really important way, describing a “language problem”, which ultimately for him, meant the ability to communicate verbally with professors, TAs, and peers on campus. We were not talking about English or ESL 115 when he mentioned this; I was simply trying to understand his educational background. And yet, for him, English proficiency was one area in which he felt he did not excel, and he felt compelled to mention that, in spite of the fact that UIUC was his first school choice, his GPA was excellent, he had won or placed high in international science competitions that were conducted in English, and that he had a coveted position working in a Physics lab as an undergraduate student here.

For these students, their belief about what it means to know a language affects how they view the English language policies at UIUC. It affects their own language use and language management efforts (where they manage each others' language), depending on whether or not they see their language abilities as competent enough for the communicative task at hand. It also affects how they participate in courses and communicate with their instructors and fellow students (or not). It also suggests that if UIUC's institutional English policies from above are meant to ensure students' success in the university environment, then, according to students' own perceptions of their language abilities, they need support services to help them improve

their communicative competence with peers (in both formal and informal spaces), as well as with their instructors.

Student Experiences with Language Policies Prior to UIUC

Like Ying, the students in this study all come from primary and/or secondary education spaces that are multilingual to some degree, and like Ying, have experienced English language policies because of the multilingual and heteroglossic nature of their schooling experiences (not just English language policies, but also language policies related to other languages) prior to attending UIUC. Those prior language policy experiences affect how they not only view English language policies at UIUC, but also how they view their own usage and proficiency of the English language. Several of the students in the study attended high schools that had explicit “English only” policies that resulted in punitive measures if the policy was not followed as such. Some of the high schools were public, some were private, some were elite, and many participants attended more than one type of high school.⁴⁴

Ying is one of the students who attended a school that had an “English only” policy that she described as “harsh”, and one that, in principle, she disagreed with. She said that even though her school had an “English only” policy, that students would “jumble up some words”, describing translingual communicative practices (discussed earlier in this chapter).

Ying: Like in ESL, when they are trying to talk to me in English, some of them is not very

⁴⁴ I felt that it was important to distinguish between the type of high schools that students attended to better understand the contexts in which language policy occurred. The students seemed to easily know if their high school was public or private, but determining its elite status was more difficult. I asked students questions based off the definitions and concepts of elite schools from the work of McCarthy, Bulut, Castro, Goel, and Greenhalgh-Spencer (2014) and Angod (2015).

fluent in English. They may jumble up some words, like Chinese...you know what I mean. Yeah, I of course know what they mean. I don't think other than Chinese people they are know what they are meaning. But, sometimes, like in my high school, you know, like in Chinese, for yes, people always say "dui", right? Like, sometimes people can't adjust it in their mind. But in my high school, my teachers they are really strict about it, and they don't' let one Chinese word exist in their classroom, and I feel like it is discrimination. I feel like, it's ok, for people, they can't control it. It's ok, they are children. You can't be too harsh on them. But some of my teachers they were really harsh and students they all hate them. They shouldn't be doing that.

Other students have experience in primary schools where instructors shamed students for using languages other than the dominant language of transaction in that region, leading to deep-seated feelings in the students about what should or should not be allowed in a classroom space with regards to language policy.

Bo was one of the student participants told me about his long history with language policy (not just English language policy) in educational settings, and how language policy in the classroom at an early age led to being discriminated against and ultimately feelings of resentment towards his linguistic oppressors. Language policy in his formative, early years of schooling caused him to be bullied because he did not speak Cantonese—the local language where he lived (but not the official language of his school, which was Mandarin), to become a bully later on in his schooling towards others who spoke Cantonese, to have to change schools

from a public to a private setting, and to have conflicted feelings about himself and his views towards speakers of Cantonese.

One of the first things that Bo said to me was that he learned Putonghua (Mandarin) in elementary school, because at home, his family spoke “Sichuanese”, as he called it (Sichuanhua—the Chinese name for “Sichuanese”—is a language spoken in Sichuan province in China). His family was originally from Sichuan province but later moved to Guangzhou, where Bo was born. This background information, and how described his linguistic background to me, is interesting in itself, has an influential impact on his language ideology, and is discussed in the previous section. For this section, it is important to note that he spoke Sichuanhua at home and learned Mandarin, the official language of instruction and interaction in the classroom, in elementary school. Here is his story, told to me verbatim (italics added by me to show where he vocally added emphasis):

Bo: “I tried so hard to learn Mandarin, actually. I love languages.

Natalie: Why did you try so hard to learn Mandarin?

Bo: Because it sounds beautiful. Like, do you know Taiwanese Mandarin? I don’t like it because it sounds like, not fluent enough. But standard Mandarin, it sounds really fluent and really soft. But for southern people, they always speak Mandarin in a really hard way. They have an accent, so that’s why I don’t I want to practice myself my Mandarin. And I did it! I spent like six years doing this.

Natalie: How about Cantonese?

Bo: I don’t like it.

Natalie: How did you learn?

Bo: I grew up there. Hahaha.

Natalie: But they didn't speak it in school?

Bo: Teachers in classes, you have to speak Mandarin. Everybody has to speak Mandarin.

You use Mandarin to teach, you use Mandarin to learn. However, like during breaks or like when you hang out with your friends, they always speak their mother tongue which is Cantonese.

Natalie: Do you remember a time when you didn't understand Cantonese?

Bo: Of course. I did. I was excluded. I was isolated by the whole class at that time.

Cantonese people somewhat look down on people who cannot speak Cantonese. I was kind of isolated from everybody at that time and the teacher *appreciated* the isolation. Because it's *our* place, you have to speak our mother tongue. If you cannot speak that then you're alien. I told my mother this. She was so angry about this. How can you appreciate discrimination in school, like publicly in your class. So my mother told me *never* speak Cantonese, never learn Cantonese, never learn their things no matter where you live. Yeah, and speak Sichuanese.

But later, you know sometimes like, even though the teacher says don't play with him, you still play with him. So many other friends they don't care whether I can speak Cantonese or not, and we get together, we hang out together, and after years and years together I can speak Cantonese. But I still don't speak it. I appreciate Sichuanese.

Natalie: Do you think you're native like in Cantonese?

Bo: 80%. But like, after I came here, I avoid Cantonese people. I just don't like them. I really don't like them. My parents wanted to move to Shanghai because of discrimination. Actually, I mean, this happens a lot in China, not only about in Canton. In Sichuan, people have discrimination against Cantonese people and have against other people. This is normal, but I never expected school to be like this. That was outrageous. That hurt a lot, actually. I mean, back in high school I was like psychologically distorted because of that. I did everything I could to hurt Cantonese. Like in my class, because back in my high school it was an international school, and we had one Cantonese people and I bullied him so much and I was like oh, I got a revenge, like that. I *hate* Cantonese people. But later I realized I did something wrong. That's totally wrong, that's *totally* wrong. I became those people who I hated. So, I apologized to him and I became friends with him after the first year.

Natalie: You went first to a local public school, and then to an international high school. Why?

Bo: Bullying. Cause all the way from six years old to the graduation of middle school I was bullied by Cantonese people so much. I hate them so much later. I hate Hong Kong people [who speak Cantonese], I hate Cantonese people, I hate Cantonese, I hate anything related to them. That's why Cantonese language is a language that's prohibited in my family. This is kind of a phenomenon you can see everywhere in China.

That's why I say I didn't have a childhood. My childhood was destroyed by Cantonese people. That's why I don't like them. Even after I came here I avoid Cantonese people. I don't speak Cantonese.

Bo's story is a heartbreaking one, and a clear example of how language policy (language management efforts, language practice, and language ideologies) can be harmful and have an effect on a person long after they are physically removed from the policy situation. His experiences as a young person in school have led him to feel bias against speakers of Cantonese, and those experiences must have an influence on his own language usage today (though I will not extrapolate and try to state what those influences are). However, just like any other aspect of language policy, Bo's own language ideologies and language practices are contradictory. He ended one thought by saying "I don't speak Cantonese", and yet, a few minutes later, he tells me:

Bo: That's why I always have tension among my Cantonese friends. My best friend is Cantonese. Unexpected, but she's born here in America. She has nothing to do with those people. She's totally different from those real Cantonese people. I called her Cantonese because the only language she can speak is Cantonese and English. Actually I always speak Cantonese with her.

He recognizes his own contradictions, and feels conflicted about his indexing of Cantonese speakers. He told me:

Bo: But like, I mean, like honestly speaking, like, the mature me is telling me, this is not right. You cannot hate them. Because you still have Cantonese friends and they treat you well. What you hate is who you hate is just a little part of

Cantonese people. I was trying to convince myself that I was just being unfortunate that I met them, but the majority of Cantonese people are good. Like, the mature me is telling me this. But sometimes, when I hear Cantonese, when I meet Cantonese people, the hatred...is still there. And I try to suppress it. I mean, that's the most I can do, because I experienced those things. Anyway. We don't have Cantonese people in this class [meaning ESL 115].

That's why I feel shameful that I come from Guangzhou. I've been living there my whole life and I'm not part of the city. I don't belong to there. That's why even if after I graduate I want to go back to China, I don't go back to Guangzhou. I will move my family back to Sichuan province. ... This was kind of a good experience, because now I really treasure equality. That's why I try my best to forget about those hate things...hatred. I try my best. I'm still trying.

His language and experiences with language policy make him reflect on his belonging and identity as a Chinese person, as well as the direction of his future. Even as he tries to reconcile his past experiences with his current ideologies, he acknowledges the need to "try" to push forward in a mindset of equality. Here, he is specifically speaking about an equality mindset that pushes away the patterns of thought that index certain linguistic groups. He certainly faced injustice and a form of oppression through language policy from below (he spoke of his teacher's and classmates' treatment of him as something adhoc and nothing official from school administration making it policy from below), as he identifies Cantonese speakers as his oppressors from his childhood, even expressing that they robbed him of that.

Bo's past experiences with language policy certainly affect his current navigation of and interaction with language policy here at UIUC.

Other participants expressed the opinion that in their past, saying that they wish they could have spoken the language that would have been most convenient for communication, and oftentimes still did, admitting that it was not only hard for the school teachers and administrators to control, but also that it was almost impossible for they themselves to control. At the same time, they said that they still felt that it was wrong on some level to go against the language management efforts (ex. English-only policy), and would still try to hide the fact that they were using a different language.

Nancy, the student from Malaysia, said this about her high school experience in Malaysia:

Nancy: Even in Malaysia in my English class we couldn't speak in Malay, because my English instructor she wanted us to speak English in English class, so no other language.

Natalie: Why do you think that is?

Nancy: She wants us to practice, um, speak English better, and also she wants us to respect her, because she's not good in Malay, and it is very important for the instructor to always know what the students are doing.

Natalie: Ok, What if it was in like math class. In math class, and she breaks you up into groups. If you're in math class and you're in groups and there are three Malays, what language do you think it would be ok to use?

Nancy: Um, if everyone is only doing their own job and doing their own work, and if I

just want to ask like very not so important question, probably I would just like shoot in Malay but will really probably in low volume. Because I mean, if you are talking to that person and it's very loudly and the other person hear but they couldn't listen, they probably would like... .

Nancy had experienced an English-only policy in her English class during high school, and seemed to carry that expectation over to now at UIUC, where she assumes that there is an official language policy, and she assumes that others would not like it if she spoke in multiple languages in the classroom.

Huang, a Chinese student who went to high school in China and part of college (is now a transfer student), directly spoke about how his previous English language policy experience in a private English institute in China affects his current perceptions of the current English language policies he encounters in ESL 115:

Natalie: I mean she [the ESL 115 instructor] doesn't tell you don't speak Chinese does she? What do you think about that?

Huang: I don't know. I mean, it should be...there should be rules that you can't speak Chinese. But, there are just too much Chinese people in the class.

Natalie: Why do you think there should be a rule?

Huang: It just makes sense. From my previous experience, like, English class you cannot speak Chinese. It's like a foreign teacher... . It's not a teacher in the middle school but I took that course when I was in middle school.

Sally, a Chinese student who went to a private boarding high school in the U.S. for three years, also had an English-only policy experience, but this was for all official school spaces and

not just in “English class”. Her school had a large population of international students, and the rule seemed to be made specifically for them, stating that they were not allowed to use any other language besides English in official school spaces, including her dormitory public spaces:

Natalie: What language did you use when you were in high school?

Sally: English of course.

Natalie: Could you use Chinese at all?

Sally: The thing is that we have like a one...how to say that...it’s called common language policy. It’s that once you’re in campus, like in academic building, you cannot really talk to friends in Chinese in case to respect others. Which, you know, if it’s two Chinese girls together why are we talking in English? It’s just like a rule there. But if like, a teacher around you, near you, you don’t wanna talk in Chinese. It’s just they will feel bad. They won’t know what you are talking about.

Natalie: Did anyone ever tell you it made them feel bad?

Sally: Teachers. American friends they don’t really care. It’s only teachers.

Natalie: So the teachers would say something to you?

Sally: Hey, common language policy! Or hey, language!

Natalie: Were there other languages people spoke?

Sally: Yeah, Spanish. We have Mexican students, some from European, have some Japanese boys, Korean boys...

Natalie: And they also kind of quietly spoke their own language and would get in trouble if they heard...?

Sally: Yeah. [Laughs]

Natalie: What about in your dorm?

Sally: Yeah we just talk.

Natalie: That's not part of the policy?

Sally: Um, in the common area, like girls, we lived in little houses...

Natalie: How did you feel about the common language policy?

Sally: Dumb. You don't really want to speak English to another Chinese girl. It's like you and another American can speak Spanish to each other?

Natalie: Did you feel any other feelings besides it's a dumb rule?

Sally: I can't understand the cause of it.

Natalie: Any emotions about it?

Sally: No, it don't really like cause us to get into trouble. It's just like, teacher don't like it, but some teacher don't really care. There are lots of cool teachers too.

Sally's experience with the "English only" policy-from-above is similar to Guohua's experience in his private U.S. high school:

Natalie: Were you...what language did you use in High school?

Guohua: Uh, Chinese and English.

Natalie: Both?

Guohua: I mean, for teacher no, English only. I mean when I was talking to my friends I used Chinese.

Natalie: At school?

Guohua: Uh Chinese friends, yeah.

Natalie: That was allowed?

Guohua: I mean, the school didn't allow, but it's hard for them to control this kind of things.

Natalie: Was there a rule?

Guohua: There was, but...like, during the class time, you cannot talk in Chinese. Yeah, but you understand there's only one teacher so it's hard to control this kind of thing. And I understand that it's not good to talk in Chinese with your friends, but if you wanna be actually friends with them, it's hard to actually communicate in English all the time since some of the issues you are talking about with them, while you are talking to them, it's hard to just talk in English.

Natalie: Why do you think it's a problem to speak Chinese in class?

Guohua: Cause it's U.S. And uh, the class are taught for like...taught in English. So if you are communicate in Chinese, first of all the teacher don't know what you are talking about so, which means if you are talking in Chinese you might talk about other topics, so the teacher don't know what you are talking about. Like if you are talking about the right topic I think the teacher will allow you to do that, but the teacher don't know what you are talking about. That's the issue.

Natalie: Was that a written rule or did people just tell you?

Guohua: There's no written rules, but people just saying. Teachers. They are just saying like, even though we are talking in Chinese, that teacher might just say stop talking in Chinese, but there's no strict rules. Like if you talk in Chinese you gonna get punished, something like that. There's no such rules.

Natalie: But the teacher will try to control you...

Guohua: I mean yeah, that's right. I understand. But it's still a problem. It's hard to control the students. When all the students except you are talking in Chinese, they are force you to talk in Chinese as well, because if you talk in English with them, it's hard to communicate with them. Like they gonna think you are weird as well. I understand the teacher's rules but still, it's hard for me to...

While Sally's language policy came from above, Guohua's language policy came from below—through teachers. Both of them had the same consequences, however, for violating the language management efforts of their schools: they would be chastised by a teacher or administrator, but nothing more serious. Sally disagreed with the policy, but Guohua sided more with the teachers, expressing that he understood their discomfort in not being able to understand their students. Sally thought the reason for the policy was due to teachers' potential discomfort of not understanding what their students were talking about in class, but she did not show the same desires to conform to the policy as Guohua did.

Another student, Scott, went to a private boarding high school in the U.S. with a large international student population. He had an English-only policy at his school, but it was more punitive than the two mentioned above:

Natalie: What language did you speak in HS?

Scott: English.

Natalie: Ok. So can you kind of explain what language was like in high school? How did you use it? Did you ever speak Chinese?

Scott: Yeah I speak Chinese. After class.

Natalie: Like where?

Scott: Dormitory. Not in hallway. In dormitory. We have policy. If I speak non-English language, I will, academic time...I will get punishment, like if I speak Chinese in class I get two hours. Two hours, I have two options. 1, doing dishes. The other thing, take care of horses.

Natalie: You guys had horses?

Scott: Yeah, we had to...

Natalie: Pick up manure?

Scott: Yeah.

Natalie: Did you have to do that?

Scott: Yeah a lot. [Laughs]

Natalie: Did everybody have to do it a lot?

Scott: No, if somebody breaks the law, if somebody doesn't follow the policies.

Natalie: So why you?

Scott: I speak Chinese a lot. [Laughs] Cause my friends talk to me.

Natalie: Did your friends get in trouble too?

Scott: Yeah , same. Yeah, the most all international students were doing that.

Natalie: So all Chinese students?

Scott: Yeah. [Laughs] Yeah, anyone speak not English language will.

Natalie: Do you feel like you were treated fairly?

Scott: No, cause Chinese is so different than English. If I speak in Chinese everybody

knows. Some of the like, Indo-European language system is similar to English.

Like. I don't know. Just, uh, somebody see a sentence in Chinese, somebody see a sentence in Germany or France. Chinese is so different.

Natalie: So what do you think about that rule? That policy.

Scott: When I was in there, I hate that policy. But, I'm right now...I think it's funny. It is a good policy. They force us to speak English to practice English.

Natalie: That was good for you?

Scott: Yeah.

Natalie: Why did you hate it then?

Scott: Cause I have to do dishes. Laughs.

Natalie: You could've just not spoken Chinese right? Do you think that was possible?

Scott: No. Chinese friends talk to me, in Chinese, if I reply in English, they say I'm weird.

Natalie: Did you try to get each other in trouble sometimes?

Scott: Yeah!

Natalie: Can you tell me a story about that?

Scott: Some...uhh, so many, like, uh, um, in class, I talk to my friends in Chinese, uh, what's the question? Yeah, uh, when the teacher turn back, I talk to him in Chinese, then he talk to me, then he was faced on him.

Natalie: Why couldn't he just talk to you in English?

Scott: He just uh...laughs. Cause I talked to him in Chinese.

Natalie: It's a rule? Kind of? if you start in Chinese you have to finish in Chinese, it's a little rude?

Scott: Yeah, a little rude.

Natalie: Did he know what you were doing? Did he get mad?

Scott: Mmhmm. [Laughs]

Looking at the students' perspectives on an English-only policy, one has to ask: Who really benefits from English-only policies? I can only speculate since I did not conduct research at those sites, but Sally and Guohua agree that the policy benefitted the teachers but not the students. All three students, instead, felt that they were harmed by the policy socially—being made to feel weird if they spoke English to their friends, or perhaps not speaking to their friends on deeper subjects of concern because of the lack of linguistic competence to do so for personal subjects. Only Scott, who experienced a more punitive English-only policy, mentioned that he thought, in retrospect, that the policy was beneficial for his English language proficiency. None of them mentioned that it was otherwise good for them academically.

The Hegemony of English in Students' Language Ideologies

One important aspect of the student participants' language ideologies is their acceptance of the hegemony of English, where English is not only the most important language, but it is the pathway to success (Shannon, 1995). Nancy from Malaysia spoke to me directly about how she thinks English is viewed in Malaysia and how her English proficiency affects her life.

Natalie: If you had your preference in your life, would you rather speak more Malay right now or more English?

Nancy: I would speak more English because it can connect me to more people.

Natalie: Here on campus?

Nancy: Yes here on campus and even in Malaysia if you can speak English better, if you are good at speaking English, then you can go further. It means like, you will go through job interview very well, because right now in my country English is very, very important, but not all people want to learn to speak it. Cause for me, before you are good at speaking in English, you will struggle with talking in English, and that is the phase where most Malaysians don't want to experience, where they feel very awkward, and it takes a lot to try to speak English with other person that don't speak English.

Natalie: S you think it would just help your life more?

Nancy: Yes.

Natalie: Why is English so important in Malaysia right now?

Nancy: Probably because of our education, and because I am going into the business part, so like, in international business, they speak in English. And even the commercials on our television, is in English. I think that's very important. We don't really use...actually we only speak in Malay, but most of the thing, everything is in English.

Natalie: What is the national language?

Nancy: Malay language.

Natalie: But they're kind of switching to English? Why do you think that is?

Nancy: Yes. Probably because of the development. They really want to develop the country, so we have to understand the official international language, which is English. So you can go further.

Natalie: So in order for Malaysia to develop, they need more English.

Nancy: Yes, so they can go further.

Another student participant, Christopher, explained to me that of all of the things he needed to learn in university in order to be successful, English was the most important, expressing that he needs to overcome “the language barrier”.

Natalie: So in ESL 115 class, I noticed sometimes people will speak Putonghua

[Mandarin]. Do you ever speak Putonghua in writing class?

Christopher: Yeah sometimes but I prefer not to do that because I’m always trying to improve my English. I think it’s very important. The most important thing for me as a business student. Because we are good at the study. GPA is not a problem.

Natalie: Who is we? Chinese people?

Christopher: Chinese business students. [Laughs] So, the language barrier is the biggest obstacle for me. So, like, interview, career fair, language is so important. It’s the basic skill you need to know.

Huang, the Chinese student who works in the Physics lab, spoke directly to me about his perspective on the hegemony of English:

Huang: I don’t know, maybe my parents want me to speak better English, things like that.

Natalie: Why?

Huang: I mean English is important in China and people realize that English is important.

And for my parents, my father have been to Paris before and he's an engineer and he cannot speak English so he thought that English is important and maybe his child should speak English when he was young.

Natalie: Why is English important?

Huang: It's like, everyone is speaking English in the world. I mean it's a common language for foreigners. I mean for people from other countries. The first language you try is English, right? Yeah so, it's not like in U.S. cause it's like people learning Spanish as their second language or those other countries that English is not their first language, their second language must be English.

Natalie: You think it should be?

Huang: No, but it just is. Well it's an unstoppable trend, right? I mean in the European countries like Germany and France, they speak English right? But there's a lot of people in German can speak English and in France too.

Huang calls the hegemony of English "an unstoppable trend". He is a person that has first-hand experienced what it is like to be under the pressure of that hegemony, being told from a young age that English is the language of success in the world and more personally, for his own life.

Ying spoke about her past English language policy experiences in her private high school in China in a way that reveals her opinions about the language ideologies of her high school instructors. What she said reveals Ying's own language ideologies and, in particular, her views about the hegemony of English.

Ying: But it's kind of good for people to, you know, speak Chinese during class, like, the

teacher doesn't care about it, because sometimes, it makes me feel a little bit uncomfortable when there are certain rules, like, when there are all Chinese people there in the classroom and the teacher just set the rule that you are not supposed to say any other language other than English.

Natalie: Have you experienced that here at U of I?

Ying: Not really, but I have experienced that during high school. Sometimes, I don't really think the teacher is doing that on purpose, but sometimes, when they are too strict about their rules, it feels like discrimination.

Natalie: In high school?

Ying: Yeah. It feels like they are racist. It feels that they think English is the best language in the world, because they are too strict about it, and it's just not applicable for all Chinese students to speak English to each other. People are trying to speak English, but they are just automatically just speak some Chinese words.

"It feels like they are racist. It feels that they think English is the best language in the world." This statement by Ying sums up why an attitude of English hegemony is harmful to multilingual international undergraduate students. It devalues the other languages in their repertoires, and as a result, devalues them as capable people. These students are made to feel that their English language proficiency is the most important part of their intelligence and even themselves, taking away from other, perhaps more important, aspects of themselves.

The Importance of Language Ideology in Policy from Below

The students in this study are truly brilliant. Their language repertoires, and how they navigate language policy at UIUC is remarkable. They should be given credit for how difficult of

a thing this is that they do everyday and with such aptitude. The students experience a different language policy every time they enter a different space on campus, whether that be a classroom, instructor's office, or over email. They must, on their own, determine what the language ideology of the other people in that space is and what the language management practices are of that space in order to determine how they can use language in that space. It is such a complicated thing for these students that come from heteroglossic worlds to live and interact in a university that has such monoglossic language policy, and they do it seemingly effortlessly. They silently accept the criticism that comes from the campus that do not have high enough proficiency of one of their languages in their repertoires—English—and do whatever is required of them to improve it (though, if they want to graduate, they do not have a choice), which also means that their own language ideologies, and how they view their own multilingualism, are being silently influenced every day.

The student participants in this study select which language to use based almost entirely on making accommodations for other people. Chinese students feel social pressure to speak Mandarin to other Chinese students, and if they don't, they might be seen as "weird". Nancy from Malaysia chooses to use either English, Northern Malay, or Southern Malay with her peers based on the desires of the group with whom she's communicating. Dipti from India even told me that she switches her variety of English (pronunciation and vocabulary), going between American, British, and Indian, based on how she thinks it will be received by others on campus (usually choosing to use American English with non-Indians and a combination of British English and Indian English with her closest friends). The students in this study choose which language to use with their instructor based on the desires of the instructor and what would make them

most comfortable, or what languages the instructor allows. They also choose language based on official and unofficial spaces, determining what languages would be allowed in which spaces based on language management efforts that they assume exist, or language ideologies that they feel others possess on campus.

Language ideology is the most influential aspect of English language policy, both from above and from below. The language ideology of the institution sets language management efforts that have huge effects on students lives, determining who and who cannot become students at UIUC, and what classes they will be required to take on campus. Language ideology also infiltrates every aspect of language policy from below, in the ESL 115 classroom and in other classrooms around campus. The language ideology of individual instructors in high schools set the stage for how students view language policy and how students will use language later on in university life. The language ideology of individual instructors at UIUC determine whether or not a student is given the right to use his or her linguistic repertoires to their full capacity, which in turn affects how a student feels about themselves as capable students and how they view their future success. The language ideology that individual students carry with them every day affects how they enact language policy at UIUC, accepting it, rejecting it, or somewhere in between, always navigating the complicated feelings of wanting to use the languages in their repertoires that would make their education better, but also carrying a heavy burden of wanting to respect the monoglossic environment that they feel exists at UIUC.

CHAPTER 6

Conclusion: Towards Language-as-Resource

Language policy at a large university such as the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) is not easy to understand. Answering the question “What is the language policy at UIUC?” could potentially be a much longer and more elaborate dissertation than this one. Indeed, language policy is like peeling back an onion (Ricento & Hornberger, 1996), layer upon layer, always discovering another layer that you didn’t know was there, always feeling that there is one more layer that you could dissect and discover. In Chapter One, I situated the context of this study, emphasizing the importance of studying language policy at UIUC. In Chapter Two, I elaborated on relevant literature in the field of language policy and planning, globalization, and a review of previous studies of language policy, international students, and higher education. In Chapter Three, I described the ethnographically-informed qualitative methods and procedures for this dissertation. Chapters Four and Five present data and findings that answer the research questions:

1. What are the English What are the language policies at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign that most affect multilingual international undergraduate students in this study?
 - a. What are the language policies “from above”? (From the institution, campus admissions, and department levels)
 - b. What are the language policies “from below”? (From the students, teachers, and day-to-day levels)
2. What are multilingual international undergraduate students’ experiences with and

perceptions of language policies at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign?

Chapter Four is dedicated to language policy from above. I describe a brief history of ESL at UIUC up to present day, arguing that from the beginning until now, the institution has a language-as-problem orientation. Then, I present two key language management efforts of the University: admissions requirements and ESL courses. I discuss admissions policies that require students to “prove English proficiency”, either through showing standardized test scores (TOEFL or IELTS), or achieving high scores on the English portions of the SAT or ACT. I then discuss why some multilingual international undergraduate students are (or are not) required to take an ESL writing course and how that decision is made, as well as English language management efforts from the ESL department through a recommended first-day handout (syllabus). I find that institutional language policy is often contradictory and ad hoc, even at the most “official” places (i.e. campus Admissions). I also present some of the students’ experiences with these policies from above. I posit that the predominant language ideology of the institution—a part of language policy—reveals an attitude congruent with the hegemony of English, where English is seen as the only language of success and devalues multilingualism in University spaces.

Chapter Five is dedicated to language policy from below. I present the language policy that is enacted in the observed ESL 115 writing course, student experiences with language policy in other campus spaces, and finally the language ideologies of the student participants that affect their current experiences with and enactments of language policy at UIUC. The language policy from below at UIUC is heavily influenced by individuals’ own language ideologies (of both students and instructors). Individual instructors exercise the freedom to set language policy in their classrooms ad hoc through language management, and students

themselves enact language management practices. The student participants in this study make attempts to adhere to those different language policies in order to give respect to the instructors (those in power over them) and the English-speaking domestic students (the perceived linguistic majority). Translingual communicative practices (the use of multiple languages for communication) are prevalent in all official spaces of campus, but it is not always welcome. Additionally, students themselves have mixed opinions on whether or not they think translingual communicative practices should be allowed in official campus spaces, pointing to conflicting language ideologies. Language policy from below at UIUC is also contradictory, ad hoc, and almost never written. Language-as-problem, language-as-right, and language-as-resource orientations are all evident in the language policy from below, and are heavily influenced by individuals' own language ideologies and previous experiences with language policy outside of UIUC.

Limitations of the Study

Because of the nature of case study as a methodology, there are obvious limitations to the generalizations that can be made from the conclusions here. The class I observed was only comprised of 15 students and one instructor. Those individuals have experiences and life circumstances that are unique, as all individuals do. As I've discussed here, language policy is heavily influenced by individuals' unique experiences and language ideologies, both from above and from below.

I also observed one section of one ESL writing course—ESL 115. This course is designed for multilingual international undergraduate students who score higher on the English Placement Test and are deemed proficient enough in English writing to only need to take one

semester of ESL writing, instead of the two-semester track courses ESL 111 and 112. ESL 115 would also be the course for students who were not necessarily required to take an ESL writing course, and could have taken the Rhetoric courses to meet the composition requirement for graduation. Thus, the students in this course are not the students on campus with the lowest English proficiency, but perhaps are somewhere in the middle. This gives them a different perspective than a student who would be placed in ESL 111 and 112 who has lower English proficiency, and also excludes students who have not experienced an ESL course on campus at all.

As for the demographics of the student participants in this study, the overwhelming majority were Mandarin speakers from the People's Republic of China, with only one participant from India and one from Malaysia. While that does somewhat fit the general demographics of undergraduate international students at UIUC (the majority from China, and then India and Malaysia fall after that), this study is lacking the perspective of Korean and Taiwanese students—the other two countries that make up a large portion of undergraduate students. Additionally, six out of the 15 participants attended high school in the U.S. for at least one year, five of which were for two or more years. The others attended either an international high school, elite private school, or high-ranking high school in their state/province. That is to say, these are exceptional students. I do not know if all multilingual international undergraduate students at UIUC have similar high school backgrounds, and this is significant to language policy, as I argue through this dissertation that students' experiences with language policy in high school significantly impact their experiences with and perceptions of language policy at UIUC.

I would also be remiss to not mention that qualitative research and ethnographic methodology has its limitations, precisely because of some of its advantages. I got a close look of one situation and one group of people through a very small window. This makes the conclusions that I am able to draw about this situation and these participants compelling, but does limit the extent to which these conclusions can be applied to other situations. The students, as well as the institution, all have unique characteristics that would not be replicated exactly in any other space or time, no matter how hard one would try. Additionally, I as the researcher bring my own unique experiences and perspectives to this study, and as much as I try to remain as objective as possible, part of myself will always be evident throughout this dissertation, and I am not without bias, as no person is.

That being said, this study can, I believe, be quite informative for language policy in higher education, and specifically more so at UIUC. The student participants, though all individuals, had very similar experiences with and perceptions of language policy at UIUC. Time after time, I was astonished at how similar their responses were to my questions during interviews, or when I would go with a student to another class and then talk about it over coffee. This study can also serve as a launch-pad for the University in its different institutional entities to start asking more and better questions about the language policies that are in place. This study should serve as a disruption to the policy-making norms of the institutional entities at UIUC making decisions that affect multilingual international undergraduate students without giving those same students a seat at the table. The student participants in this study all had insightful, thought-provoking opinions and experiences surrounding language policy at UIUC, and deserve a voice in the decision-making process. Additionally, this study can contribute to

future research into language policy at U.S. higher education institutions—an area of inquiry that has been sparsely investigated.

One of the major findings of this study, despite its limitations, and one that I am certain would be true of other university spaces like UIUC's, is simply that UIUC is a multilingual space. That is to say, multilingualism is the norm at the University, whether it is recognized as such or not. While I believe that monolingualism has been assumed to be the majority for students on campus, I think that is a wrong assumption. Students consistently told me during interviews that they limited their own translingual communicative practices (i.e., using languages other than English) in official campus spaces, especially if they thought they could be overheard by “native English speakers” (presumably referring to monolingual English-speaking American students). The student participants in my study were very conscious of others' feelings regarding language in official campus spaces, willingly admitting, for the most part, that they thought that they should only use English, as much as possible, because “this is America”. Some students even went as far to say that “because English is the official language” of the U.S., they should try to respect that and only use English. Of course, English is not the official language of the U.S. (there is no official language as of this moment), but the sentiment, nonetheless, seemed obvious to these participants: Americans do not appreciate other languages being spoken in official spaces.

Recommendations for Policy from Above at UIUC

Shift in language ideology. First and foremost, what I am advocating for at UIUC is a shift in language ideology that will spread into all other aspects of English language policy at UIUC. The University has a hegemonic view of English, where English is seen and believed to be

the pathway for success, and the only language for success at the University. This is detrimental to multilingual international undergraduate students because it devalues their own linguistic repertoires and multilingualism, creating a sense of insecurity about their abilities to succeed in and belong at UIUC.

Making a shift in language ideology is a big task, and one that will not happen overnight. Practically speaking, this change could start occurring in four key places at UIUC: 1) Changing language on official university planning documents, departmental websites, and printed materials to use discourses that have language-as-resource and language-as-right orientations. 2) Admissions requirements; 3) Education campus-wide on the value of multilingualism, the harm of English-only policies, and the benefits of translingual communicative practices; and 4) EPT and ESL requirements.

Changing language on official university planning documents, departmental websites, and printed materials to use discourses that have language-as-resource and language-as-right orientations. Firstly, if diversity is a value of higher education, especially at UIUC, then the institution should expand their definition of diversity to include students' language backgrounds. The implications of that expansion would mean that at all levels, a student could not be discriminated against because of their language abilities. Defining what is discrimination based on language will be difficult, but that challenge exists at every level of anti-discrimination and should be addressed. One student in this study expressed feeling discriminated against by an instructor because of her Chinese language background. Other students expressed a fear that, by using languages other than English in official campus spaces that they would be disrupting in a way that would be displeasing to people in power (namely, instructors), and

possibly carry punitive consequences. They also expressed views of English hegemony, where languages other than English were not welcome on campus and indeed should be silenced. Including language to the University's statement on diversity and inclusion would be one small step towards seeing, embracing, and valuing multilingual students on campus.

Making changes to other official university planning documents, departmental websites, and printed materials to use discourses that have language-as-resource and language-as-right orientations is also essential. Recognizing that "international student" does not equate "multilingual student" is important, not only for accuracy, but also for representation and visibility of multilingual students. One's status as a multilingual person is not necessarily accompanied by citizenship status, and when it is, it erases the multilingual person who has another citizenship status. One student in this study was a U.S. green card holder and another student was a U.S. citizen. Yet, they found it difficult to express who they were to the University community because they were always identified as an "international student". Out of the scope of the study but important to mention are the other multilingual undergraduate students on campus who do not identify as "international students", and yet are multilingual and experience the same constraints of language policy at UIUC as those students in this study. For multilingualism, and indeed language itself, to be seen as a resource and not a problem or a deficit, then multilingualism must be made more visible in the language that is used in official campus spaces, documents, websites, and other written spaces.

Admissions requirements. I see many problems with this requirement for students to "Prove your English proficiency" and "demonstrate a command of the English language". Firstly, UIUC states that a student has the burden of proving a command of English language if their

first language isn't English, but how does the University know what a student's first language is? I decided to start an application on the UIUC website as if I were an incoming freshman, and while there is an optional question regarding the primary language spoken at home, there are no other required questions asking for an applicant's first language. So, is Admissions relying on the student applicant to disclose the information about their first language? As this dissertation shows in Chapter 5, asking a multilingual student to identify their "first language", and even identify what constitutes as a language in their repertoire at all, is problematic in itself. Students in this study often did not identify languages in their repertoires as "languages", and instead referred to them as "dialects". Also, the concept of a "first language" may be confusing to a multilingual speaker, as they might have had a different primary language in their formative years than they do now.

As well as "first language", Admissions webpages also use the terms "native language", "non-native English speaker", and "non-English speaking country" on the Undergraduate Admissions webpages. "Native language" comes with the same problems as does the term "first language". As with some of the student participants, their "native language" is a language that is not their primary transactional language, and in some cases, the primary transactional language in schooling is English (as is the case with several of the student participants in this study). The term "non-native English speaker" and "non-English speaking country" present problems as well, as many scholars have written about (see Kachru, 1965 & 1992 and Canagarajah, 1999a for a more thorough discussion on this). These two terms are from a monolingual point of view which misunderstands the world of multilinguals, and assumes things from a monolingual perspective where a country has one language of transaction

(English or not) and a person is a native speaker of one language (English or another). In fact, multilinguals can be “native speakers” of more than one language, and countries can have more than one language in which its citizens (and visitors) interact, and can certainly have more than one “official” language. To say that there are English-speaking countries and non-English speaking countries is also a fallacy because the majority of English speakers in the world now live in China and India (Wei & Su, 2012). Perhaps “English-speaking country” needs to be qualified in terms of only certain countries that meet the Anglo-native-speaker preferences of UIUC. The Office of Graduate Admissions does indeed specify which countries would be considered “English speaking”, and instructions for how to prove English proficiency if the applicant is from another country not on the list. And still, even if the Office of Undergraduate Admissions provided such a list, there are arguments that would say that list is biased in ways that still privilege Anglo English over other English varieties.

Does Admissions make judgements about students’ names and decide from there whether or not they need to have above-average English section scores on the ACT and SAT? Because they mention “international student”, Admissions definitely makes decisions about whether or not a student does or does not have a “command of the English language” based on the applicant’s citizenship status. One must also assume that this burden to “prove English proficiency” would fall on students who do have U.S. citizenship even more so if they identify as a person who does not have English as their first language. Does Admissions hope that students who think their English proficiency might not meet the standard of “command” beyond proof will simply decide on their own to study for months and pay hundreds of dollars to take an extra standardized test (that test being the TOEFL or IELTS)? And then, if they do not

choose to do so, I argue that the multilingual student applicants are unaware of the implications of self-identifying as multilingual with a language other than English as their “first language”. They are not told of the implications until after admittance, where they receive a letter in the mail stating that they are required to take the English Placement Test, which then will potentially change the courses that they then must take as a student. English language requirements for multilingual international undergraduate students need do be more transparent, stated clearly on websites, and have clearly-articulated reasoning and implications for those requirements.

How does a student applicant feel about the requirement that they need to prove their English proficiency if they grew up speaking a language other than English at home? Even if there are no boxes to be checked on the application process, does this leave the student in fear that they did not complete all necessary steps? This all points to an institutional attitude that does not value nor understand multilingual students growing up in heteroglossic environments. It tells such a student that they need to go a step further to prove their worthiness to attend this university. This hegemony of English and language-as-problem orientation leads to potential discrimination and extra psychological burden placed upon multilingual students that should not be there.

Education campus-wide on the value of multilingualism, the harm of English-only policies, and the benefits of translingual communicative practices. Overall, in order for there to be a shift in language ideology at UIUC, faculty and students (and those involved in language policy and planning on all levels) there needs to be education and an effort to express from a greater institutional level that all languages are valued, accepted, and encouraged so that

learning can be maximized. Instructors could be encouraged to talk about the issue of languaging in the classroom and receive training on multilingualism and language-as-resource and language-as-right orientation. Some resources on campus for instructors about multilingual students to exist at UIUC already. The International Illinois Programs website has a lot of resources for faculty and staff to address “the challenges of international students”. These range from articles on how to pronounce Chinese names to a well-informed and language-as-resource and language-as-right oriented article written by two former Writing Center instructors at UIUC. The majority of resources listed on that website, however, have language-as-problem orientations and have echoes of English hegemony. Additionally, there is a lot of language on those documents that equate “international student” with “Chinese student” or “multilingual student”, as well as frame international undergraduate growth as “challenging” without recognizing them as a large and valuable part of campus. These problems must be overcome through an examination of the materials being offered in light of language-as-resource and language-as-right orientation, as well as an expansion of resources, and the visibility of them to faculty on campus, is necessary.

UIUC needs to recognize that faculty as well as all students must be educated in these ideas, alongside other diversity initiatives, in order to truly be inclusive. Education on seeing language-as-resource and linguistic repertoires as resources as not deficits should also exist for multilingual international TAs and instructors, given that student participants in this study overwhelmingly experienced language management efforts and were encouraged not to use their primary language as a matter of “policy”. Perhaps the instructors that performed that

language management also need to be made to feel that their own multilingualism is a resource, not a deficit, and not something that should be seen in any punitive manner.

One of the problems that I could see with initiating a policy change such as requiring language to be included in diversity and inclusion training, is that it might add more training that faculty and graduate student TAs do not have time for more training, and would not do it unless it is required. However, a study conducted by Nathan Lindberg (2016) of faculty who teach multilingual international students at one university concluded that faculty members in that category are overall very positive about receiving training on how to better serve that student population. Perhaps faculty at UIUC would be as open, as well, and would benefit from training on multilingual international students. I suggest an online training module as the means of this training, because faculty are used to taking mandatory online trainings from the University, and it might make it easier for faculty participation considering their demanding schedules.

Instructors and policy-makers should be educated on the implications of English-only policies in official campus spaces. This study suggests that English-only language management policies on campus have the effect of making multilingualism invisible in campus spaces. Students in this study expressed that they thought they must use parts of their linguistic repertoires in secret (whispering in a corner when they are using a language other than English, or only speaking other languages in unofficial campus spaces). English-only language management policies also were harmful to students in this study socially, as they had to choose between obeying an authority's request for English-only and being socially stigmatized from their peers in their language communities. Additionally, it is perpetuating language folklore to

assert that English-only policies aid in students' educational pursuits, as research shows the benefits of allowing students to use translingual practices in class. Some instructors and policy-makers might assume that students need outside enforcement to help them use spoken English in official campus spaces and ultimately improve their English language proficiency and competence. However, students in this study expressed the desire on their own to improve in their English language proficiency and competency, and chose to use spoken English in certain times for that purpose. While many student participants said that they understood and even agreed with English-only policies in theory, they told stories of how English-only policies were damaging to them. Embracing and encouraging translingual communicative practices could allow multilingual students to self-select language use based on what would be best for their own educational and social well-being, instead of being forced to use or not use certain languages that carry harmful ideologies behind them.

Changes to EPT and ESL requirements. Before I address some of the changes that I recommend for the EPT and ESL requirements on campus, I think it is necessary to address some of the positive things that this study found regarding the ESL Service Courses and specifically, ESL 115. The ESL 115 instructor in this study had a language-as-resource and language-as-right orientation, and this resulted in students in the ESL 115 class to use language in a way that they thought would aid their own understanding of the curriculum, and gave them confidence that the instructor respected and affirmed their linguistic repertoires as multilingual students. It's good that the ESL Service Courses department allows instructors to set the language policy for language management in their own classes. This gives instructors the freedom to explore their own language ideologies and beliefs about learning a second

language, while respecting each instructor's authority in language management practices. This also allows for instructors to set a policy that is contextualized for the different students enrolled in their class. The ESL (and even Rhetoric) departments would do well to give instructor training in language orientations to help their instructors have similar positive attitudes towards the multilingual nature of their classroom spaces, helping them to overcome attitudes of English hegemony and their biases, if any, regarding their own language ideologies (i.e., overcoming a bias of monoglossia as norm).

All of the student participants in this study expressed that they enjoyed ESL 115. They liked the instructor and the atmosphere of the class, saying that they felt comfortable with Elise and felt comfortable asking questions during class. They were pleased with the workload. Many of the student participants liked that they had a chance to interact with peers for group work during the course, as well as a chance to get to talk to the instructor during class. Not all of the students felt that the course was entirely useful for them, but they all did say that they learned some new things about writing in English, or about writing as a student at UIUC, of which they were not previously aware. Most of them specifically mentioned course content related to plagiarism and using the University's library system as being the most helpful aspects of ESL 115. Overall, the students were happy with the course, and according to Elise, most of the participants in the study received an A in the course (with one or two exceptions receiving a B).

The Linguistics Department website regarding the English Placement Test (EPT) and the available ESL courses for undergraduate students is thorough. It gives students good information about what to expect for the EPT, what to expect to learn in an ESL course, and who could or should take the EPT and ESL courses. Once students navigate to that page, they

are able to learn what is included in an ESL writing course and an ESL pronunciation course (the two types of courses available to undergraduates). They are also able to learn information related to registering for ESL courses and general validity information about the EPT. The website does a good job of separating out the differing language policies for undergraduate and graduate students. If a student is directed to that website, the information that they need to make an informed decision about choosing an ESL class is available.

The ESL department at UIUC has done an excellent job of administering the EPT and providing the required ESL writing courses for multilingual international undergraduate students according to institutional English language policy. They hire well-trained faculty, have a guided system of instructor training, observation, and improvement, as well as a solid system of course materials management and development, all overseen by administrators that are well-informed and well-educated in ESL pedagogy. I know these things because of my interaction with the department over the course of 10 years, and because of my own education in and experience with ESL instruction for university students. The ESL department now, and the ESL department in its inception almost 70 years ago, is a group of conscientious and hard-working professionals that care very much about the students that they serve. The University asks a lot of the ESL department without much support in return, and the ESL department gives above and beyond, to the benefit of the students with whom they come in contact. In addition to providing more resources (read: funding) to the ESL Service Courses, UIUC should make better use of the resources that exist in the ESL Service Courses department and its partner department, the Division of English as an International Language. There should be more sharing

of information and collaborating on policy making, both in terms of English language policies from above and English language policies from below.

As for recommendations in this area of the EPT and ESL courses, my thoughts lie in three directions: 1) Recommendations for ESL 115; 2) Recommendations for the EPT; and 2) Recommendations for language policy from above.

Recommendations for ESL 115. What seems to be perpetuating the large enrollment in ESL 115 (I cannot say the same for ESL 111/112), is the students that get to self-select into ESL 115 or Rhet 105. The student participants in this study that self-selected into ESL 115 said that they talked to their peers over Wechat discussion groups, etc., and heard that ESL 115 would be easier, academically speaking, than the Rhet 105 equivalent. Those students in this study admitted that they did learn something in ESL 115, but expressed regret in not challenging themselves further, thinking that they possibly might have learned more in Rhet 105 since ESL 115 was indeed, not very challenging for them. These are the brightest students who are used to pushing themselves academically. The recommendation based on this then, would be that ESL 115 examines its course content to see if there were a way to make it more challenging for students, not for the purpose of making the course harder, but for the purpose of offering a more academically challenging, and potentially more helpful, course for the students. Are there ways to make ESL 115 more similar to Rhet 105, while still offering some different course content from which multilingual international students specifically would benefit?

If, however, Rhet 105 and ESL 115 have communicated well and can say with certainty that course content is similar, but perhaps the main difference is in instructor biases in grading in Rhet 105 (i.e. instructors in Rhet 105 grading down multilingual international students' work

based on certain language ideologies and indexicalities of students' language backgrounds), then what would be beneficial is a more concerted effort on the part of the Office of the Registrar, international student advisors, the ESL Service Courses, and the English Department that houses Rhet 105 to dispense information in an accessible way to students that gives an accurate representation of the pros and cons of each course. This would empower students to make a more informed decision about which course to select, rather than relying on word-of-mouth from peers.

Another recommendation is to make adjustments to the language policy on the recommended First-Day Handout for ESL 115. One of my conclusions from this study is that English-only policies can cause harm to students academically, socially, and psychologically. Instead, I recommend that the First-Day Handout include a section on "Language use in the classroom", where it discusses the empowerment of students to choose what languages to use in the classroom that would best help them improve in their English writing, understand the course content, and help all students to have a good experience in the classroom. This gives students the option of using translingual communicative practices when it would be helpful, recognizes their own responsibility for using their linguistic repertoires to make the most out of their experience in ESL 115, and acknowledges the already-existing respect they have for other students and the instructor in the course. This might also set for them an expectation of language use in other campus spaces, providing an opportunity for a discussion on the value of their diverse linguistic repertoires and how their own multilingualism could be welcomed and accepted, for the benefit of all. As an ESL instructor myself, I would also want to make sure that the discussion included instruction on what truly helps a student improve English proficiency

and competence, encouraging students to see their own competence in different areas of English and, if they desire, help them discover strategies for improving their areas of weakness. For example, students in this study expressed a desire to improve their sociolinguistic competence, so while talking about language use in the classroom, ESL 115 instructors could offer information to the students on the sociolinguistic and pragmatic norms of American university classrooms (i.e., not talking while the instructor is talking, valuing students asking questions, etc.). Acknowledging and embracing translingual communicative practices and the value of multilingualism in the ESL 115 course is a way to make that space simultaneously progressive, instructive, and helpful for its students and faculty alike.

Additionally, I recommend that the ESL Service Courses considers new ways of labeling the students that they serve. There are pejorative connotations to the term “ESL student” now that should be avoided on campus if language ideology is to shift towards language-as-resource and language-as-right orientations. Additionally, consistently referring to students as “international” do not accurately describe the entirety of the students enrolled in ESL courses, as well as the misconceptions that come with labeling a student “international” (i.e., assuming that every “international student” should submit a TOEFL score, is a candidate for the EPT, and is multilingual). I chose to use the term “multilingual international undergraduate student” in this dissertation, and though the “international” part of that label is how all participants in this study self-identified thus making it appropriate for this dissertation, it would not be the best term to use for the ESL Service Courses because of its literal meaning. Removing the word “English” from the label would help to delegitimize the hegemony of English, as well as would adding a some other term that acknowledges the multiple linguistic repertoires that they

possess. This might also mean that the department would need to re-label the courses that they offer, changing them from “ESL” courses to something else. I recommend that the department gives thought to this, and consider other ways of labelling the students that they serve and potentially the classes that they offer.

Recommendations for the EPT. As for the English Placement Test, students in the study consistently expressed their lack of understanding of the purpose of the test. Several students questioned the value of the test and wondered why their TOEFL score was not sufficient to judge their English proficiency. Several students also expressed their opinion that the exam was too long, and that the exam allowed for too much time to finish the required tasks during the exam. If the format of the exam is to not be changed, I recommend that students be given more explicit explanation as to the purpose of the test, the reason behind the structure of the test, and the implications of the test. Additionally, that certain students would need to take an English Placement Test needs to be more visible and accessible to student applicants. Currently, the only places available online that has this information is one blog post on the Admissions blog, and the ESL Service Courses website. I don’t believe that it is likely that students would navigate to those specific pages on their own. I recommend that the EPT requirements, including the possibility of having to register for the EPT, more visible and accessible to students. This information may be sent out to applicants individually via email once they are accepted, but as a language policy management effort, it should be clearer to all applicants earlier on. Who might have to take the EPT and upon what basis? What are the language policies in place that would require a student to take the EPT (i.e. what scores on which exams)? These questions should be addressed in a transparent way to students.

Recommendations for policy from above. In general, UIUC gives the impression that students must reach up to an ideal native-like proficiency of American academic English, but why? As Blommaert points out, we all have truncated repertoires, even in our so-called native languages. If students can take classes, get good GPAs, and produce good academic work, why do we insist that they also must have a certain level of academic proficiency? The Admissions blog says that the requirement to “Prove your English proficiency” is for the benefit of the students, but is it really? Who is benefiting from this policy? Why is the University so afraid of a student being admitted, attending all four years, obtaining a degree, and using multiple languages (perhaps even using other languages more than English) in their linguistic repertoires while they are here? What is wrong about that? Does it threaten the privilege of “native-English speakers”? Why should UIUC be more concerned with privileging the American academic English repertoire, unless it is because it is out of fear of losing that privileged and powerful position of being in the linguistic majority? By demanding that students come and leave with a certain level of English proficiency, UIUC is acting as standard-holders for the English language and what is acceptable language for a university graduate of an American university. But, why do this when the rest of the world, and arguably the majority of the world, uses multiple varieties Englishes anyway? Is an English language policy requiring students to “Prove your English proficiency” really necessary?

Making ESL courses required, and not offering them as an actual service (that is optional), is not doing a service to the student. Could UIUC just let the multilingual international undergraduate students select courses like every other student, and provide actual services for them that help and respect them as individuals who are capable of accessing services when

they want them or need them (instead of increasing the requirements above and beyond that of other students)? I believe the more important mandatory language policy requirement on campus, rather than requiring students to prove English proficiency, would be to help all instructors (TAs and professors alike) have a language-as-resource and language-as-right orientations to language, reducing institutional monoglossic biases. If the University strives to give acceptance and bring inclusion for other aspects of being human, why does it not extend this same acceptance and inclusion to language and linguistic diversity, as well? The dangers of English hegemony are known. Why then does the University reproduce it on campus, potentially furthering linguistic colonialism to the detriment of 25% of its student body and arguably, more, as the numbers of multilingual students on campus are much greater than the number of foreign-passport-holding students?

The students in this study did not seem to struggle with English proficiency to the extent that it had an impact on their GPAs. On the contrary, they were all students who had high GPAs and excelled in the coursework of their respective majors. That is important to note, because many of these students were flagged as students who were required to take ESL 115, presuming that they would not excel in a general Rhetoric course. Perhaps this would be a different conclusion if I had studied students in ESL 111/112, but the question still remains: Who says that these students could not perform well in Rhetoric courses? If we rely on anecdotes from Rhetoric instructors who likely have language ideologies and biases against multilingual speakers, or who at the very least are not well-educated on language-as-resource and language-as-right orientations, then who does the ESL writing course truly benefit?

Are students being filtered into ESL writing courses because of institutional biases and language ideologies against the varieties of English that the students speak? I posit that part of the reason ESL writing courses for undergraduate students exist now, in this moment in time, is because of a belief that students from certain countries have “bad English” and would be scored more harshly by instructors who do not accept the reality and legitimacy of multiple English varieties. In essence, multilingual international students are made to navigate English language policies that are in place because of institutional language ideologies that privilege white, Anglo, specifically American academic English and discriminate against all other English varieties.

Lest I sound like I am advocating for getting rid of ESL courses, I am not. I am merely advocating for the right of students to be better empowered to make their own choices as to which services and courses they access on campus. In fact, students themselves expressed a desire for different types of ESL courses than those that are currently offered to them as undergraduates. While students in this study overwhelmingly said that they chose to take ESL 115 because it would be easier and give them a better grade than Rhet 105, they also said that their main insecurities in their English proficiency do not come from their writing abilities, but from their listening, speaking, and sociocultural skills. They also expressed some anxiety about their formal linguistic competence (grammar and pronunciation).

Students in this study expressed the desire to have access to courses that help them better interact with their English-speaking peers, and some students expressed frustration with or fear of not being understood by those same peers when speaking. This attitude of students agrees with a study conducted by McCrocklin and Link (2016) that concluded that multilingual

international students generally express a desire to have pronunciation that is “native like” (the term is used by the study to represent the majority-speaker American English accent on university campuses in the U.S.), while also concluding that the student participants in the study expressed no concerns about losing their identity if their accents in English became more like those of their American English-speaking peers. The participants only expressed benefits and positive emotions of changing their accents when speaking English. If UIUC were to broaden the offerings of ESL courses, my study and McCrocklin and Link’s (2016) study suggest that courses in listening, speaking, and pronunciation would be popular among multilingual international undergraduate students.

I recommend a reallocation of resources in the ESL Service Courses, in addition to a bolstering of funds from the larger campus budget (giving ESL Service Courses a portion of the international student fee), in order to offer other ESL courses to help meet multilingual international undergraduate students’ felt linguistic needs (sociolinguistic and pragmatic competence, as well as pronunciation, grammar, listening, and speaking in both formal and informal university spaces). The old ways of only, or mainly, providing an ESL writing course for undergraduate students is based on language-as-problem orientation; it is time UIUC moves beyond that.

If this change is not possible to do soon enough, I recommend that incoming multilingual international undergraduate students be made more aware of the pre-Fall semester intensive English language program that the Intensive English Institute department at UIUC offers: Transitions to Illinois. This program offers instruction on English competence in the areas that the student participants in this study expressed the most need for: listening and

speaking in formal and informal campus spaces, formal linguistic competence instruction (grammar and pronunciation), as well as sociolinguistic and pragmatic norms of American university life. That UIUC offers this optional program (at extra cost to the student) does show their awareness of students' felt needs, but information about this program is difficult to locate, accessible only from the Admissions and International Student and Scholar Services webpages (in addition to the Intensive English Institute's own website). One of the limitations of this program is that it is offered only for students during the summer before they begin at UIUC. I recommend that this program be offered to not only incoming students, but also offered, perhaps in a slightly different format, for students like the participants in this study who have already been on campus for some time but still would like to take English language courses to improve their confidence in English communication on campus. This program is not offered through the ESL Service Courses, but is nonetheless an avenue for students to have their felt language needs met, if students were made more aware of it.

Recommended Review of Institutional English Language Policy at UIUC

My final recommendation is a review of institutional English language policy at UIUC by a group of representative stakeholders, including multilingual international undergraduate students. A review is necessary for moving the campus towards a more inclusive perspective of language with language-as-resource and language-as-right orientation, making adjustments in language management efforts as well as the discourse of policy documents so that language use on campus can reflect the embrace of multilingualism and the rejection of English hegemony. The multilingual student stakeholders should be invited to the table and given an

equal voice in this policy review, as they are the lives that are most greatly impacted by the language policies at UIUC.

I anticipate that some might say, as a criticism to my recommendations posited in this dissertation, “But what about the monolingual English speakers?”, or, what they are often referenced as: “the domestic students”. I hesitate to make the claim that the majority of students at UIUC, even looking at undergraduate students, indeed come from monoglossic backgrounds and are monolingual, given that a strong argument can be made that multilingualism is actually the norm for the majority of people around the world, in some way or another. The dominant monolingual paradigm must be challenged at UIUC, and those who hold that paradigm must be educated to see that multilingualism is actually more of the global norm. Thus monolinguals should be the ones to embrace multilingualism, and not the other way around.

Concluding Thoughts

The ways in which the multilingual international undergraduate students at UIUC view their own linguistic repertoires, and what they believe about what it means to “know” a “language” are important. The importance lies in how they view their own ability to live a fruitful life in and succeed at UIUC. Students should not be made to see their truncated repertoires (Blommaert, 2010) from a deficit perspective, which cause feelings of insecurity and self-doubt, and may hold them back from fully participating in courses and interacting with fellow students and instructors. They also should not be made to feel that English is the only language of success in the world, and that their success in life (or at the very least, at UIUC) depends greatly on their spoken English proficiency and competence. Instead, the University

should work to help students see that the linguistic resources that they bring with them to the spaces of higher education are empowering, brilliant, and can lead to their success in all areas of life, instead of something that could hold them back.

The student participants in this study definitely “know” English. They have been studying the English language and studying other subjects through the medium of English for the majority of their lives, as well as successfully living in a predominantly English speaking country and working towards obtaining a bachelor’s degree on a U.S. campus for over six months at the time of this study. No one could argue that they don’t “know” English. I also do not agree with anyone’s assessment that their English is not “good” (not even the students’ assessment of their own language). By any reasonable definition of “goodness”, these students are leading the lives they live precisely because their English is “good”.

The multilingual international undergraduate students at UIUC are indeed vulnerable and at the mercy of others who are in power over them when it comes to language. Many of the student participants in this study had experienced English-only language policies prior to coming to UIUC that had language ideologies that included language-as-problem orientation that also perpetuated English hegemony. Because of that, many of the student participants, if not all, have adopted a similar language-as-problem orientation to language themselves. This orientation serves to undermine their confidence and hold them back from critically enacting and pushing against language policy on campus that may be detrimental to their overall well-being. English-only policy can be harmful to multilingual students. It was harmful to the majority of the participants in this study. It serves to devalue their multilingualism and linguistic repertoires that these remarkable students possess. At UIUC, it can hold them back from

academic pursuits that they would otherwise be able to do. It is socially detrimental to students, where they are forced to choose between adhering to social rules of their language communities or face the possibility of punishment or reprimand from a person in authority and power over them. It also holds them back from communicating with instructors and peers about course content, causing a lack of confidence that leaves them knowing they want to ask questions and pursue thoughts about the content, if only they could do it in a language other than English.

As Thor Sawin (2015) argues, there are hidden “costs” to language policy and language choices that people make, both in language policy from above and language policy from below. Further research should be done to determine those hidden costs to the multilingual international undergraduate students and the institution as a whole at UIUC and at other campuses in the U.S. This not only refers to English language policy implications, but also to real-life, everyday effects of how English language policy at UIUC is enacted. This dissertation touches briefly upon some of those costs, but more inquiry should be done.

If xenophobia and the nation-wide rise in the U.S. of hate crimes associated with the fear of people from other countries is a concern for the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign as it is around the rest of the country, then addressing language policy should be part of the fight against it, as part of the fear of foreignness involves language use. UIUC has a moral responsibility to protect its multilingual international undergraduate students from discrimination and potential harm that could come under the current political climate in the U.S. Thus, UIUC has a moral responsibility to make sure that the linguistic rights of their students are valued and protected, as well. As Sheila M. Shannon (1995) writes, “...the

consequences of linguistic hegemony involve the violation of linguistic rights because all individuals have the fundamental human right to speak their mother tongue” (p. 176). Under no circumstances and for no reason should a university take away a human right of any kind from its students, and language is no exception. UIUC must make a shift in language ideology that sees language as a right and language as a resource; the lives of multilingual international undergraduate students depend on it.

References

- Ahn, E. (2007). A Region Divided/United: Language Policy Developments in the European Union.
- Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The Internationalization of higher education: motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11 (3–4), 290–305.
doi:10.1177/1028315307303542
- Andrade, M.S. (2017). Institutional Policies and Practices for Admitting, Assessing, and Tracking International Students. *Journal of International Students*, 7 (1), i-vi.
- Andrade, M.S. & Evans, N.W. (Eds). (2009). *International Students: Strengthening a Critical Resource*. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Andrade, M. S., Evans, N. W., & Hartshorn, K. J. (2014). Linguistic support for non-native English speakers: Higher education practices in the United States. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 51(2), 207-221. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/jsarp-2014-0020>
- Andrade, M. S., Evans, N. W., & Hartshorn, J. (2015). Perceptions and realities of ESL students in higher education: An overview of institutional practices. In N. W. Evans, N. J. Anderson, & W. G Eggington (Eds.), *ESL readers and writers in higher education: Understanding challenges, providing support* (pp. 18-35). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Andrade, M. S., Evans, N. W., & Hartshorn, J. (2016). Internationalizing higher education: English language policy and practice. In B. Krishna, & C. Foster (Eds.), *Campus support services, programs, and policies for international students* (pp. 188-208). Hershey, PA: IGI Global.

- Angod, L. (2015). *Behind and beyond the ivy: How schools produce elites through the bodies of racial others* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto).
- Association of Public Land-grant Universities. (2012). *The Land Grant Tradition*. Retrieved from www.aplu.org in December 2012.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (2010). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (Vol. 1). University of Texas Press.
- Biklen, S. K., & Casella, R. (2007). *A practical guide to the qualitative dissertation*. Teachers College Press.
- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2014). Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy. In *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (pp. 1-20). Springer Netherlands.
- Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bogdan, R.C. and Biklen, S.K. (1997). *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). *The Forms of Capital*. In *handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*. Edited by: Richardson J.
- Bjorkman, B. (2014). Language ideology or language practice: An analysis of language policy documents at Swedish universities. *Multilingua*, 33 (3-4), 335-363.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1999a). Interrogating the “native speaker fallacy”: Non-linguistic roots, non-pedagogical results. *Non-native educators in English language teaching*, 77-92.
- Canagarajah, A.S. (1999b). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Canagarajah, A.S. (2002). *Critical academic writing and multilingual students*. Ann Arbor,

- Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- Canagarajah, A.S. (2006). The place of world Englishes in composition: Pluralization continued. *College Composition and Communication*, 57, 586-619.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2012). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. Routledge.
- Daller, M.H., & Phelan, D. (2013). Predicting international student study success. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 4(1), 173-193. Doi: 10.1515/applirev-2013-0008
- Davidson, F. (1997). Thoughts on Language Testing at the 50th Anniversary. In P. Goodman (Ed.), *Recollections and Remembrances: 50 Years of DEIL's History* (pp. 51-52). University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign: Division of English as an International Language.
- De Costa, P. I. (2010). From refugee to transformer: a Bourdieusian take on Hmong learner's trajectory. *TESOL Quarterly*, 44 (3), Migration and Adult Language Learning (September 2010), 517-541. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27896744>
- De Saussure, F., & Baskin, W. (2011). *Course in General Linguistics [1916]*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Dictionary.com. (2017). "Xenophobia". Retrieved from <http://www.dictionary.com/browse/xenophobia> .
- Dyson, A. H., Genishi, C., & National Conference on Research in Language and Literacy. (2005). *On the case: Approaches to language and literacy research*. New York: Teachers College Press/NCRL.
- Ellingboe, B.J. (1998). Divisional strategies to internationalize a campus portrait: results, resistance, and recommendations from a case study at a U.S. university. In J.A.

- Mestenhauser and B.J. Ellingboe (Eds.). Reforming the higher education curriculum: Internationalizing the campus (pp. 145-178). Phonex: American Council on Education Series Higher Education.
- English as a Second Language Service Courses. (2016). ESL 115 First Day Handout. [Class handout]. Linguistics Department, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, Illinois.
- Erickson, F. (1985). *Qualitative Methods in Research on Teaching*. Occasional Paper No. 81.
- Erling, E. J., & Hilgendorf, S. K. (2006). Language policies in the context of German higher education. *Language Policy*, 5(3), 267-293.
- European Higher Education Area. (2017). Homepage. Retrieved from <http://www.ehea.info/>.
- Fairclough, Norman. (2006). *Language and Globalization*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2016, November 14). Latest Hate Crime Statistics Released: Annual Report Sheds Light on Serious Issue. Retrieved from <https://www.fbi.gov/news/stories/2015-hate-crime-statistics-released>.
- Foley, A. (2004). Language policy in higher education in South Africa: implications and complications: perspectives on higher education. *South African journal of higher education*, 18(1), 57-71.
- Freire, Paulo. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- García, O. (2011). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. John Wiley & Sons.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). Translanguaging and Education. In *Translanguaging: Language,*

- Bilingualism and Education* (pp. 63-77). Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Goodman, P. (Ed.). (1997). *Recollections and Remembrances: 50 Years of DEIL's History*.
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign: Division of English as an International
Language.
- Guo, Y., & Beckett, G. H. (2007). The hegemony of English as a global language: Reclaiming local
knowledge and culture in China. *Convergence*, 40(1/2), 117.
- Haan, J. E. (2009). *ESL and internationalization at Purdue University: A history and analysis*.
Purdue University.
- Horner, B. & Trimbur, J. (2002). English only and U.S. college composition. *College
Composition and Communication*, 53 (4), 594-630.
- Hsieh, M.H. (2006). Identity development of East Asian female international students with
implications for second-language higher education. *Education*, 127 (1), 3-15.
- Hughes, R. (2008). Internationalisation of higher education and language policy: questions
of quality and equity. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 20 (1), 1-18.
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/hemp-v20-art6-en>
- Hult, F. M., & Hornberger, N. H. (2016). Revisiting Orientations in Language Planning: Problem,
Right, and Resource as an Analytical Heuristic. *Bilingual Review/Revista Bilingüe*, 33(3).
- Hussey, M. (1997). Memories of Twenty-Seven Years. In P. Goodman (Ed.),
Recollections and Remembrances: 50 Years of DEIL's History (pp. 3-4). University of
Illinois at Urbana-Champaign: Division of English as an International Language.
- Hymes, D. (1964). The ethnography of speaking. In T. Gladwin and W.C. Sturtevant
(Eds.), *Anthropology and Human Behavior* (pp. 13-53). New York: Harper & Row.

- Hymes, D. H. (1972). On Communicative Competence. In Pride, J. B., & Holmes, J. (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics*, 269-293. Baltimore, USA: Penguin Education, Penguin Books Ltd.
- Hymes, D. (1980). *Language in Education: Ethnolinguistic Essays. Language and Ethnography Series*. Center for Applied Linguistics, 3520 Prospect Street, NW, Washington, DC 20007.
- Illinois English Language Forum. (2014). Home page. Retrieved from <http://www.ielf.illinois.edu/>.
- ICEF Monitor. (2016, February 12). New report tracks key influencers for international students. Retrieved from <http://monitor.icef.com/2016/02/new-report-tracks-key-influencers-for-international-students/>.
- Institute of International Education. (2016). *Open Doors 2016*. Retrieved from <https://www.iie.org/Research-and-Insights/Open-Doors/Open-Doors-2016-Media-Information>.
- Jenkins, J. (2013). *English as a lingua franca in the international university: The politics of academic English language policy*. Routledge.
- Kachru, B. B. (1965). The Indianness in Indian English. *Word*, 21(3), 391-410.
- Kachru, B. B. (1992). World Englishes: Approaches, issues and resources. *Language teaching*, 25(01), 1-14.
- Kanno, Y., & Varghese, M. M. (2010). Immigrant and refugee ESL students' challenges to accessing four-year college education: From language policy to educational policy. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 9(5), 310-328.
- Kuteeva, M., & Airey, J. (2014). Disciplinary differences in the use of English in higher education: Reflections on recent language policy developments. *Higher Education*, 67(5), 533-549.

- Leonard, D.E.P. (2011). Why we teach “ESL” writing: a socio-historic discussion of an undergraduate ESL program. (Unpublished dissertation). University of California Davis, Davis, CA.
- Levinson, B. A., Sutton, M., & Winstead, T. (2009). Education policy as a practice of power: Theoretical tools, ethnographic methods, democratic options. *Educational Policy*, 23(6), 767-795.
- Li, C. N., & Thompson, S. A. (1989). *Mandarin Chinese: A functional reference grammar*. Univ of California Press.
- Li, G., Chen, W., & Duanmu, J-L. (2010). Determinants of international students’ academic performance: A comparison between Chinese and other international students. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 14, 389-405. Doi: 10. 1177/1028315309331490
- Lichtblau, E. (2016, November 14). U.S. Hate Crimes Surge 6percent, Fueled by Attacks on Muslims. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/15/us/politics/fbi-hate-crimes-muslims.html> .
- Lin, A., & Martin, P. W. (Eds.). (2005). *Decolonisation, globalisation: Language-in-education policy and practice* (Vol. 3). Multilingual Matters.
- Lindberg, N. (2016). *Faculty members' perceptions of teaching writing to students who use English as an additional language* (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University of Pennsylvania).
- Longtin, A. (2017, February). What is the English as a Second Language Placement Test? *University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Admissions Blog*. Retrieved from

<http://blog.admissions.illinois.edu/?p=24583> .

- Martirosyan, N.M., Hwang, E., & Wanjohi, R. (2015). Impact of English Proficiency on Academic Performance of International Students. *Journal of International Students, 5* (1), 60-71.
- Matsuda, P. K. (2006). The myth of linguistic homogeneity in U.S. college composition. *College English, 68* (6), 637-51.
- McCarthy, C., Bulut, E., Castro, M., Goel, K., & Greenhalgh-Spencer, H. (2014). The Argonauts of postcolonial modernity: Elite Barbadian schools in globalizing circumstances. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 12*(2), 211-227.
- McCarty, T. L. (Ed.). (2011). *Ethnography and Language Policy*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- McCarty, T. L., Romero-Little, M. E., Warhol, L., & Zepeda, O. (2011). Critical Ethnography and Indigenous Language Survival: Some New Directions in Language Policy Research and Praxis. In McCarty, T.L. (Ed.), *Ethnography and Language Policy*, (31-52). New York, NY: Routledge.
- McCrocklin, S., & Link, S. (2016). Accent, Identity, and a Fear of Loss? ESL Students' Perspectives. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 72*(1), 122-148.
- Milroy, L., & Muysken, P. (1995). *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Min, Y. K. (2010). *Culture, Cognition, and Context: Situated Literacy Practices of L1 and L2 Writing Programs* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign).
- Mortensen, J. (2014). Language policy from below: language choice in student project groups in a multilingual university setting. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 35* (4), 425-442. DOI: [10.1080/01434632.2013.874438](https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2013.874438)

- Peer, M.K. (1997). A Foreign Idea. In P. Goodman (Ed.), *Recollections and Remembrances: 50 Years of DEIL's History* (pp. 1-2). University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign: Division of English as an International Language.
- Pennycook, A. (2005). Teaching with the flow: fixity and fluidity in education. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 25 (1), 29-43. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02188790500032491>
- Praninskas, J. (1997). Something Special. In P. Goodman (Ed.), *Recollections and Remembrances: 50 Years of DEIL's History* (pp. 5-6). University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign: Division of English as an International Language.
- Preisler, B. (1999). Functions and forms of English in a European EFL country. In T. Bex, & R. Watts (Eds.), *Standard English: The Widening Debate* (pp. 239-267). London: Routledge.
- Prendergast, C. (2003). *Literacy and Racial Justice: The Politics of Learning after Brown v. Board of Education*. Carbondale, IL: SIU Press.
- Ramanathan, V., Morgan, B., & Moore, H. (2007). Non-language policies and ESL: Some connections. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41 (3), Language policies and TESOL: Perspectives from practice, 573-583. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40264389>
- Ricento, T. K., & Hornberger, N. H. (1996). Unpeeling the onion: Language planning and policy and the ELT professional. *Tesol Quarterly*, 30(3), 401-427.
- Rizvi, F. & Lingard, B. (2010). *Globalizing Education Policy*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE journal*, 8(2), 15-34.
DOI: [10.1080/08855072.1984.10668464](https://doi.org/10.1080/08855072.1984.10668464) .

- Sassen, S. (1996). Analytic borderlands: Race, gender, and representation in the new city. In *Re-presenting the city: Ethnicity, capital, and culture in the twenty-first-century metropolis*, edited by Anthony D. King. New York: New York University Press.
- Sassen, S. (2000). Spatialities and temporalities of the global: Elements for a theorization. *Public Culture* 12(1), pp. 215-232. Duke University Press.
- Sawin, T. (2015). What "Getting By with English" Costs: Fieldworkers' Language Choices and Organizational Language Policy. *Reconsidering Development*, 4(1), 3.
- Schwandt, T.A. (2007) *The SAGE Dictionary of Qualitative Inquiry*. Los Angeles, Calif. : Sage Publications.
- Schwandt, T.A. (2013) Lectures from Foundations of Qualitative Research Course, Spring 2013, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Center for World-Class Universities of Shanghai Jiao Tong University. (2014). *Academic Ranking of World-Class Universities*. Retrieved from <http://www.shanghairanking.com>.
- Shannon, S. M. (1995). The hegemony of English: A case study of one bilingual classroom as a site of resistance. *Linguistics and education*, 7(3), 175-200.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2009, January). The stakes: Linguistic diversity, linguistic human rights and mother-tongue-based multilingual education-or linguistic genocide, crimes against humanity and an even faster destruction of biodiversity and our planet. In *Keynote presentation at the Bamako International Forum on Multilingualism, Bamako, Mali* (pp. 19-21).
- Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language Policy*. London: Cambridge.

Steinmetz, K. (2016, November). Dictionary.com's 2016 Word of the Year Is Xenophobia. *Time Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://time.com/4583809/xenophobia-word-of-the-year-2016/>.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Sage.

Sterzuk, A. (2015). The standard remains the same: language standardisation, race and othering in higher education. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 36 (1), 53-66. DOI: 10.1080/01434632.2014.892501

Swain, M. (2009). Linguaging, agency and collaboration in advanced second language proficiency. *Advanced language learning: The contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky*, 95.

Tardy, C.M. (2011). Enacting and transforming local language policies. *College Composition and Communication*, 62 (4), 634-661. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23006909>

Thorne, B. (2005). Unpacking school lunchtime: Structure, practice, and the negotiation of differences. *Developmental pathways through middle childhood: Rethinking contexts and diversity as resources*, 63-88.

The Times Higher Education World University Rankings. (2015). Retrieved from <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/world-university-rankings/2014-15/world-ranking>

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. (2007). *Strategic Plan*.

[http://provost.illinois.edu/committees/gened/Reference/Illinois StrategicPlan.pdf](http://provost.illinois.edu/committees/gened/Reference/Illinois_StrategicPlan.pdf).

Accessed November 2015.

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. (2012). *The UIUC English Placement Test Fact Sheet*. Retrieved from <https://uofi.app.box.com/s/3v1x6vqmb4nxjyvi5y5u> on May 20,

2014.

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. (2013). *2013-2016 Strategic Plan*. Retrieved from <http://strategicplan.illinois.edu>

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. (2014). *International Statistics*. Retrieved from http://iss.illinois.edu/download_forms/stats/fa14_stats.pdf

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. (2015). *UIUC Student Enrollment*. <http://www.dmi.illinois.edu/stuenr/#race> . Updated 2015. Accessed November, 2015.

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. (2016a). *Fall 2015 International Statistics*. Retrieved from http://iss.illinois.edu/download_forms/stats/fa15_stats.pdf .

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. (change 2016b). *Linguistics Department: ESL and Service Programs*. Retrieved from <http://www.linguistics.illinois.edu/students/esl/>.

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. (2016c). *Spring 2016 International Student Enrollment by Department, Education Level and Class*. Retrieved from http://iss.illinois.edu/download_forms/stats/sp16_stats.pdf .

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. (2017a). *2016-2017 Campus Profile*. Available from <http://dmi.illinois.edu/cp/> .

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. (2017b). *Admissions Website*. Available from <https://admissions.illinois.edu> .

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. (2017c). *Freshman profile*. Available from <https://admissions.illinois.edu/Apply/Freshman/profile> .

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. (2017d). *Illinois-China history*. Available from <http://international.illinois.edu/shanghai-office/history.html> .

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. (2017e). *International Student and Scholar Services*

Website. Available from <http://iss.illinois.edu> .

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. (2017f). Statistics. Retrieved from

<http://iss.illinois.edu/about/statistics.html> .

Wardlow, G. (1999). International students of Agriculture in U.S. institutions precursors to academic success. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 30, 17-22.

Waters, G.A. (2001). ESL policy and practice: a linguistic human rights perspective. *The Clearing House*, 74 (6), 296-300. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30192107> .

Wei, R., & Su, J. (2012). The statistics of English in China. *English Today*, 28(03), 10-14.

Yu, Y. (2010). *Attitudes of learners toward English: A case of Chinese college students* (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University).

Appendix A

Student Participant Chart

Name	Citizenship	High school	Languages	Major	Year	TOEFL	SAT
Anna	China	1 public school in China, 1 public school in U.S.	Mandarin, English	Mathematics	Fr	"Above 100"	"Above 2000"
Bo	China1	International school in China	Sichuanhua, Mandarin, Cantonese, Japanese, English	Journalism	Fr	Unknown	2200
Christopher	China	Public in China	Mandarin, English	Accounting	Soph. (transferred from a Chinese university)	101	Not required by UIUC
Dipti	India	Public in India (formerly private), all girls	Hindi, Madwardi, French, English	Art History	Fr	96	Unknown
Gillian	China	1 year public school in China (#1 school in city), 3 years in U.S. schools (2 private, one public)	Mandarin, Jiaxinghua, English	Unknown	Fr	102	2150
Guohua	U.S. permanent resident	Private school in U.S.	Mandarin, Spanish, English	Math/Statistics	Fr	96	1900
Huang	China	Public school in China (#1 in city)	Mandarin, Cantonese, Anhuihua, Manzhua, English	Astronomy and Physics	Junior (transferred from a Chinese university)	102	Not required by UIUC
Kevin	China	Public in China	Mandarin, English	DGS changing to Electrical and Computer Engineering	Fr	Unknown	Unknown
Kirstie	China	Unknown	Mandarin	Mathematics	Fr	99	2060
Lina	U.S.	Public school in U.S. all four years	Mandarin, English	Math and Computer Science	Fr	Not required	1900

Nancy	Malaysia	Private school in Malaysia	Northern Malay, Southern Malay, English	Actuarial Science	Soph.	97	Unknown
Sally	China	1 year public school in China, 3 years private school in U.S.	Mandarin, English	Advertising	Fr	98	1900
Scott	China	Private school in U.S.	Mandarin, Hangzhouhua, Shanghaihua, Japanese, English	Statistics and Chemistry	Soph. (transferred from a Chinese University)	96	2000
Yangjin	China	Public school in China, graduated early then did 2 years of private test-taking school	Mandarin, Anyanghua, English	Engineering Mechanics	Soph. (transferred from U.S. university)	105	1990
Ying	China	Private elite British school in China	Mandarin, Anhuihua, Cantonese, Korean, Spanish, English	Psychology	Fr	107	2000

Appendix B

ESL 115 Suggested Course Syllabus

ESL 115: Spring 2016 Course Syllabus			
Class Week & Days	Class Date & Day	Lesson Topics	Due Dates
Unit 1: Diagnostic Analysis			
Week 1 Days 1 & 2	1/20 W	Introduction to course, Discussion of Diagnostic Exam, Ice-breaker	
	1/22 F	Diagnostic Exam (50 minutes)	
Week 2 Days 3 - 5	1/25 M	Module 1.1 Communication Model & Writing Across Borders	Assign: Reflection #1
	1/27 W	Module 1.2 Audience & Purpose Writer's Help Instruction	
	1/29 F	Module 1.3 Thesis Statements	
Week 3 Days 6 - 8	2/1 M	Module 1.4 Strengthening arguments	Assign: New Draft of Thesis + Body Paragraphs
	2/3 W	Module 1.5 Coherence: Intro & Transitions	
	2/5 F	Module 1.5 Coherence: Cohesive Devices	
Week 4 Days 9 - 11	2/8 M	Module 1.6 PIE	DUE: New Draft of Thesis+Body Paragraphs
	2/10 W	Module 1.7 Introductions & Conclusions	
	2/12 F	Module 1.8 Academic Style	
Week 5 Days 12 - 14	2/15 M	Module 1.10 Peer Perception [Training]	Assign: Complete Draft for Peer Perception
	2/17 W	Module 1.10 Peer Perception [Online] 2.1 Avoiding Plagiarism (10 min)	

	2/19 F	Module 2.2 Paraphrasing [Online] Module 2.1 Avoiding Plagiarism Cont'd	
Unit 2: Pre-Research			
Week 6 Days 15-17	2/22 M	Module 2.2 Paraphrasing Continued	DUE: Final Draft of Diagnostic Revision
	2/24 W	Plagiarism Prevention Tutorial Certification Test (in-class)	
	2/26 F	Module 2.3 Overview of Research Papers	Assign: Pre-Research Portfolio
Week 7 Days 18 - 20	2/29 M	Module 2.4.1 Choosing a Topic	Assign: Reflection 2: Pre- Research Portfolio Assign: Topic proposal
	3/2 W	Module 2.4.2 Choosing a Topic	
	3/4 F	Module 2.5 Pre-research	Assign: Concept Map
Week 8 Days 21 - 23	3/7 M	Module 2.6 In-depth Pre-research: Critical Thinking	Due: Concept Map
	3/9 W	Module 2.7 Research Paper Thesis Statements	
	3/11 F	Library Day	
Week 9 Days 24 - 26	3/14 M	Module 2.8 "Rough" Outline	
	Unit 3: Annotated Bibliography		
	3/16 W	Module 3.1 Source Reliability	
	3/18 F	Module 3.2 Source Relevancy	

Week 10: Spring Break (Saturday, March 19th until Sunday, March 27th)			
Week 11 Days 27 - 29	3/28 M	Module 3.3 Choosing Sources & Refining the Topic	Assign: Reflection #3 Assign: Annotated Bibliography
	3/30 W	Module 3.4 Reflective Writing Module 3.5 Introduction to the Annotated Bibliography	
	4/1 F		
Week 12 Days 30 - 32	4/4 M	Module 3.6.1 Summarizing Sources	
	4/6 W	Module 3.6.2 Summarizing Sources	
	4/8 F	Module 3.7 Reference Page Citations	
Unit 4: Writing the Research Paper			
Week 13 Days 33 - 35	4/11 M	Module 4.1.1 Source Synthesis: Using a Matrix	Assign: IRP
	4/13 W	Module 4.1.2 Source Synthesis: Language & workshop	
	4/15 F	Module 4.2 Avoiding Plagiarism: Quoting & Review of Paraphrasing	
Week 14 Days 36 - 38	4/18 M	Module 4.3 Avoiding Plagiarism: In-text Citations	DUE: Solution 1 Paragraphs
	4/20 W	Module 4.4 Research Paper Introductions	
	4/22 F	Module 4.5 Research Paper Conclusions	
Week 15 Days 39 - 41	4/25 M	Module 4.6 APA Research Paper Formatting Elective Topic	DUE: Complete 1st draft
	4/27 W	Options: 1) Academic Emails 2) Writing Concisely 3) Titles 4) Word Choices (COCA)	
	4/29 F	Module 4.7 Peer Perception + ICES	

Week 16 Day 42 & 43	5/2 M	Individual Conferences—NO CLASS	DUE: IRP At instructor's convenience
	5/4 W	Individual Conferences—NO CLASS	

Appendix C

ESL 115 First Day Handout

(English as a Second Language Service Courses, 2016)

***The text in red can be changed. The rest of the text needs to be the same for ALL ESL 115 First Day Handouts.**

ESL 115: Principles of Academic Writing

Fall 2015

Class: ESL 115 (Section)

Time: 12:00-12:50 MWF

Location: FLB G52

Website: <http://learn.illinois.edu>

Instructor: Cassandra Rosado

Office: 3051 FLB

Office hours: M 1-2; Th 10-11

Email: TBA

Overview: This course is designed to introduce undergraduate international students at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign to the practices of research-based writing for American academic audiences, such as developing a research question, searching library databases, creating an annotated bibliography, synthesizing sources, and drafting and revising research papers. Strategies for avoiding plagiarism will also be introduced and practiced in this process. General principles of academic writing, such as awareness of audience and purpose, coherence and unity, clear thesis statements, PIE structure, and formal academic style, will be also discussed. Readings are used as a stimulus for discussion of a topic and/or as a source of support in writing assignments. Although oral skills are not the main component of this course, students can expect to practice oral English through group discussions, collaborative writing tasks, and peer review.

Grade Policy for the ESL Writing Service Courses:

Undergrads must receive a D- (60%) or above in order to receive the proficiency required for graduation. If you do not get above those marks, you have to retake ESL.

Your grade will be made up of the following components:

ESL 115 Major Assignments	
Diagnostic Essay Revision Assignment	20%
Pre-research Portfolio	15%
Annotated Bibliography (5 sources)	15%
Individual Research Paper (5-7 pages)	20%
Participation & Homework	10%
Attendance	10%
2 Reflective Assignments	5%
Writer's Help eBook Exercises (a minimum of 12 exercises and 3 LearningCurve quizzes)	5%

Grading Scale		
A+ (97-100)	A (94-96)	A- (90-93)
B+ (87-89)	B (84-86)	B- (80-83)
C+ (77-79)	C (74-76)	C- (70-73)
D+ (67-69)	D (64-66)	D- (60-63)
F (0-59)		

Required textbook: *Writer's Help 2.0* eBook

The required textbook for this course is an eBook (online textbook) called *Writer's Help 2.0*. This handbook will be used throughout the course and will serve as a significant resource in three ways: to help you prepare for class, to provide you with extra help, and to offer you practice exercises for independent study. Because it's an online textbook, you can access it on any computer with your individual username and password.

Please purchase this book by the 2nd day of the class. You can purchase an access code at the Union Bookstore, OR directly purchase it online through the course-specific URL your instructor provides you. Please note that you may purchase either 2-year or 4-year access at your own preference.

Student Assessment: There will be no final exam for this course. Your written assignments will be graded on organization, content, conventions and vocabulary/style. All writing assignments are due at the assigned time, and late papers will be penalized. We will employ a process method for completing papers, and you can expect to revise your drafts one or more times before it is considered "done" and ready to be graded.

Course Management System: The course website can be found at: <http://learn.illinois.edu> All assignment and homework information will be posted here. This is also the place that you will submit all of your own work electronically. All essays will be due electronically on the due date by 11:59 p.m. on the course website.

Student Participation: This is an ENGLISH language class. Everyone is here to improve his/her language skill. You must therefore stick to speaking in ENGLISH at all times in the classroom. You are also not allowed to use any electronic devices (e.g. laptops, cell phones) while lectures or activities are in progress. Violating this rule will result in confiscation of your device until the class is over. Frequent violation of these classroom policies will result in a 0-point mark for your participation grade.

Homework and reading assignments may be given daily. Students are expected to come to class prepared to discuss homework and readings. Participation in class discussions and activities is expected and will contribute to the final grade—this includes encouraging the participation of others. A grade of zero will be given to all work missed due to an unexcused absence. Late homework may not be accepted or will be marked down.

Attendance Policy for the ESL Writing Service Courses:

Students are required to attend all classes. If, for some reason, you must be absent, please contact the instructor before class. IF YOU ARE ABSENT, YOU ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL NOTES AND ASSIGNMENTS. Two tardies (times late) count as one absence, no matter if it's 1 minute or 10. If you are tardy more than 20 minutes, it counts as an absence. After three absences, you will receive a verbal warning from the instructor. After four absences, the ESL Writing Director will be notified and you will receive a formal probation warning. After 5 absences, you may fail

the course. Remember, students who are chronically absent or late are in danger of failing the course at the director's discretion.

Plagiarism Policy for the ESL Writing Service Courses:

One of the main goals in this course is to teach you how to avoid plagiarism and how to uphold academic integrity principles. As you know, the consequences of plagiarism are serious. Plagiarism is one type of academic dishonesty which may result in a student's suspension or dismissal from the University. At the very least, it will result in a failing grade in the course at the director's discretion. Therefore, the work you turn in for this class **MUST BE YOUR OWN**. Do not plagiarize or you will receive an F on the assignment and in the course!

All students will be required to submit their major assignments to the Compass 2g UIUC SafeAssignment database in accordance with campus policies and procedures regarding academic integrity, which are set forth in the Student Code at Article 1, Part 4 (http://admin.illinois.edu/policy/code/article1_part4_1-401.html).

All students in this course must complete the ESL Plagiarism Prevention Tutorial and the Certification Test in order to demonstrate a thorough understanding of plagiarism before exiting the ESL Writing Service Courses. In order to pass the test, students should be able to:

- Identify general purposes and need for citations in academic writing
- Recognize what is (not) intellectual property
- Differentiate plagiarism (including inappropriate paraphrase) and legitimate textual borrowing (paraphrasing, quoting, and summarizing)
- Define plagiarism and its possible consequences

The minimum passing grade for the Certification Test is 80%.

Atlas Computer Lab Policy:

Atlas is the campus service that provides the ESL Writing Service Courses with computer labs on the basis that we comply with the following policies:

- 1) You must have a reservation to use a room, and an instructor must be present for the duration of every class meeting.
- 2) Classes are expected to leave on time, and those in FLB must leave at least 5 minutes before we close (M-Th 8pm, F 5pm).
- 3) We do not permit food or drinks without lids in our classrooms.

Campus Emergency Operations Plan: The purpose of this plan is to provide operational guidance for the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign's mitigation, preparedness, response and recovery actions to prevent or minimize injury and/or death to people and damage to property resulting from emergencies and/or disasters of natural, manmade or technological origin. It can be found online at <http://police.illinois.edu/emergencyplanning/index.html>. You are encouraged to sign up for

emergency text messages at <http://emergency.illinois.edu> and you will receive information from the police and administration during emergency situations.

Disability Resources & Educational Services at UIUC

At the University of Illinois, students with disabilities can register with Disability Resources and Educational Services (DRES). International students are able to use the same services and assistance as domestic students.

Often, people think of disabilities as conditions where a person uses a wheelchair or has a sensory impairment, like being blind or deaf. Of course, DRES offers services to students with those disabilities, but students may also use DRES services for non-visible conditions, like ADHD, anxiety disorders, or learning disabilities.

Many students who have significant difficulties with attention, learning, mood, or anxiety may have problems in their classes as a result of these symptoms. In the U.S., these problems are viewed as medical conditions for which a person can receive support from a counselor or medication. In these situations, registering with DRES can help a great deal in your classes. You might also be able to receive extra time on an exam, receive help taking notes in your classes, or request an extension on work.

Some students may think of “disability” as bad, shameful, or something to be hidden. However, at the University of Illinois, we think of disability as simply another way that people can be different from one another. When it’s appropriate, students with disabilities should become registered with DRES to receive the support that they need.

If you are an international student and recognize that you have a problem with attention, learning, mood, or anxiety, you might want to become registered with DRES. If you have questions about becoming registered with DRES, you can contact Dr. Thomas-Stagg (jstagg@illinois.edu). When writing, please provide a little information about yourself and what concerns you are having. Dr. Thomas-Stagg might suggest seeking some kind of treatment (from the Counseling Center or McKinley Health Center), or he might suggest that you sign up for an academic screening so that DRES can learn more about you and make the best recommendation. For more information, you can visit the DRES website: www.disability.illinois.edu.

Appendix D
IRB Approval Letter

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research

Office for the Protection of Research Subjects
528 East Green Street
Suite 203
Champaign, IL 61820



March 1, 2016

Cameron McCarthy
LAS Administration
360 Education Bldg
1310 S Sixth St
Champaign, IL 61820

RE: *International Student Experiences with and Perspectives of ESL Policies*
IRB Protocol Number: 15632

EXPIRATION DATE: 2/26/2020

Dear Dr. McCarthy:

Thank you very much for forwarding the modifications to your project entitled *International Student Experiences with and Perspectives of ESL Policies*. I will officially note for the record that these minor modifications to the original project, as noted in your correspondence received February 23, 2016, including changing the research team, altering compensation, adding administrator interviews, and naming UIUC in published materials, have been approved. It has been determined that the research activities described in this application still meet the criteria for exemption at 45CFR46.101(b)(1, 2).

This determination of exemption only applies to the research study as submitted. Please note that additional modifications to your project need to be submitted to the IRB for review and exemption determination or approval before the modifications are initiated.

We appreciate your conscientious adherence to the requirements of human subjects research. If you have any questions about the IRB process, or if you need assistance at any time, please feel free to contact me at the OPRS office, or visit our website at <http://oprs.research.illinois.edu>.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Michelle Lore".

Michelle Lore, MS
Assistant Human Subjects Research Specialist, Office for the Protection of Research Subjects

c: Natalie Mullen

Appendix E

Interview Protocol for Students

Interview participants: Students enrolled in ESL 115.

Interview questions: These questions were used as a guide for the semi-structured interviews with student participants. They are directed at Spolsky's (2004) three-part language policy framework (language practices, language ideology, language management).

1. When did you come to the states?
2. What are some positive and negative experiences you have had as a university student because you are an international student?
3. What do you think people's attitudes on campus are towards non-native English speakers? (Attitudes of students, professors, staff, etc.)
4. What is your experience with the TOEFL requirements on campus?
5. What is your experience with the English proficiency test on campus?
6. What is your experience with ESL courses on campus: registration for courses, offerings, availability, quality, etc.?
7. What are some experiences on campus you have had because of your English language abilities? (in class, outside of class, administrators, advisors, etc.)
8. Apart from your ESL classes, what are your professors' and instructors' attitudes and policies towards English language? (i.e. do they require your work to have no language mistakes, do they down-grade for English mistakes, do they allow you to speak or write in your native language at all?)
9. What do you think the ideal situation on campus would be for non-native English speakers-- any ideas, policy changes, etc.? Dream big.
10. Any other thoughts or opinions or experiences or ideas regarding English and ESL on campus?