

Major Paper 1: Linguistic Identity Synthesis

For Major Paper 1, we are going to be building on the ideas that we have been discussing in class. In SA 1, you wrote a narrative about how language affects your own identity giving personal anecdotes as evidence. In SA 2, we explored *Mother Tongue* and looked at the ways that Tan uses rhetorical strategies to make her claim about language and identity. The goal of this essay is to have you enter into this conversation, making your own argument about language and identity or language and power. To create this argument, you should synthesize evidence from three of the four course readings and Ted Talk video (Anzaldúa, Baldwin, Lyiscott, Muñoz, and Tan). The guiding questions below will help you come up with some possible ways of addressing this prompt.

Format: 5-7 Pages (12 point Times New Roman, double spaced), MLA or APA formatting.

Guided questions: Please do not attempt to answer all of these questions; they are here to help you to make connections for you to create your own complex claims. That being said, know that this is NOT a comprehensive list for all the questions you could consider, and you may feel free to explore other lines of inquiry—as long as you can relate it to the readings we have done in class.

- What do the authors argue? Are there variations in their arguments? Can you relate your personal narrative to them in any way?
- How do they use different writing tactics to argue their points? What kinds of evidence do they use to support their position? (Think back to SA 2.)
- What do the authors think is the relationship of language to identity? Is language a way to perform identity? Why? How? In what ways do you agree or disagree with them?
- Why is each author's language important to them? How can you relate to this sentiment?
- Why does this whole conversation matter? Why does it matter that people think that non-standard variations of English are lesser? Think about how language discrimination has affected your own life, the lives of the authors, and/or the lives of other people that you know. (Think back to SA1 and SA2.)
- What are the authors' stance about linguistic discrimination? And your own?

- How do the authors use the word language? How do they define language? In what ways is your own definition similar? Different?
- What do the authors think about the use of non-standard varieties of English in an academic setting? And you?

Targeted learning outcomes:

- Recognizing how different elements of a rhetorical situation matter for the task at hand and affect the options for composing and distributing texts. (Outcome 1)
- Coordinating, negotiating, and experimenting with rhetorical effects tailored to a given audience, purpose, and situation (i.e., awareness of rhetorical situation) (Outcome 1).
- Reading, analyzing, and synthesizing a diverse range of texts and understanding the situations in which those texts are participating. (Outcome 2)
- Creating a “conversation”—identifying and engaging with meaningful patterns across ideas, texts, experiences, and situations. (Outcome 2)
- Considering, incorporating, and responding to different points of view while developing one’s own position. (Outcome 3)
- Engaging in analysis—the close scrutiny and examination of evidence, claims, and assumptions—to explore and support a line of inquiry. (Outcome 3)
- Understanding and accounting for the stakes and consequences of various arguments for diverse audiences and within ongoing conversations and contexts. (Outcome 3)
- Designing/organizing with respect to the demands of the genre, situation, audience, and purpose. (Outcome 3)
- Understanding and accounting for the stakes and consequences of various arguments for diverse audiences. (Outcome 3)
- Engaging in a variety of (re)visioning techniques, including (re)brainstorming, (re)drafting, (re)reading, (re)writing, (re)thinking, and editing. (Outcome 4)
- Giving, receiving, interpreting, and incorporating constructive feedback. (Outcome 4).