

SOCIAL CLASS AND
FOREIGN LANGUAGE LEARNING EXPERIENCES

by

Alice C. Astarita

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

(Second Language Acquisition)

at the

The University of Wisconsin-Madison

2015

Date of final oral examination: 5/14/2015

The dissertation is approved by the following members of the Final Oral Committee:

Richard F. Young, Professor, English

Monika Chavez, Professor, German

Mary Louise Gomez, Professor, Curriculum & Instruction

Catherine Compton-Lilly, Associate Professor, Curriculum & Instruction

Jenell Johnson, Assistant Professor, Communication Arts

© Copyright by Alice C. Astarita 2015

All Rights Reserved

Dedication

This work is dedicated to my mother and father whose love, support, and example encourage me to pursue my passions— and persevere!

Acknowledgements

A number of people have walked with me while I researched and wrote this dissertation. First and foremost, my advisor, Richard F. Young, held the standard high and stuck with me even while worked from across the country. His intellectual rigor, sharp editing, and investment in the subject matter greatly improved this project. I am forever grateful for his time and attention.

I have benefitted from the advice and experience of Monika Chavez who generously shared her expertise in survey design and data analysis. Mary Louise Gomez shifted my perspective and taught me to think in new ways. I am also appreciative of valuable input from Jenell Johnson and Catherine Compton-Lilly that served to better frame and contextualize my research. I am thankful for the direction of Sally Magnan who ushered me into the field and expressed confidence in my ability to make a contribution to it. Junko Mori, Dianna Murphy, and Wendy Johnson all contributed to my professionalization and assisted me in countless ways throughout this process. Thank you all for making an investment in me and my research.

I am indebted to the members of the Working Class Student Union for sharing their perspectives with me. Thank you especially to the woman I met one fateful day on Bascom Hill. Our conversations have broadened my understanding of the world and enriched my life. To the participants who entrusted me with their stories: I promise to continue to be a good steward of them.

A community of family, friends, and colleagues have accompanied me on this journey. Thank you for your presence. I hold you in my heart.

Table of Contents

Abstract	vii
Chapter 1: Project Development	1
“Me”search	
Classism and Concerted Cultivation	
Campus Stereotypes Based on Social Class Difference	
Teaching Italian to <i>Coasties</i> and <i>Sconnies</i>	
Allying with the Working Class Student Union	
Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework	15
The Construct of Social Class	
The Relationship Between Foreign Language Study, Higher Education, and Social Class	
Semiotic Processes of Identification in the Foreign Language Classroom	
Goffman’s Stigma Theory: Managing Identity in the Foreign Language Classroom	
Post-structural Conception of Identity	
Conceptualizing Social Class Identity in SLA	
Chapter Summary	
Chapter 3: Social Class in Scholarly Literature	32
Social Class Identity Research in SLA	
Working Class Identity Research	
Working Class “Foreigners” in the Land of Academe	
Social Class Representation in Foreign Language	
Foreign Language Textbook Interpretation	
Communicative Language Teaching and Social Class	
Other Language Teaching Methods and Social Class	
Chapter Summary	

Chapter 4: Methods.....85

Pilot Study

Full Study

Instruments for Data Collection

Context and Population

Recruitment and Participation

Data Analysis

Chapter 5: How is Socioeconomic Difference Recognized and Highlighted in the Foreign

Language Learning Environment?113

Introduction

Social Status at The University of Wisconsin-Madison

Recognizing Social Class in the Foreign Language Classroom

‘Taking Notice’ of Socioeconomic Status

Insights from First-Generation and Working Class Participants

Chapter Summary

Chapter 6: What are Participants from Particular Backgrounds’ Feelings, Dispositions to

Discussion Topics, and Participation Strategies in the Foreign Language Learning

Environment?160

Introduction

Feeling in the Foreign Language Classroom

Disposition to Class Discussion Topics

Relationship between Social Class Background and Disposition to Topics

Insights from First-Generation and Working Class Participants

Chapter Summary

Chapter 7: How Do Participants from Particular Backgrounds Enrolled in Beginning Italian Courses Perceive Representation in the Textbook?	209
Introduction	
Frequency of Textbook Use in Beginning Italian	
Document Analysis of the Beginning Italian Textbook, <i>Avanti!</i>	
Actual and Ideal Representation of Social Class Identity and Socioeconomic Status	
Relationship between Social Class Background and Reported Representation	
Insights from First-Generation and Working Class Participants	
Chapter Summary	
Chapter 8: Implications of this Study, Limitations, and Future Research	238
Project Summary	
RQ1: How is Socioeconomic Difference Recognized and Highlighted in the Foreign Language Learning Environment?	
RQ2: What are Participants from Particular Backgrounds' Feelings, Dispositions to Discussion Topics, and Participation Strategies in the Foreign Language Learning Environment?	
RQ3: How Do Participants from Particular Social Class Backgrounds Enrolled in Beginning Italian Courses Perceive Representation in the Textbook?	
Study Implications	
Limitations and Future Research	
Concluding Thoughts	
References	254
Appendices	265
<i>Appendix A: Coastie Song Lyrics</i>	
<i>Appendix B: Sconnie Song Lyrics</i>	
<i>Appendix C: Sconnie Nation & Bucky's Locker Room</i>	
<i>Appendix D: CoastieUSA</i>	
<i>Appendix E: Rifkin (2003). Sample Lesson Plan</i>	

Appendix F: Questions from the On-line Survey

Appendix G: Semi-structured Interview Protocol

Appendix H: Frequency Tables for Textbook Representation of Social Class and Socioeconomic Status of Participants, Classmates, and Native Speakers

Abstract

Block (2007a, 2012a, 2014) has repeatedly called for increased research on learner social class identity in Applied Linguistics. This study considers how socioeconomic difference is recognized in the US foreign language classroom. It examines curricula that solicit information indicative of learners' social class backgrounds.

French, Italian, and Spanish classes were recruited for an online survey (N = 101) that addressed foreign language learning experiences. Sixteen first-generation and/or working class students completed a follow-up interview using a semi-structured protocol. Results show socioeconomic difference is highlighted by activities that elicit personal information. Parental educational attainment, family income, and number of hours worked affected the amount participants from different social class backgrounds report their classmates and instructors noticed their socioeconomic status. Self-identified lower and upper class participants reported divergent classroom experiences in terms of how comfortable, valued, part of the group, adequate, and heard they felt. Selective disposition toward discussing certain topics suggests that identity management strategies like withholding, modifying, and inventing information described in interviews with working class and first-generation participants are also employed by participants of other social class backgrounds. Finally, the amount a subset of participants (n = 68) indicated their beginning Italian textbook represented the diverse socioeconomic statuses of native speakers differed by first-generation status.

Among this study's implications are the need for increased instructor sensitivity to the way curricula can elicit information that directs attention to socioeconomic difference. It also calls on textbook authors and publishers to represent socioeconomic diversity within the target language culture.

Chapter 1: Project Development

‘Me’search

Dissertation topics often address an issue of psychological importance to the graduate student. This dissertation is no different. My interest in social class is rooted in two significant life experiences. First, my parents each returned to school and changed career paths mid-life which altered our standard of living. Second, between kindergarten and twelfth grade, I attended eight schools in six radically different communities across the United States. With each new enrollment, I was acutely aware of my socioeconomic difference in relation to my classmates.

I spent the first decade of my life in the affluent suburban neighborhoods of Los Angeles and San Diego where I attended public elementary schools with classmates of roughly the same upper middle class background. My mother was the principal of a small public relations firm and my father worked as an engineer in the aerospace and defense industry designing secure communication systems for the military. However, due to government cuts in defense spending in the early 1990s, he was laid off. One year prior to this, my mother had closed her public relations firm and begun theological studies. Once my father lost his job, we moved to be closer to the theological seminary my mother was attending.

The summer we moved, I was sent to camp from the lovely home we owned in Del Mar, California just blocks from the beach. Six weeks later, I returned from camp to a dumpy graduate student sublet in Claremont, California. I was eleven years old. My father was not working, my mother was a full-time student, and our new living conditions were like nothing I had ever known.

Two years later, my mother’s continued theological studies necessitated a move to suburban Connecticut. Since we were no longer living in a college town environment, it was

rather difficult to explain my family's situation. My mother was a full-time student at Yale Divinity and my father attended to the household with the assistance of a live-in helper from Indonesia. Despite having earned straight As at my previous school, I believe the perception that my parents lacked professions prompted the guidance counselor to track me with the second tier students. Though my mother strongly advocated I be placed with the top tier students headed to Ivy League universities and liberal arts colleges, she was not successful.

For high school, I was enrolled in private college prep schools on partial scholarship where I often felt economically underprivileged in comparison to my classmates. I attended boarding school in western Maine for one year and an Episcopal day school in Bethesda, Maryland, just outside Washington, D.C., for my final three years. I commuted to this school from College Park where my mother served as a chaplain at the University of Maryland. Living in an apartment near the university in the predominantly African-American Prince George's County marked me as 'other' among my classmates. They tended to live in homes in the predominantly white suburbs of Montgomery County that surrounded our school.

When my mother could not drive me to prep school, I used public transportation. On occasion, this made me late to my first class, Advanced Placement History. Just after walking into class especially late one day, an announcement over the PA system stated there was a car in the student parking lot with its headlights on. Our teacher paused at the front of the classroom, turned, and chastised me, "I guess that wouldn't be your car, now would it?" I don't know whether she assumed I had driven myself to school or whether was she making fun of me because I didn't have my own car like the majority of my classmates. In either case, her remark drew attention to a material good my classmates knew I lacked, and indicated my comparatively

lower socioeconomic status. I felt humiliated. My internal reaction registered with her and she apologized after class; but I never forgot the experience.

I graduated *cum laude* and attended Wellesley, an elite women's college in Massachusetts. That same year, after returning to school to retrain in computer programming, my father began working for the government. A few years later, my mother became an associate rector at a large suburban parish in Montgomery County. By the basic measures of income, occupation, and education, our family had regained its socioeconomic footing. But, the instability I experienced during my formative years (grades 5-12) cultivated a sensitivity to social class bias unlike that of my upper middle class peers.

Classism and Concerted Cultivation

I also attribute an early awareness of social class and its relationship with language to the continuous presence of nursing assistants from various socioeconomic and cultural backgrounds in our home. They were employed twice daily and occasionally lived-in to care for my father who had multiple sclerosis and used a wheelchair. As a child, I was curious about these nursing assistants' cultural values, ways of speaking and being. However, I was taught not to emulate them or become close with them, and admonished if I did.

Grammar, enunciation, table manners, appearance (including dress, hair, posture), and conversation topics were all closely monitored, evaluated, and commented in my family. My father's strong New York accent concerned my mother so much that she tape recorded him so he could hear it for himself. She had learned from her mother that certain accents marked you and she feared his would hinder his career advancement.

While attending the University of Delaware in Newark, my maternal grandmother had been ridiculed for her own “down state” accent. Although the state of Delaware is only 96 miles long and 30 miles wide, the way she spoke marked her as a “country bumpkin.” Whenever I visited her, she always corrected my speech. For example, she insisted I accentuate the difference between ‘t’ and ‘d.’ Would you ask the *waiter* for a glass of *water*?

Very simply stated, classism is the privileging of one group’s particular ways of doing and being over other another’s. Like racism, classism is carefully taught. It can be passed down from generation to generation as a way of seeing the world through a prejudiced lens. My grandmother’s acceptance of classist beliefs about accent has resulted in a concerted cultivation of speech that spans three generations of my family. This hyper-vigilance and incessant commenting on one’s accent, grammar, manners, and dress has also had a distancing effect. It upset me that my grandmother seemed so focused on my grammatical missteps, casual pronunciation, and teenage dress! It felt as if she could never get past the surface and really get to know me. Over the years, I have come to understand that she was teaching me how to avoid the pain she had suffered at university when her classmates mocked her “hick” accent.

While my grandmother accepted her college peers’ classist valuation of her accent, she could have chosen to reject it. She might have cultivated a feeling of pride for her southern Delaware roots, the farmland granted to her ancestors by William Penn, and the agricultural innovations for which her college-educated father was well-known. Instead, she worked to eradicate her unsophisticated accent so that it would not detract from people’s assessment of her. I assume she did not wish for this perceived shortcoming to prevent her from achieving her goals, both social and educational. Her decision to obfuscate her background by speaking

differently in order to better blend in reminds me of the stories I heard while interviewing first-generation and working class students for this research project.

Campus Stereotypes Based on Socioeconomic Difference

Classism within the student population at the University of Wisconsin-Madison can be seen by examining two commonly used campus stereotypes: *Sconnies* (people from Wisconsin) and *Coasties* (people from the East Coast or out-of-state). On the surface, these stereotypes indicate a geographic difference. However, if you look closely, these stereotypes are indicative of socioeconomic difference.

According to the *Data Digest* for 2011-2012 (the year this data was collected), 40.4% of students enrolled in the Fall 2011 semester were non-residents. However, under the Minnesota Compact, 13.2% of these non-resident students pay in-state tuition (p. 12). The remaining 27.2% of enrolled students pay non-resident tuition (Office of the Provost & Office of Budget, Planning and Analysis, 2012, p. 12).

In 2011-2012 the yearly undergraduate tuition rate was \$9,671 for residents and \$25,421 for non-residents (p. 80). Factoring in books, living costs and travel expenses, the report estimates the annual total cost of attendance for residents and non-residents as \$22,542 and \$39,201, respectively (p. 80).

Setting aside the fact that both residents and non-residents benefit from financial assistance and student loans, we can put the above stated numbers together for a rough idea of the undergraduate student body's socioeconomic make-up. In the 2011-2012 academic year, just over a quarter of undergraduates (27.2%) needed \$16,659 more to finance their education than the vast majority (72.8%) of the undergraduate population. The disparity in cost of attendance for

instate and out-of-state students is one truth that contributes to the Coastie/Sconnie stereotype and contributes to a divide on campus.

These geographic and economic divisions within the student body were underscored in 2009 when UW-Madison students Quincy Harrison and Cliff Grefe received national attention for their YouTube music video entitled “Coastie Song (What’s a Coastie?)” (Zooniversity, *n.d.*). The two musicians are known as Zooniversity and together they crafted lyrics that illustrate the characteristics of the Coastie stereotype (see Appendix A). Their lyrics depict Coasties as female students from the East Coast who wear brand names (Ugg, Northface, Gucci), drink pricey coffee (Starbucks), possess expensive electronics (Blackberry, ipod) and reside in the Lucky Building, a high-end apartment building that boasts a concierge and doorman (see full lyrics in Appendix A).

Following a basic definition of social class put forth by Connel *et al.* (1982), which states that class is “not what people are, or what they own, so much as what people do with their resources,” these lyrics draw attention to class disparities in the student body by describing the stereotypical spending habits of a particular group of non-resident students (p. 33). Instead of sparking a conversation about socioeconomic difference on campus, the song attracted attention for what some considered an anti-Semitic tone in the lyrics (Johnson, 2009). To clarify the song’s message for *The Badger Herald*, a student newspaper, Zooniversity’s Quincy Harrison stated: “It isn’t a hate song, listen close and you’ll see it’s a playful way of showing Coastie love” (Truong, 2009). Perhaps to prove his point, Harrison produced the video for “What’s a Sconnie? (Sconnie Song)” written as a response to the Coastie song by artists TayTay, AOL and Booty B (*n.d.*). The songwriters changed the lyrics of the original to depict resident students or Sconnies.

Like the original song about Coasties, this one describes Sconnies in terms of their stereotypical consumption habits. However, in contrast to Coasties' high-end purchasing preferences, these lyrics identify Sconnies as those who eat at McDonalds, live in the run-down houses on Breese Street, wear unfashionable hunting hats, and drink cheap beer (see full lyrics in Appendix B). Both the Coastie and Sconnie stereotypes center around how each group uses its resources.

Interestingly, each term has been co-opted and commercialized with the intention of transforming all negative connotations into points of pride. Five years prior to the Coastie-Sconnie lyric battle, UW-Madison freshmen, Ben Fiechtner and Troy Vosseller, capitalized on the Sconnie identity and founded Sconnie Nation, "...with the goal of spreading Sconnie pride across the country" (*n.d.*). They sell red t-shirts patterned after the University of Wisconsin-Madison's arched white-lettered WISCONSIN t-shirts, only theirs read SCANNIE (see Appendix C). According to their website, Sconnie pride may be expressed for "anything of or relating to Wisconsin."

Sconnie is an identity. It can be used as a noun ("I am a Sconnie") or an adjective ("Look at that Sconnie truck"). You don't have to be from Wisconsin to appreciate the Sconnie movement. It's all about embracing and celebrating this genuinely Wisconsin-esque environment we call home. Sconnie is tailgating, bowling, bubblers, washing cheese curds down with a beer, having a tractor-shaped mailbox, or eating a cream puff. If you like eating a brat and cheering for the Pack, you know what we're talking about.

(Fiechtner and Vosseller, *n.d.*)

These entrepreneurs envision the Sconnie identity as open to anyone. In fact, their whole enterprise is promoted as a *lifestyle* with the slogan, "Original Apparel Celebrating the

Wisconsin Lifestyle.” This idea is emphasized by their description of who might identify as Sconnie: “Anyone from Wisconsin, who attends school in Wisconsin, or just loves the dairy state in general can identify with Sconnie” (Fiechtner and Vosseller, *n.d.*).

According to the co-founders of Sconnie Nation, Sconnie is not merely a geographically-oriented stereotype. For them, Sconnie represents values of a particular social class—the same penchant for beer, football, tractors, regionalisms, and brats echoed in the song “What’s a Sconnie? (Sconnie Song).” Sconnie Nation celebrates the things this geographically diverse social class likes to do with its resources and profits by selling the t-shirts that symbolize it.

The origins of the Coastie stereotype have been explored in campus-wide discussions about whether it is in fact an anti-Semitic slur (Allen, 2010). While crossing the street in front of the business school in the summer of 2012, I noticed a man wearing a red t-shirt with white letters reading *COASTIE*. I stopped him and asked where he acquired the shirt. He made them. The company he started with his partner, CoastieUSA, sold American Apparel t-shirts printed just like the Sconnie Nation t-shirts (see Appendix D). He told me: “We started CoastieUSA because we believed the term Coastie was “given” from a negative position, perhaps derogatory and potentially anti-Semitic. Hence, we were looking to put a more positive spin on the word. In addition, we felt that those who decided to sport the shirt would do so with a sense of cultural pride (V. Vitale, personal communication, February 5, 2015). Interestingly, Vito’s life story contrasts with the elements that make up the Coastie stereotype on campus: He is a first-generation college student from Wisconsin who graduated from the Business School, owns a painting company, and is trying to break into the real estate business.

Teaching Italian to *Coasties* and *Sconnies*

Before arriving in Wisconsin, I had no first-hand experience with the Sconnie lifestyle. All of my family's moves had been within Southern California and along the Eastern and mid-Atlantic seaboard. We were, however, devoted fans of *A Prairie Home Companion*, a weekly variety radio show whose featured segment, "The News from Lake Wobegone," describes small town Minnesota life. Arriving in Madison for the first time in the dead of winter, I couldn't believe my eyes when I saw the frozen lake dotted with shacks. Since Lake Wobegone stories are fictional, I never imagined that people *actually* ice-fished! Over the years, I have come to understand that much of my initial confusion and occasional aversion to the Sconnie lifestyle can be attributed to my social class background. Potlucks, (ice) fishing, hunting, watching football, drinking beer, and barbequing were decidedly *not* a fixture of my childhood.

As a teaching assistant for Italian at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, I took note of the differences between my students and me. In my second semester of teaching, one particular interaction truly baffled me. It occurred on the first day of class after going over the syllabus and explaining an attendance policy that allowed for five total absences throughout the 16-week semester. When class ended, a bearded student approached me and explained that he would have to miss more than the allotted five classes during hunting season. Incredulous, I told him skipping class to go hunting would jeopardize his grade and asked him whether he could go once the semester had ended. To me, going hunting did not constitute a valid excuse for missing class the same way an important family event in my own life experience might—for example, a wedding. At the time, I did not appreciate that families often have a tradition of hunting together. And, most importantly, there is a specific season in which hunting is permitted! The student chose to drop my Italian course.

While teaching Italian, I also observed interactions among my students as we completed language learning activities that required them to share personal details about themselves. During a summer session Italian course in my second year of teaching, the class was learning vocabulary related to housing. Using a clear overhead sheet and marker, I asked students to design their dream home, label it using the chapter's vocabulary, and present it to the class using the conditional (e.g., "My dream house *would have* a swimming pool.").

One student from New York City drew a large house in the country nestled among rolling hills complete with grazing horses. Using the overhead projector, she presented her dream home to the class; however, she used the present tense. When I prompted her to use the conditional, it became clear that she had drawn her family's *actual* country house in upstate New York. On previous occasions, the same student had offered other details of her life, including attending a private high school in New York City with the children of various famous people. These stories seemed to indicate a life of comfort and privilege to the other students and me. She seemed to be the epitome of the Coastie stereotype.

The next student to present a dream home began his presentation by emphasizing that his drawing was not his *actual* home and, contrary to the presentation by the student from New York City, his was in fact an *imagined* dream home. Throughout the rest of the course, I remarked that the student from New York City refrained from sharing any more details of her life with the class.

These experiences came to mind as I read about identity research in Second Language Acquisition (Lin, 2008). Of all the identity categories considered in this line of research (including race, ethnicity, nationality, sexual orientation, and gender), I noted that learners' social class background was not considered. In his 2007a review of identity research, David

Block had called for studies to focus on social class identity. I began to consider how one might go about it. The major issue to resolve, of course, would be how to identify participants' social class.

In Fall of 2009, I was walking down Bascom Hill reading the signs stapled to sticks and pushed into the soil along the pathway. Campus student groups reserve this area to communicate messages to the student body as they traverse the campus. On this day, the laminated signs listed facts and figures about first-generation college students and quotes related to working class identity. When I reached the bottom of the hill, I introduced myself to a woman who was knocking the last sign into place. She worked with the Working Class Student Union, a student group formed to support first-generation college and working class students. The group seemed like the perfect population for my research study on social class and foreign language learning. Rather than assign participants a social class based on objective measures that may not ring true to their cultural experience of social class, I had found a population whose social class identity was self-identified.

Allying with the Working Class Student Union

The University of Wisconsin-Madison is the first institution to host a student organization that supports first generation, working class, transfer, and non-traditional students. The Working Class Student Union (WCSU) was founded in October of 2007 by Chynna Haas, a student who “felt that working class students shared a unique identity that had traditionally been silenced” (2014). Through the organization Chyna wished to help students with this particular background have their voices heard.

WCSU creates a supportive network for first-generation and working class students, advocates for the issues that impact its members (like tuition increases) as well as disseminates educational resources about social class diversity to the campus community. The *About Us* section of the group's website states:

WCSU supports and advocates for first-generation, non-traditional, transfer and working class college students while educating the campus on the benefits of celebrating class diversity. Our goal is to offer a safe community where people can share their unique experiences, knowledge and goals. Through peer counseling and social & educational events, WCSU aims to create a campus where achieving academic and career success are possible for students of all socioeconomic backgrounds. We also serve as peer advocates for students who need support when attending meetings with advisors, the financial aid office or confronting an uncomfortable situation. We offer our services to all students and our educational workshops to individuals and groups alike, including student orgs, residence halls and faculty. WCSU staff also offer insight on class issues and experiences for panels or classroom discussion. (2014)

Since I self-identify as upper middle class and was a traditionally-aged, unmarried, childless, non-transfer student while attending college, I felt in order to be a self-aware, effective researcher, it was especially important that I familiarize myself with the issues of concern to WCSU group members and their struggles at university. I reached out to the woman I met on Bascom Hill, explained my developing research project, and asked her whether group members might be interested in speaking with me. In the Spring and Summer of 2010, I conducted many hours of exploratory interviews and conversations in order to better acclimate myself to the needs and concerns of first-generation and working class students.

However, I did not wish to be perceived as an outsider who used the group for research. Rather, I wished to contribute to the organization by becoming involved and doing what I could to further its mission. While completing these pre-pilot interviews, I posted fliers around campus, participated in brainstorming activities, assisted with the editing of important documents, and used my professional contacts on the Working Class Student Union's behalf.

I continued to volunteer my time with the Working Class Student Union throughout my pilot study (AY 2011-2012). I hung event posters and completed other administrative tasks. I helped man the table at the student organization fair and carried WCSU signs during the 2011 Act 10 protests at the Wisconsin State Capitol. In Spring 2011, when funding eligibility was in question, I spoke on behalf of the organization in front of the Associated Students of Madison (ASM). I attended nearly all the events held by the organization including issue meetings, keynote speeches, and staff meetings (when invited). In Fall 2011, the president asked that I act as an informal advisor to the organization. She included me in a team building adventure learning program (ALPS) course along with the other WCSU officers.

I see my dissertation as an extension of the Working Class Student Union's mission to educate the entire campus about class-related issues. I have experienced my involvement in the organization as one of mutual consciousness-raising. Just as listening to members' life experiences has helped me to expand my awareness, I believe sharing stories from my life experience along with my research interest offered those with whom I interacted another perspective. As with the eradication of racism, classism will only be eliminated through cross-class friendships and alliances.

When I assess the research topics of interest to me, I note that I gravitate to the stories of the marginalized, whether the marginalization be due to minority language status (Astarita

2008a, 2009), learning “disability” (Astarita 2008b) or, in the present case, social class affiliation/background. In writing this dissertation, my intention has always been to use my relative privilege to advocate on the behalf of first-generation students and working class students.

In Chapter 2, I will frame my study by discussing the definition of social class, the relationship between foreign language learning and social mobility, identity theory, social class identity research in Second Language Acquisition (SLA), and stigma theory (Goffman, 1963).

Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework

In the sections below, I refer to the work in sociology and anthropology that assist me to conceptualize social class identity. I also review Goffman's stigma theory (1963). I will show how the study of social class identity within foreign language education is important, significant, and of interest to the field of Second Language Acquisition.

The Construct of Social Class

Defining and operationalizing social class. As the study of the development, structure, and functioning of society and its problems, sociology is most directly positioned to investigate social class. Yet, within this field there is significant disagreement about how to define it.

Variables such as income, education, and occupation can be used as proxies, but debate about how and whether to combine them to index social class is on-going within the field of sociology (Lareau, 2008). As social class is taken up as an identity construct in Applied Linguistics, the field will likely undergo its own debate about how to best to define and operationalize social class identity.

Currently, David Block is the leading Applied Linguistics researcher taking theoretical stands on this topic (2014). He does not support using index-based approaches, nor does he find self-identification to be useful. He prefers operational categories like those used in the Great British Class Survey (personal communication, April 13, 2013). For this survey, sociology researchers Devine and Savage drew on Bourdieu's concept of capital (1984) and designed a series of questions that measure one's cultural, social, and economic capital. For example, based on my high cultural capital (100/100) and social capital (70/100), but low economic capital (22/100), I result as an Emergent Service Worker. Their results pinpoint seven distinct social

classes in Britain today, including: Elite, Established Middle class, Technical Middle Class, New Affluent Workers, Emergent Service Workers, Traditional Working Class, and Precariat (Savage et al., 2013). A simplified version of the survey is available online (<http://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-22000973>).

Present study. Due (in part) to this project's genesis working with the Working Class Student Union, I have used a combination of self-identification and indexical approaches in this research project. This choice contrasts with Block's views, but I reasoned that since my participants were college students, they were still in formation and it would be difficult to create productive categories based on Bourdieu's idea of capital (1984). When working with a student population, first-generation status (i.e., neither parent graduated from a four-year college/university) is a useful proxy for social class. Self-identification as being raised in a family of a particular social class (lower, working, middle, upper) also assisted me to understand variations in my data. In the end, I used a combination of these two variables to create seven participant groups: 1) first-generation lower class, 2) first-generation working class, 3) working class without first-generation status, 4) first-generation middle class, 5) middle class without first-generation status, 6) first-generation upper class, and 7) upper class without first generation status. Participants were grouped based on their answers to two survey questions in which they indicated their first-generation status and identified themselves as being raised in a lower, working, middle, or upper class family (see Chapter 4).

The Relationship Between Foreign Language Study, Higher Education, and Social Class

Meritocracy. In indexical approaches to social class, education is a key component. The United States is commonly (and uncritically) referred to as a meritocracy; a society where education will even the playing field for all to prove their innate ability (Goldthorpe & Jackson,

2008). The basic idea of a meritocracy is that opportunities for advancement should be made available to people based on their abilities (as certified and approved by educational institutions), not based on other attributes such as ethnicity, race/color, sex, age, family status, pregnancy, citizenship, disability, veteran status, national origin, creed, or genetic information. In the US, these attributes are protected by the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Education Amendments Act of 1972, and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and included in non-discrimination policies. However, social class identity and socioeconomic status are not protected classes.

The concept of meritocracy was developed by the sociologist Michael Young (1958) as a satirical critique of Britain's Education Act of 1944. Though the act was intended to provide a secondary education for all, Young felt it exacerbated social stratification by pre-selecting students for particular employment (i.e., tracking). Beginning in the 1970s, the term was picked up and used positively by American intellectuals (Goldthorpe & Jackson, 2008).

Foreign language requirement as gate-keeper. Foreign language courses function as a gate-keeping mechanism that must be negotiated to enter and exit higher education. The amount of pre-collegiate foreign language study a student completes tracks him to particular higher education institutions. For example, the language requirement for admission to The University of Wisconsin-Madison is two years of a single foreign language for admission, but four years are typical for admitted applicants (Office of Admissions at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2011). In fact, Reagan and Osborn (2002) argue that the *main purpose* of foreign language classes at the pre-collegiate level is not fluency in the target language, but the fulfillment of college entrance requirements:

Taking (and passing) foreign language classes often functions as a necessary condition for admission to college. In other words, getting through a couple of years of foreign

language classes is simply one of the hurdles that one must endure to get into higher education (which, in turn, is a hurdle that is for the most part required for social class maintenance and upward mobility). This is the function, rarely articulated publicly...that...would seem to be served by secondary level foreign language classes. (p. 5)

According to Regan and Osborne (2002), foreign language teaching fails to achieve the stated goal of proficiency due to a combination of factors. First, foreign language instruction does not begin until middle or high school as opposed to elementary school. Second, due to fire drills, pep rallies, snow days, and student absence, the amount of instruction time at the pre-collegiate level is less than the 150 required contact hours for proficiency estimated by Liskin-Gasparro (1982). Lastly, ineffective teaching methods and few opportunities outside the classroom “to utilize the target language in meaningful ways” hinder language learning at the pre-collegiate level (Regan and Osborne, 2002, p. 4). Based on this continued low level of achievement in foreign language at the secondary level, Reagan and Osborn (2002) claim that the justification for continued foreign language study is related to class mobility via access to higher education rather than fluency in the language.

The study of foreign language is an integral part of social class maintenance and mobility because it must be negotiated not only to enter particular institutions of higher education, but it is often required to *exit* them. At the University of Wisconsin–Madison, there are foreign language requirements that must be fulfilled to graduate. These vary depending on major, degree, and school. For example, undergraduates enrolled in the College of Letters and Sciences must take between 1-3 semesters of a foreign language depending on whether they are pursuing a B.A. or a B.S. degree (Languages at UW-Madison, 2015). These requirements may be fulfilled by using a

combination of the time spent studying foreign language in high school and study at UW-Madison.

In contrast, foreign language study is not required for acceptance or graduation from two-year and vocational institutions. For example, to be accepted at Madison College, an area vocational community college, there is no general foreign language requirement. There is also no general language requirement to fulfill in order to graduate (Madison Area Technical College, *n.d.*), yet they do offer language courses.

A 2011 advertising campaign featured on the sides of city busses promoted Madison College using the slogan “Real World Smart” which implies that the courses taught have real world application. One could argue that due to the population of Hmong who have lived in the area for 40 years, a Hmong language course has real a world application (Cassidy, 2015). Yet, Madison College offers Arabic, French, Mandarin Chinese, and Spanish (Madison Area Technical College, *n.d.*). Since there is no foreign language requirement at Madison College, students may enroll for personal interest or the “real world” motivation to earn liberal arts transfer credit to the University of Wisconsin-Madison, the four-year institution down the street (Madison Area Technical College, *n.d.*).

To further emphasize the role of foreign language study in students’ access to particular types of higher education, consider the 2011 advertising slogan of another area institution, Herzing University. It is, “Real Students. Real Success.” This primarily career-focused, for-profit institution requires no foreign language for admission just like Madison College. However, in contrast to Madison College, it does not offer any foreign language classes (Herzing University, *n.d.*). One can surmise that for the students who attend Herzing University, the “real world” has

rendered foreign language study completely irrelevant to achieving career goals and “real success.”

The foreign language admission and graduation requirements for the above institutions illustrate the role of foreign language in accessing higher education. If a student’s goal is to attend a top tier four-year institution like the University of Wisconsin-Madison, it is imperative that he take foreign language prior to applying for admission. Reagan and Osborn (2002) hold that the primary function of foreign language courses prior to the collegiate experience is to fulfill entrance requirements rather than achieve language fluency. Of the participants in the present study, 43 of 101 participants agreed that fulfilling the language requirement to graduate from The University of Wisconsin-Madison was among their reasons for enrolling (see Table 4.5).

Semiotic Processes of Identification in the FL Classroom

Identity is constructed via identification processes that orient or align one to a particular identity; in the case of this study, social class. These four semiotic processes are: practices, indexicality, ideology, and performance (Bucholtz and Hall, 2004). All four semiotic processes are activated in the foreign language classroom.

As Bucholtz and Hall (2004) explain, throughout childhood and into adulthood, we are socialized into specific *practices* that make up our *habitus* (Bourdieu, 1977). Foreign language students acquire knowledge about language and culture that they put into specific social practices (i.e., greeting routines, hand gestures, linguistic ticks, the inadvertent scrambling of their native language syntax). The repetition of these specific practices *index* particular social meanings, for example, a cultured, bilingual or worldly person. *Ideologies* about foreign language learning—

the purpose and usefulness of it and the social class ideology found in the textbook—all work on the student's identification with the target language culture and others. These practices may differ from those into which they were socialized throughout childhood and early adulthood which can require students to *perform* a different identity.

I hypothesized that the teacher, textbook, and institution work to socialize students into a middle class habitus by asking students to engage and enact middle class practices. The social inequality (Philips, 2004) between student and teacher present in the classroom grants power to the teacher to elect topics of discussion, coerce answers from students, and ratify them as acceptable or unacceptable. These class discussion topics (i.e., leisure activities, description of family members, vacation experiences) and textbook vocabulary lists can leave out the practices and experiences of students from working class backgrounds. At an institutional level, the language requirement ensures all students are exposed to this kind of socialization.

Goffman's Stigma Theory: Managing Identity in the Foreign Language Classroom

Goffman's concept of stigma is a useful lens through which to see data related to social class identity and foreign language learning in a classroom setting. Sameness and difference orient a person to the identification with a group (Bucholtz and Hall, 2004). Likewise, the group orients toward a person.

Goffman builds his theory of stigma on structural preconditions. First, it is elaborated based on the idea that society categorizes people according to social settings and the people one presumes will be encountered in a particular setting (Goffman, 1963). In an R1, top tier university setting, for example, we are likely to encounter people whose parents also attended

college and those who have the resources to afford tuition. Students from underprivileged backgrounds and those unable to afford tuition are not expected members of the community.

Another structural precondition is that a person's social identity is determined by his appearance, both personal and structural attributes. By personal attributes, Goffman means clothing and grooming. By structural attributes, Goffman means occupation and other status signifiers. It is anticipated that strangers will meet the normative expectations for a particular social setting, which constitutes his virtual social identity. When a stranger's social identity differs from what is expected, his *actual* social identity is manifested (Goffman, 1963). In the foreign language classroom students are expected to share personal information about their lives to practice speaking. This sharing allows his classmates and instructors to make an assessment of his actual identity with respect to his virtual one. For example, if the foreign language instructor, classmates, and the textbook anticipate a student will share information that indicates a middle class background (i.e., educated parents with white collar jobs), but instead a student shares that he is the first in his family to attend college and his parents work at a factory, a student's virtual and actual identity must be reconciled.

Stigmatization. Attributes and evidence can confirm or disconfirm the stranger's categorization. Given middle class expectations of the foreign language curriculum, students who have not previously been socialized into a middle class *habitus* will carry a stigma. Goffman (1963) theorizes that,

an individual who might have been received easily in ordinary social intercourse possesses a trait that can obtrude itself upon attention and turn those of us he meets away from him, breaking the claim that his other attributes have on us. He possesses a stigma, an undesired differentness from what we had anticipated. (p. 5)

Unexpected and undesirable qualities will reduce the stranger from a “whole and usual” person while unexpected but *desirable* qualities will cause the “normal” to reassess and reclassify positively. The same quality may be considered stigmatizing or enhancing depending on the context (Goffman, 1963).

Types of stigma. Goffman (1963) identifies three types of stigma: physical (i.e., deformity), individual character (i.e., dishonesty) and tribal membership (i.e., social class). The stigma works to counteract the hold other qualities have. For example, in certain social settings, the stigma of my father’s wheelchair eclipsed his other desirable characteristics: good looks, a sense of humor, and intelligence. Goffman describes the attitude a “normal” may have toward the stigma as “benevolent social action...designed to soften and ameliorate” (p. 5)

Stigma theory. Goffman (1963) theorizes several possible outcomes in response to stigma. The first is that “normals” will, “construct a stigma-theory, an ideology to explain his inferiority and account for the danger he represents, sometimes rationalizing an animosity based on other differences...” (p. 5). Second, a defensive response to such treatment may be read as an expression of the defect itself and thereby justify the discriminatory stance (Goffman, 1963). Third, if an individual feels he is not accepted even when considered in a “selected category into which he unquestionably fits”—for example, as a student—the outcome can be devastating shame and self-hatred derived from the new realization of his difference as a truly defiling thing (Goffman, 1963, p. 7). To blend in, Goffman theorizes that the “stigmatized individual is asked to act so as to imply neither that his burden is heavy nor that bearing it has made him different from us; at the same time he must keep himself at that remove from us which ensures our painlessly being able to confirm this belief about him” (Goffman, 1963, p. 122). While groups can acclimate to stigmatizing information through daily interaction, what Goffman terms *daily*

rounds (1963), the stigmatized often employs other techniques to mitigate or prevent the effect of a stigma. These include: concealing, avoiding, creating physical distance, or covering.

Managing identity in the classroom. Goffman's concept of stigma and theorization about how one may manage a "spoiled" identity is of particular relevance to this study. Non-middle class students and those whose parents were not socialized in to the norms of higher education carry the burden of managing personal information in the foreign language classroom to blend in and avoid any discriminatory stigma-theorization about their value. Participation strategies that develop to manage one's identity as a marked person have direct implications for the foreign language learning because they can result in avoiding speaking (and therefore not practicing a language).

Post-structural Conception of Identity

According to Ortega (2009), interest in using identity theory to understand language acquisition has grown thanks to Norton (1995, 1997, 2000) who theorized that a person's socially constructed identity affects access to speaking practice and thus constrains one's language development. Norton called for a "comprehensive theory of identity" (2000, p. 4) in order to theorize empirical SLA studies that address the interaction with one's identity and language learning in a particular context. To examine the social construction of identity and how social constraints on it affect language learning, SLA researchers have relied on post-structuralist theory.

In a post-structuralist conception, identity is regarded as fragmented and context-dependent. In his review of identity research in SLA, Block (2007a) lists the concerns of post-structuralism as "moving beyond the search, associated with structuralism, for unchanging laws

of human behavior” and states that it has “led many scholars to frame identity not as something fixed for life, but as fragmented and contested in nature” (p. 864).

This post-structuralist understanding of identity has been described in many ways within the field. Norton (2000) outlines her conception in the following way: “I use the term identity to reference how a person understands his or her relationship to the world, how that relationship is constructed across time and space, and how the person understands possibilities for the future” (p. 5). Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004), differentiate among imposed, assumed, and negotiable identities (p. 21). Other theorists, like Erni (2008), exhort researchers “to think about identity constructions not in terms of a model, framework, or even theory, but in terms of operations/operationality” (p. 197). In order to understand the post-structuralist conception of identity to which Block (2007a), Norton (2000), Pavlenko & Blackledge (2004), and Erni (2008) refer, it is important to ground our knowledge in a basic anthropologic understanding of the term.

Bucholtz and Hall (2004) define identity as made up of two key concepts, sameness and difference. “The first of these allows for individuals to imagine themselves as a group, while the second produces social distance between those who perceive themselves as unlike” (p. 369). They encourage us to think of identity as attributes of situations or contexts rather than fixed attributes of individuals or groups. Here lies the difference between a structuralist view of identity and post-structuralist view.

Fixed identity attributes contribute to an essentialized view of groups that does not account for context. Norton (2000) called for “SLA theory [...] to develop a conception of identity that is understood with reference to larger, and frequently inequitable, social structure, which are reproduced in day-to-day social interaction” (p. 5). As such, the contexts of “day-to-day social interaction” foreground particular identities within specific contexts and place others

in the background. Empirical studies have shown how the highlighting of particular identities in specific contexts adversely affect language learning, such as race (Talburt & Stewart, 1999) and national origin (McKay & Wong, 1996). The present study draws on a post-structuralist conception of identity to evaluate how emphasizing socioeconomic difference affects the foreign language learning experience of self-identified working class students and first-generation status college students in the foreign language classroom context.

Conceptualizing Social Class Identity in SLA

Identity as context dependent. The concept of identity as context dependent came to the forefront of SLA research due in large part to a seminal article by Firth and Wagner (1997). In it, the researchers took issue with the dichotomy *Native Speaker / Non-native speaker* and proposed that these labels represent only one of “a multitude of social identities” that may be relevant at a given time (p. 292). Working within this post-structuralist framework, identity is understood to condition interaction and social structures while it is simultaneously *conditioned by* interaction and social structures (Block, 2007a). Conceptualizing identity as a multifaceted, context-dependent *site of struggle* rather than as idealized and fixed or static, assists SLA identity researchers to theorize their research (Norton, 2000). A post-structural conception of identity will be similarly useful to investigating social class identity in a foreign language learning environment like the classroom. To investigate social class identity within the foreign language classroom, attention must be paid to power relations within the educational institution and in society at large. Summarizing the research of Connell *et al.* (1982), Norton writes: “[C]lass cannot be reduced to a system of categories; it is, rather, a system of relationships between people” (Norton 2000, p. 13).

Ryuko Kubota's 2003 reflection on how trends in gender research in second language writing might transfer to research on race and class, challenges future researchers to "explore differences between social categories in a non-essentialist way and expose discourse and power relations that are embodied in these differences" (p. 31). Specifically, she reviews studies in gender and language that take issue with the gender binary (with regard to language use) and illustrates how the social and discursive construction of gender is also true for race and class. This paper is theoretically relevant to the present study because it sets up the argument for the dynamic and shifting nature of identity as it is constructed in discourse. Though the article reviews research in gender identity, it points out how the concept can be extended to race and, most importantly for this study, social class.

Kubota makes the case that the study of race and social class identities should take a cue from the study of language use and gender which has moved beyond a binary conceptualization of gender (male-female) based on biological characteristics to adopt theories that take into account, "multiple and fluid identities, [and their] social and linguistic construction," as well as "individual agency, gender identity as constituted through 'performativity' (i.e., repeated performance of a gendered norm)" (Sunderland, 2000, p. 34). To this end, Kubota suggests a series of questions for research in second language writing. However, she only cites studies from the wider field of literacy and composition studies such as Heath (1983) and Rose (1989) to exemplify such research.

Social class identity. Despite Kubota's 2003 suggestion that non-binary theories of gender identity be applied to social class identity, social class as an identity inscription has not been the focus of SLA identity research. This is a situation that Block (2007a, 2012a, 2014) seeks to change. In his article, "Class and SLA: Making Connections," Block (2012a) reviews

Marx, Weber, and Bourdieu to paint a picture of the construct in the social sciences today and then applies it to the language development analysis of Carlos, a Colombian immigrant to London trained in Philosophy.

Status. In reviewing the “foundational figures of European sociology,” Block explains that while Marx’s reductive class categories (i.e., bourgeoisie, proletariat) allow for the study of capitalism, they are “not commensurable with poststructuralist perspectives on culture and identity” (p.191). That is, their ‘determinism’ (derived from a person’s relationship to his mode of production) contrasts with the dynamic post-structuralist conceptions of identity reviewed above. Block contrasts Marx’s view with that of Weber who allowed for mobility across classes by emphasizing ‘status’ and ‘status situation’ rather than relationship to the mode of production.

Distinction. Block (2012a) also reviews Bourdieu’s idea that difference and ‘distinction’ is based on consumption and behavior; that is, participation in particular activities denotes one’s social class (Bourdieu, 1984). Block selects the following quotation from *Distinction* to illustrate this “socioculturally-based phenomena:”

[E]conomic barriers—however great they may be in the case of golf, skiing, sailing or even riding and tennis—are not sufficient to explain the class distribution of these activities. There are more hidden entry requirements, such as family tradition and early training, or obligatory manner (of dress and behavior), and socializing techniques, which keep these sports closed to the working class... (Bourdieu, 1984 as cited in Block, 2012a, p.192).

As I will demonstrate below, this idea is of particular importance to the present study because participating in the foreign language curriculum typically relies on sharing information, activities, and life experiences that highlight one’s social class identity and socioeconomic status.

Post-structural relativity. In “Economising Globalisation and Identity in Applied Linguistics in Neoliberal Times,” Block (2012b) aims to show how taking into consideration the economic and material basis of human activity and social life can move research in Applied Linguistics more fully into the ‘critical’ sphere. In his view, social class as an identity inscription has been marginalized due to the current Neoliberal political atmosphere which emphasizes individualism over collectivism (i.e. identifying with members of one’s social class). He shows how applied linguistics research favors cultural ‘flows’ while ignoring the “economic backdrop that shapes them” (p.74).

Yet in his discussion, Block does not manage to define social class anymore definitively than the few researchers in Applied Linguistics he calls out for having left the construct undefined and unproblematized. The chapter and article both merely list factors other than education, occupation, and income which may affect one’s social class identity. It is left to researchers to figure out how to operationalize these factors in a meaningful and productive way.

Toward a critical conception of social class identity. For this study I chose to rely on participants’ status as the first-generation in the family to attend college and their self-identification with a particular social class. For students, even the most traditional sociological measures of a person’s social class—income, occupation, and education—are complicated to determine due to the liminal nature of the student status. By definition, students are in formation, in the middle of preparing for future careers which will define their income levels, social circles, access to resources, pastime activities, and aspirations. To measure first-generation status, I gathered information about parental educational attainment. I assumed that if neither parent attended a four-year college, the student was not previously socialized into the middle class value system found in the university environment (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990).

Since the social class identity of students is rooted in their family of origin and the values, tastes, beliefs, and ideals with which they were raised, I also used participants' self-assessment of their family's social class. Using these measures to gauge social class identity still requires the researcher to take context into consideration: both that of the university and classroom learning environment as well as what Block calls the "economic backdrop" (2012b). I discuss the university context of this study in Chapter 4.

Chapter Summary

I intend to take a critical theoretical perspective on the foreign language classroom learning environment and pay particular attention to the way learners' self-identified social class interacts with foreign language study. To frame the study, I reviewed theories of identity and social class. I also explained the relationship between foreign language study, education and social class mobility.

How to define and operationalize social class is debated. Ways of measuring social class include indexical approaches, operational categories, and self-identification. Access to education depends on fulfilling foreign language requirements to both enter and exit particular institutions of higher education. The post-secondary foreign language learning experience activates four semiotic processes of identification and attempts to socialize students into middle class *habitus* (Bourdieu, 1977) via the repetition of the practices and promoting ideologies presented in the textbook and by the teacher. Foreign language requirements ensure that students are exposed to this value system prior to graduation.

Identity as conceptualized in a post-structuralist manner is fluid and context dependent. The specific aspect of learner identity I intend to investigate—social class—is particularly

sensitive to context. Leo van Lier (1988) envisions context as the concentric circles of a pond, beginning in the center at the moment of interaction and extending through subsequent circles of context. In the present study, I will explore how the foreign language classroom is situated within the wider context of the university campus, a regional society, and US society. As I see it, the interplay of these contextual levels bears on the simple foreign language exchange and affects the classroom learning experience.

In Chapter 3, I will present a review of the empirical SLA research that informs the present study as well as working class identity research in other fields, and first-person narrative accounts by working class academics. Finally, I will present language textbook studies and explore the role of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and textbook interpretation in the foreign language classroom.

Chapter 3: Social Class in Scholarly Literature

Social Class Identity Research in SLA

Within the field of SLA, a paucity of research addressing the role of learner social class has been noted, especially in the foreign language learning context (Block 2007a). Until the publication of *Social Class in Applied Linguistics* (Block 2014), I was aware of only three studies that addressed the role of class in language learning within immersion learning environments, second-language (Norton 2000, Block 2007b), and study abroad learning environments (Kinging, 2004).

Though it was not the focus of her research, Norton (2000) addresses social class identity within a second language setting. By problematizing the concept of *motivation*, traditionally thought of as the aspect of identity that explains the relative success of a foreign language learner, Norton (2000) showed how a learner's *investment in* and *access to* speaking English was directly influenced by her identity. Specifically, she demonstrated how for five women living in Canada, the social status marker 'immigrant' limited access to language practice with native English speakers and subsequently impacted their language development. Additionally, she showed how affirmation of one's self-identification with a particular social class (as 'wealthy Peruvian' in the case of Felicia) encouraged speaking practice or, conversely, discouraged it (as in the case of Katarina who sought to affiliate with another 'professional').

Block (2007b) shows how considering the language learner's biographical information sheds light on data analysis. Specifically, he uses information about Carlos' social class to explain limited communicative competence in English and his lack of investment in improving his English. As a university lecturer in philosophy in his native

Colombia, Carlos has few points in common with his colleagues at work and no desire to affiliate or build relationships with these primary English interlocutors. Therefore, his English fails to improve.

In contrast to Norton's (2000) and Block's (2007b) study which describe the 'declassing' of participants, Kinginger's (2004) case study of Alice presents language learning as a 'classing' endeavor for her participant in the study-abroad environment. Kinginger explains, "Alice was not drawn to French because of its instrumental or utilitarian value, but precisely because of the prestige of that language in the United States as a language of culture" (p. 240). She characterizes Alice's foreign language learning as "a bid to break free of the confining circumstances of a peripatetic, working-class childhood" and the "limited perspectives it offered" (p. 240). Through informal practice in social networks cultivated at local bars and in the residence halls, Alice develops as a highly proficient French speaker, renegotiating her identity and self-perception to that of "the Queen of France," capable of engaging in "long philosophical conversations using big long French words" (p. 236).

These three studies have investigated two immersion contexts, that of study abroad and second language learning environments. A focus on social class issues in the data underscores the context-dependent nature of identity. Learners in these three studies are removed from their home status systems where they are perceived as 'wealthy', 'poor,' 'professional,' 'competent speaker,' or 'native' and positioned in new ways by the host society (Davies & Harré, 1990).

In the case of the five women who participated in Norton's study, being positioned as 'immigrant' limited speaking practice with native English speakers. In the

case of Carlos, a lack of desire to invest in relationships with his uneducated colleagues at work meant that he did not practice English, which stagnated his language development. In Alice's case, temporary relocation to France without sufficient funds to participate in activities with her classmates, marginalized her as 'poor' among her study abroad peers while it contemporaneously facilitated access to native French speakers in local social networks, and led her to be repositioned as 'cosmopolitan.' As Block (2007a) points out in his literature review of identity research in SLA, it is precisely Alice's *lack of economic resources* that prevented her from traveling with her classmates and "facilitated her move to seek contact with French students who would be more attentive to her American-ness than to her position in American society as poor" (p. 873). He observes that Alice's newly developed cosmopolitanism allows her to "sidestep and even transcend U.S.-based class distinctions that positioned her as inferior to her classmates" (p.873).

Spurred by the publication of *Social Class in Applied Linguistics* (Block 2014), interest in studying social class as an identity inscription to be studied, increased. A colloquium at the American Association of Applied Linguistics (AAAL) 2014 titled "Social Class in Language Learning and Teaching" included a review of the role of social class in English language education and four studies of Chinese, Filipino, Korean, and Mexican English language learners as well as my own presentation on the role of social class in foreign language learning (Astarita, 2014). My presentation was a late addition to the program, so it was not included in the special forum of the *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* edited by Yasko Kanno who also put together the AAAL 2014

colloquium where David Block served as respondent. I will review the way these studies define and operationalize social class in each cultural context.

“Wild goose” Korean families in Canada. Shin (2014) uses the notion of social class to reexamine her research on transnational education migration by early/pre-collegiate study abroad participants who travel from Korea to reside in North America and “acquire valuable forms of English capital” (p. 26). Shin (2014) provides no definition of social class, nor does she attempt to operationalize social class. Rather, the article simply states that Korean *gireogi gajok* or *wild goose family* consists of “a split household transnational family of middle-class mother with children in elementary school or middle school at the time of departure studying in an English-speaking country while the father remains in Korea to financially support the family” (p.26). She describes their habits while living and studying in Canada generally: “[Early Study Abroad] students and their families often located themselves in middle-class high rises in North York, an upscale residential area in Northern Toronto (rather than in downtown Koreatown, associated with older and poorer immigrants), followed the most up-to-date fashion trends in Korea...” (p.28). Shin does not report the ways her participants viewed their social class standing in Korea or whether and how it may have changed while living in Canada. However, she observed that to mitigate the marginalization the four Korean high school student participants felt due to their accents and poor English skills, they engaged in self-marginalizing practices like fraternizing with other Koreans at Korean restaurants and karaoke bars as well as dressing in the latest Korean fashion, listening to K-pop and texting. In this way, she concludes they “constructed themselves as elite transnationals” (p.26).

Learning and teaching English in Mexico. Lopez-Gopar and Sughrua (2014) do an excellent job of problematizing social class status in the context of Oaxaca, Mexico by describing colonial difference and the intersection of ancestry, economic status, education, and distinguishing practices. They take the important step of critically examining their own social class status within this context which serves to clearly illustrate the issues at play. Within the context of a country where a majority of the population struggles economically, the authors feel they are middle class as they are “neither poor nor vulnerable” (p. 37). Yet, several other factors complicate this self-understanding. First, the university where they teach is the lowest paid of all the public universities in Mexico which would place them on the low end of this category. Yet, their foreign degrees and English proficiency would place them on the upper end. However, they note that scholarship produced outside of Mexico is valued more than their own. Second, their diverse ancestries (skin color and height) intersect with their socioeconomic status and situate them each as outsiders in Oaxaca. By dissecting their own social class identity and socioeconomic status, they convincingly illustrate how identity in this context “seems delineated but also blurred and contradictory” (p. 38).

With this frame and context, the authors examine the relationship between English language education and socioeconomic status in Mexico. English instruction begins in middle school, but 40% of the population does not complete elementary school. Additionally, access to high quality English language instruction depends upon the ability to attend private elementary and bilingual schools. According to the authors, such schools are indicative of “English as a social class prestige” (p. 39). This article examines the situation of English student teachers from low socioeconomic and Indigenous

backgrounds who, despite the prestige of knowing English, end up working at low-paying private English schools where they teach the elite: “Pursuant to the colonial difference, Mexican English teachers are part and parcel of the intrusion of the English language with its connection to globalization and neoliberalism as well as its perpetuation of the gap between social classes” (p. 42). The authors call on researchers to problematize this situation so that English language teaching does not become, “the proletariat tool of the new economical world situation that benefits very few people while negatively affecting most” (p. 42).

Filipino migrants to Canada. Darvin and Norton (2014) look at the divergent experiences of migrant Filipinos residing in Canada. The researchers use immigration categories to index their participants’ social class. John migrated to Canada under the Family Class category “which allows permanent residents or citizens to apply for permanent residence for members of their immediate family,” while Ayrton immigrated under the Investor Class category “designed to attract experienced business people who have a net worth of at least C\$1.6M which requires them to invest C\$800,000 in the country” (p. 53). Ayrton’s strong command of English stems from the practice among elite Filipinos of using English in informal interactions. As a consequence, he transitions easily to the Honors program at the private school he attends in Canada. In contrast, John struggled to adjust his accented English at the inner city public school where he is enrolled. His mother works frequently and leaves him unsupervised at home, thus he does not able to widen his social networks beyond his community so that he might practice English. The authors theorize that “while John and Ayrton may have

similar imagined identities and hopes for the future, their perspective class positions will explain, at least in part, the extent to which these ambitions are realized (p. 52).

Chinese learners of English. Gao (2014) reviews several studies to show how they operationalize social class in the Chinese context. For Gao's own ethnography of privileged Chinese English learners in Britain (Gao, 2010), she relies on participants' self-understanding provided in interview data which she elicited "without providing any guidelines" (p. 22). She frames her research in the social structure of contemporary China as reported by the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences. According to this report on social stratification, there are five social classes in Chinese society: lower, lower middle, middle, upper middle, upper. Within these social classes, ten distinct social strata are identified: unemployed/underemployed, peasants, manufacturing workers, business/service workers, household business owners/individual industrialists/commercialists, office workers/professionals/private entrepreneurs, managers, rural cadres (Lu, 2002).

In Gao's 2010 study, "participants' social economic statuses and self-identified social class positions influenced their opportunities to practice English and structured friendship networks" (2014, p. 21). Gao also posits that participants' sense of their social class position was "reinforced during their English language journeys in Britain." That is, they took fashion cues from middle and upper class Brits and began wearing specific brand names which they understood to convey social prestige (p. 21).

The other two studies reviewed in Gao (2014) use different ways to define social class in the Chinese context. While Butler (2013) used measures of parents' income and education to categorize students, Liu (2012) used parent's education, occupation,

position, and income to classify students. Each uncovered a relationship between social class background and English language learning outcomes for Chinese students in primary and middle school. Although they treat elementary and secondary students, Butler (2013) and Liu (2012) have more relevance to the present study than Gao (2010) because they examine learners in a foreign language learning context.

Summary. Despite the growing interest in researching social class as an identity inscription over the last seven years, none of the SLA studies reviewed above address the social class identity of learners in a formal, US university foreign language classroom setting. In the section that follows, I turn to those studies outside the field of SLA that investigate identity issues of working class/first generation college students while learning in a US higher education institutional setting. These studies do not address foreign language learning specifically, however they do address socialization into academe, which is relevant to the study of first-generation/self-identified working class college students learning foreign language in the classroom setting.

Working Class Identity Research

Student Socialization. Outside the field of SLA, empirical research has addressed the socialization processes of working class and first-generation students. For example, the field of composition and rhetoric examines student initiation into academic discourse. The fields of psychology and sociology have addressed the effect of social class identity, experience, and culture on higher education socialization. Below, I focus on the research within these fields that investigate student socialization within educational environments.

Academic discourse. In the field of composition and rhetoric, scholarship focuses on the basic composition course as a socializing agent. Scholars have argued that it socializes students not only into academic discourse, but also middle-class value system. In fact, Bloom (1996) attempts to catalogue these values in her essay, “Freshman Composition as a Middle-Class Enterprise.” However, Le Court (2006) takes issue with Bloom’s assessment. She claims values listed such as self-reliance and responsibility, might also constitute working class values and challenges the traditional oppositional stance between working class habitus and academic discourse. LeCourt notes that Bloom’s easy attribution of such qualities to the middle class exemplifies how easily academic culture and middle class values to culture are conflated.

In “Identity Matters: Schooling the Student Body in Academic Discourse,” LeCourt (2004) shows how socialization into academic discourse can have both discursive and material effects on students from working class backgrounds. She shows how in her critical pedagogy the questioning and critiquing of power relations crafted to initiate students into academic discourse has material consequences for the working class student. That is, enacting the insights learned can harm students’ relationships and familial network, alienating them from their home cultures. (Later in this literature review, I will present first person narratives by working class academics that describe this alienation in detail.) LeCourt challenges her readers to think about how emphasis on the local, discursive, and mental ignores the structural, material and bodily interactions of students. As I discuss above, Block (2014) similarly exhorts SLA researchers to attend to the economic and material basis of human activity and social life.

Social class identity and socialization in different contexts. Working within the fields of psychology and sociology, Aries and Seider's 2005 study, "The Interactive Relationship Between Class Identity and the College Experience: The Case of Lower Income Students," asked 30 lower income students, half from an elite college they term "Little Ivy" and half from a public university they call "State College," to reflect on their social class. Using a semi-structured interview, they asked participants how their social class interacted with their college experience and how the college experience affected their relationships and interactions at home. Students were interviewed twice, once in their first year of college and one year later, in the second year. Results showed participants studying at "Little Ivy" had an increased awareness of class due to marked wealth disparities in their campus environment. These students expressed "feelings of intimidation, discomfort, inadequacy, exclusion, and powerlessness" which were not salient among State College students (p. 419).

The authors conclude that "greater homogeneity in class backgrounds" did not raise class-consciousness for State College students (p. 439). However, each group acknowledged "class-based discontinuities between their pre-college identities and their evolving identities" including dress, speech and behavior which they struggled to reconcile without being critical of the ways of doing and being in their home contexts (p. 439). An example from this study illustrates how dress and speech habits evolve in the new environment: "Part of what [Little Ivy] does is socialize people into the wealthy elite. And so I dress differently. I speak differently" (p. 431). A participant named Sarah describes the effect of such changes: "I would probably say that people of my class would say that I look kind of preppy or probably not in their social class. I think I kind of

try to fit in to what a [Little Ivy] student is like to some extent” (p. 431). In this case, it is the individual’s agency or choice of both language and the discourse of dress that serve to perform/embody a more upper class or preppy identity.

Social class identity as fluid. The fluidity of social class identity is also exemplified in this data by what the authors identify as a coping strategy employed by lower income students who “revert” to pre-college speech habits in order not to call attention to their newly acquired habits of speech:

[Students] described code switching as they moved back and forth from home to college, i.e. using different modes of speech in each setting. They faced criticism for using too large a vocabulary when talking to people at home. As Allen said, “If I use a big word, it’s like ‘Oh, Mr. Smarty Pants over here.’ I try not to show off my vocabulary.” (p. 435)

Additionally, students in the study report their regional accents return as well as a less articulate way of speaking when they visit home. This data from Aries and Seider (2005) highlights the multiple, fluid nature of students’ social class identity as they are socialized into the university. It shows the ways in which language and dress work to construct and perform various identities both in and away from the university environment.

Social class-based peer support groups. The authors conclude that by comparing the two educational settings (“Little Ivy” and “State College”), they were able to highlight the “importance of social context in shaping the class-based experience of identity for lower income students and...the meaning that cultural capital may have for individuals” (p. 439). To ease the transition into college for low-income students at the

Little Ivy and other elite institutions, the authors suggest student clubs be established for lower income students. They suggest such organizations would function similarly to those associations created for the support and development of peer groups based on gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, and race, which have assisted its members to integrate at elite colleges and institutions. The University of Wisconsin-Madison is the first institution to establish such an organization. Founded in 2007, the Working Class Student Union was established to advocate and support first generation, working class, transfer and “non-traditional” students (see Chapter 1).

Working Class “Foreigners” in the Land of Academe¹

In addition to the research on working class students’ socialization into academic practice, two other bodies of literature point to the need for further investigation of social class identity and the foreign language learning experience in the classroom setting. The first body consists of first person narratives by working class academics that describe the cultural alienation they experienced in higher education, both as students and professors. The second body of literature is made up of language textbook studies that reveal middle class bias in the presented material. In the sections that follow, I review the first person narratives and textbook studies that I believe indicate a need for scholarly research on social class identity and the *foreign* language learning experience, specifically that of first generation and working class students.

Over the last twenty-five years, many collections of essays have provided a venue for working class academics to write about their experiences studying and, later, working

¹ The ideas in this section title are those of Story (2008, p. 91).

in higher education. The genre includes reflections from working class academics generally speaking (Dews & Law, 1995; Muzzatti & Samarco, 2006; Ryan & Sackey, 1984; Zandy, 1995) as well as volumes with more specific authorial criteria. These contain narratives by working class women academics (Tokarczyk & Fay, 1993) and queer professors from the working class (Oldfield & Johnson, 2008a). Additionally, related work includes working class academics' perspectives on social class (hooks, 2000) and pedagogical issues related to class (Linkon, 1999; Shepard, McMillian & Tate, 1998). Other books and articles by working class academics reflect on personal experience and the experience of teaching other working class students (LeCourt and Napoleone, 2010; Rose 2005). Reading some of the titles of these writings gives a quick impression of the working class experience in academe: *Strangers in Paradise, This Fine Place So Far from Home, Resilience, Lives on the Boundary, Reflections from the Wrong Side of the Tracks*. Such titles convey an idea of strength while negotiating boundaries, isolation, and alienation. Living between two worlds is a common theme in this literature.

These working class academics write about the clash between university culture and home culture that leaves them with painful feelings of alienation from family and friends back home while simultaneously feeling like an 'outsider' within the academy. Also addressed is the need to perform a middle class identity in order to succeed within the academy, which results in the erasure, denigration, and dismissal of home culture, accent, grammar, and values in order to 'pass.' The narratives indicate these struggles are frequently solitary in nature.

For working class academics, membership in a middle class institution often produces a tension between middle and working class culture, and their different values

and norms. Below, I review these essays for accounts of implicit (and explicit) classism as well as cultural differences between the working and middle classes that make the academic environment difficult to navigate for working class people both in their role as student and, eventually as academic. I will also highlight essay material that shows the effect this struggle has on one's identity.

Being educated out of a working class identity. In their introduction to *Resilience: Queer professors from the working class*, Oldfield and Johnson (2008b) relate how, in their experience, colleagues of more privileged backgrounds maintain that upon receiving a degree, one is no longer working class. They note, "The underlying assumption is that upon finishing their studies, these individuals somehow abandon all memories of their youth, an expectation applied to no other demographic group we know" (p. 2). While education may be seen as the "great leveler," it does not unmake the working class life experience that shapes a person from his formative years onward. Interest in education and intellectual pursuits on the part of the working class does not necessarily mean one has an interest or desire to become like middle class folk. Lehrermeier (2008) reacts to this assumption in a journal entry from her final year in high school: "I was certain that [some well-to-do white business man and his charming wife] would have no clue about what learning and intellectual inquiry meant to me. It certainly did not mean that I was aspiring to become like them; I resented like hell that implicit assumption" (p. 12).

A "**cruel duality.**" Implicit classism in the learning environment is the subject of many essays. Law (1995) describes how as a student she felt "increasingly ashamed of my home, my family" while studying to be an English teacher (p. 2). She recognized herself and her family in her professor's examples of children at-risk to fail because their

parents didn't read to them or take them to art museums. She describes how she learned to keep quiet about her background and "shift allegiance" in order to participate in discussions that lamented parents and students similar to herself (p. 3):

I learned to join conversations about the collapse of standards and the dilution of higher education across the country where open-admissions policies let any riff-raff in... Even as early as my freshman year, I was learning to become a double agent, learning to lie with conviction in two contexts at once and fearing expulsion from both (p. 4).

Law credits silence both for her success in academe and her continued acceptance at home (p. 4). She has termed the struggle to construct an identity that is at once acceptable to the academy and to one's family of origin, the "cruel duality" of the working class student (p. 1).

The nature of work. Law notes that what are seen as accomplishments by the academy also "make one virtually unrecognizable to [one's] kin" (1995, p. 2).

Schwalbe (1995) attempts to explain his chosen path in "The Work of Professing," a letter home to his parents who work as an electrician and a factory worker. He says, "I... feel the need to convince you that I really do work, even if my work is different from yours and what I produce can't always be seen or touched or used" (p. 320). Using one's mind rather than one's hands for work is a fundamental difference that proves difficult to explain.

Nevertheless, Schwalbe (1995) attempts to explain it to his parents by likening the research process to craft work: "You have to imagine the product, figure out how to make it, and then go through dozens of steps to bring it into being. Each step has to be done just

right in order to end up with something useful and respectable. Think of Grandpa building a cabinet and all the things he had to do to make sure it turned out right” (p. 325). The cabinet metaphor is also a useful way to help his parents understand the article writing process, another aspect of his “professing” work to which he dedicates a lot of time: “On bad days, writing can be agonizing. It goes slowly and nothing sounds right. (To use the cabinet metaphor again, the corners aren’t square, the joints are loose, the drawers won’t close)” (p. 325). He acknowledges that the concept of work he was brought up with likely influences his passion for research—which produces a visible product—rather than teaching, whose results are more difficult to measure.

Ideas about work and the values associated with it are all influenced by class background. Weaver (1993), an academic from a working-class Mennonite background, for example, describes how her commitment to hard work for the benefit of the community had “destructive professional consequences” (p. 120). She says, “service in the academy is often perceived as negative—as weakness, as something that subordinate classes, including women, do” (p. 120). Though the image of hard worker is positive in her community, she feels in academe it conjures an image of “a drudge or an unimaginative, passive, conforming person—someone who will serve on routine committees and organize conferences” (p. 120). The value of hard work for the good of the community, rather than for oneself alone, is not shared by the academy where individual accomplishments garner tenure, promotion and merit pay (Weaver, 1993).

Individualism is a value that contributes to the foreignness of middle class institutional culture for working class people. Christopher (2008), a queer working class English professor, states: “I don’t ever really want to feel comfortable in [the professional

middle class], since I don't accept some of its core values: extreme individualism, striving, materialism" (p. 40). A particular idea of what constitutes work and working for the good of the group are two working class values in direct opposition to middle class ideas about work.

Passing. Maintaining one's class identity while simultaneously nurturing one's academic pursuits is a struggle for these working class academics. Frequently, the authors in this genre report the need to "pass" by altering their accents, ways of speaking and writing, appearance and grammar. Pari (1999) describes how her non-standard use of language was received awhile a student in graduate school:

Fellow students frequently said, 'What?' when I spoke because of my nonelite dialect, which left *r*'s off the end of words. And although I spoke quite loudly, I spoke so fast that my words slurred. I mispronounced words often. I felt much more comfortable calling someone an 'asshole' or asking my professor 'what the fuck' he was talking about than speaking this sterile, unflavored language. But I sounded dumb. (p. 124)

Similarly, Le Court found her south Boston accent distracted her professor at the University of Washington from hearing the content of her seminar contributions. Intent on being heard as intelligent in the academic arena, she set to work changing her accent by practicing in front of a mirror. While she was successful, she recognized how her accent is deeply attached to her identity:

When trying to alter the accent, however, my mind and body felt separated, as if one were warring with the other; I lost many battles as my accent or ways of speaking would "pop up" when least expected, marking me as different in a

context where I wanted sameness. Not incidentally, this still occurs when I am angry or frustrated, reminding me that such an accent lives deep in my affective core, seemingly more closely tied to body than my other identities. (LeCourt & Napoleone, 2010, pp. 90-91)

Now a professor, Donna LeCourt continues to interrogate the way her social class operates in the classroom. In fact, she shares the previous anecdote in an article co-authored with one of her graduate students, Rita Napoleone, in which they discuss working class performances in the academic social space.

LeCourt and Napoleone (2010) argue “that class does, indeed, *matter* to how the body signifies in the classroom, to how one’s performances as both student and teacher are read by others, and how one’s own reactions to social space are interpreted as narratives of exclusion, opposition, or agency” (p. 83). They also hold that “the classroom space, as a social space, actively *produces* class through the way bodies in the space re/act to perceived norms only when the relation is enacted” (p. 84). The two authorial voices weave together in the article to give the perspective and experiences of both Anna Rita, a self-described southern Italian graduate student with a thick New York accent who uses her hands to speak and Donna, a professor from Worcester, Massachusetts of Irish descent.

Anna describes her own anxiety in academia both as a student and as a teaching assistant. “I believe some students position me not as a teacher but more as a bad actor trying to play a part. The student is usually a white male student, and at times his socioeconomic class is ambiguous. For such students, I represent what education tries to erase” (p. 88). She attributes her status as a “bad actor” to the combination of her accent,

ethnicity, and hand gestures, which “seem out of sync with what an academic should look like” (p. 88). To interrogate what her accent signifies for her students, she asked them to write down what they saw. Student responses included “Carmela from the *Sopranos*; Jennifer Lopez; the mafia; tough guy; uneducated; not sophisticated; rough around the edges” (p. 88). After students shared their responses, she pointed out to her students that not one wrote down instructor or teacher and used the exercise to draw their attention to how they view her in an academic context.

As a graduate student Donna faced a similar dilemma. Not only did she “work on” her accent as described above, but she also modified how she dressed and wore her make-up in order to perform an identity acceptable in academia. Previously, she had worn heavy mascara and a low-cut blouse, which she saw as “normal” and “appropriately feminine” (p. 90). But while Donna attempts to make the social class markers disappear and become a “normal academic” (p.97), Anna Rita struggles to perform both academic and working-class subjectivities: “I’m not sure I can perform the academic at all and fear that doing so may mean losing my working-class position...maybe I fear losing that ‘hallowed’ part of my identity” (p. 102).

Summary. These reflections by working class academics help others to understand the aspects of social class identity struggle within academic environments. Middle class values permeate all aspects of the learning environment that challenge working class values in terms of work, dress, accent, and speech. Maintaining one’s social class identity while simultaneously passing in the academic environment can lead to feeling of alienation and living between worlds. How do such identity conflicts relate to in the foreign language learning experiences of first generation and working class

students? In the next section, I will look at how Foreign Language textbooks reflect the middle class cultural norms of higher educational institutions and may compound the effect of social class identity struggles for first-generation and working class students in higher education.

Social Class Representation in Foreign Language Textbooks

In this section, I will argue that foreign language textbooks serve as a primer in middle-class cultural values. For example, a perusal of *Avanti!* (Aski & Musumeci, 2010), a beginning Italian language textbook, includes vocabulary relating to table manners and dining out (chapter 5), shopping for clothes (chapter 6), renting a villa (p. 384), vacations (chapter 13), white-collar employment (chapter 9), an extended nuclear family tree (p. 96), and the traditional leisure activities of the well-off including traveling, skiing, painting, and dance lessons (chapters 7 & 10). Kinginger's experience teaching a French 1 course illustrates how this narrow range of vocabulary can leave out the lived experience of certain social classes. She reports, "I had naively required the students to ask and answer personal questions about where they lived using the book's vocabulary. Before the exercise began, one of them had said: 'Comment dit-on *trailer park*? 'Cause I don't live in no, like, chateau'" (2004, p. 225).

Whose knowledge is being included in textbooks? Whose knowledge is of most worth? Whose knowledge is socially legitimate? Apple and Christian-Smith (1991) raise these important questions about textbook politics. They remind us, "texts are not simply 'delivery systems' of 'facts'" nor is the curriculum "neutral knowledge." Rather, "what counts as legitimate knowledge is the result of complex power relations and struggles

among identifiable class, race, gender/sex, and religious groups” (pp. 1-2). Raymond Williams calls this the “*selective tradition*—someone’s selection, someone’s vision of legitimate knowledge and culture, one that in the process of enfranchising one group’s cultural capital disenfranchises another’s” (as cited in Apple & Christian-Smith 1991, p. 4).

Hidden curriculum. While the main object of this review is foreign language textbook studies, one important study from the wider field of education highlights how the knowledge and cultural experience of particular groups are excluded from the curriculum. “Race, Class, Gender, and Disability in Current Textbooks” (Sleeter & Grant, 1991), examined social studies, reading and language arts, science, and math textbooks used in the 1st through 8th grades. It included 47 textbooks published between 1980 and 1988. Researchers Sleeter and Grant examined pictorial, situational, and lexical representations in the texts with particular attention to race, disability, gender, and social class.

In terms of social class, their analysis found sparse representation of low or working class people. Social studies textbooks, for example, gave the impression that socioeconomic conditions are uniform in the United States by showing “fruitful plains with corn as high as an elephant’s eye, from sea to shining sea, dotted with growing and prosperous towns and cities” (p. 88). No explicit discussion of the poor was found “except during great crises such as the Depression” (p. 88). Similarly, the language arts texts they reviewed showed little class diversity; however they noted an effort had been made to “distribute a variety of people and names across a variety of roles in a way that shows few patterns” so as not to attribute a particular experience to any particular group

(p. 91). Similarly, stories engaging social issues particular to a given group, such as racism, are lacking, with some books “explicitly deny[ing] that inequality and injustice exist” (p. 91). In the science textbooks they reviewed, the researchers observed that middle and upper class settings and artifacts such as boats, ballet and travel are used to explain concepts (p. 93). The story problems in math textbooks “frequently involve spending money to buy things, making money, or taking trips that cost money” (p. 97).

This study suggests the presence of a *hidden curriculum* (Giroux, 1981) in these textbooks by which particular messages and values about social class are conveyed. Such privileging of the middle class experience within the pictorial, situational and lexical representations of a textbook facilitates understanding of the presented concepts for those students with similar life experience. For those students whose life experience is not exemplified in the text, Apple and Christian-Smith (1991) discuss three ways in which a student might respond:

In the dominated reading of a text, one accepts the messages at face value. In a negotiated response, the reader may dispute a particular claim, but accept the overall tendencies or interpretations of a text. Finally, an oppositional response rejects these dominant tendencies and interpretations. (p. 14)

The authors posit that readers *construct* their own responses to texts, reading them “based on their own class, race, gender/sex, and religious experiences” (p. 14). Likewise, Norton (2000) elucidates how in face-to-face interaction, a language learner “reads” the situation and constructs her reaction. Her study, *Identity and Language Learning: Gender, Ethnicity and Educational Change*, presents evidence that the affirmation of a learner’s

identity can positively affect language practice and the marginalization of a learner's identity can inhibit it in a second language learning environment.

Social class visibility. In order to better understand the effect of textbook bias on student learning, we must acknowledge and consider the role of multiple student identities, both apparent and hidden, with which such biases interact. Teachers have a tendency to view their students as a uniform group with similar characteristics (college-aged, unmarried, dependent, childless, middle class, etc.), yet each student's background and identity is unique. Vandrick (1997) reminds us that while some identities may be visible, others are invisible (i.e., sexual orientation, class background, marital and parental status, family background, learning ability, mental illness, religious affiliation, health status, financial position).

Few textbook analyses have addressed bias related to the hidden identities listed above. Visible identities such as gender and its representation in dialogues or visual materials have been examined (e.g., Florent and Walter, 1989; Poulou, 1997; Rifkin, 1998; Sherman, 2010; Siegal and Okamoto, 1996) and other analyses have addressed hidden identities such as sexual orientation. For example, Thornbury (1999) found all textbooks he worked with while teaching English as a Foreign Language in the 1990s were uniformly heteronormative. He says in his "years of experience both using and writing coursebooks" for EFL, they never included any same-sex couples or family trees with homosexual unions (S. Thornbury, personal communication, October 14, 2011). Additionally, he noted the sexual preference of famous gay people included in textbooks is never mentioned (Thornbury, 1999). Based on this personal experience, he comments simply: "Coursebook people are never gay" (p. 15).

While there are economic reasons attributable to textbook profitability and market audience that might explain such exclusion, the omission of a particular identity sends a powerful message about which identities are acknowledged, accepted, and celebrated in the imagined foreign language world. As Shardakova and Pavlenko (2004) suggest,

‘imaginary worlds’ portrayed in language textbooks may offer oversimplified and stereotyped identity options to FL learners. These options, in turn, may influence—and at times even shape—the students’ motivation, degree of engagement with the target language and culture, and development of their intercultural competence (p. 28).

In the remainder of this section, I review those foreign language textbook analyses that address the visibility of social class identity and socioeconomic diversity, their representation in foreign language textbooks, and the possible implications for non-middle class language learners.

No reflection of working class identity. “Identity Options in Russian Textbooks,” is a 2004 study by Shardakova and Pavlenko that examined the limited “identity repertoires” presented in two beginning Russian textbooks: *Nachalo* (Lubensky, Ervin & Jarvis, 1996) and *Russian Stage I: Live from Moscow* (Davison, Gor & Lekic, 1996). Each textbook uses “white heterosexual middle-class college-educated men, with a professional interest in Russian” as main characters. Additionally, in the authors’ estimation, “American learners portrayed—and implicitly targeted by—the two textbooks are invariably able-bodied White middle-class educated people”(p. 31). Likewise, Russian interlocutors reflect the protagonists’ socioeconomic and educational background and “neither text shows working-class individuals as plausible friends and acquaintances

for American learners of Russian” (p. 33). In fact, the only working-class people presented in these textbooks are secondary characters. The first textbook includes a soldier and a plumber while the second textbook shows a variety of working-class characters including police officers, salespeople, vendors and a waiter.

The researchers’ main critique of these textbooks is that they do not present non-middle class people as primary Russian interlocutors. Failure to present non-middle class Russians as possible primary interlocutors to students, “run[s] the risk of presenting imagined interlocutors as a monolithic and homogeneous group and target language as invariable” (p. 35). Additionally, the texts do not problematize class-linked sociolinguistic conventions such as formal address for a professor and informal address for a plumber.

This analysis sheds light on two considerations for working class students. First, the textbook people holding jobs like those of students’ family members are not deemed of primary importance. As such, they are not presented as possible acquaintances or prospective friends. If students do not feel that people with backgrounds similar to their own and those of their kin are full members of the imagined target language world as represented by the textbook, it could affect the learner’s investment in the target language.

Second, working class students may not identify with the middle class student characters in these textbooks. Neither of these characters studying abroad seems to have issues with money, for example, a reasonable concern for students studying abroad. Moreover, the researchers argue that using the “typical American man”—educated white middle class—for the main character, “may be a harmful choice because it preempts all other choices

and allows textbook authors...to avoid discussing difficult encounters faced in Russia by American women, African American, Asian American, and Latino students, and gay, lesbian, disabled, or working-class individuals” (p. 33). They argue that by portraying educated White middle class males and primary interlocutors with similar backgrounds, the authors “deprive the students of important linguistic means of self-presentation and self-defense” (p. 33). Indeed, how do students from working class backgrounds linguistically negotiate a situation in which target language interlocutors assume them to be as privileged as protagonists in exported American television shows? A textbook that does not address typical assumptions about American student class backgrounds runs the risk of sending working class students abroad without the necessary vocabulary to present their origins in a way that simultaneously defends and supports their class identities as these researchers suggest. Shardakova and Pavlenko (2004) posit that a lack of such linguistic exploration and a narrow focus on middle-class interlocutors within the textbook, “jeopardize[s] two important goals of contemporary FL teaching—intercultural competence and critical language awareness—and obscure[s] ways in which social hierarchies are constructed and negotiated through language (p. 35).

Lack of social stratification and critical linguistic awareness. In his explication of how foreign language textbooks fail to provide appropriate content for adult learners, Cook (2003) raises several points that implicate social class. He uses six French, Italian, and English foreign language textbooks to illustrate his points.² First, he highlights how the textbooks under observation simplify introductions by only providing the equivalent of “My name is...” While the informal is frequently appropriate in English exchanges,

² *Libre Echange* (Courtillon & de Salins, 1995); *Panorama* (Gahagan & Cridlig 1996); *Ci siamo* (Guarnaccio & Guarnaccio, 1997); *Atlas 1* (Nunan, 1995); *Changes* (Richards, 1998); *Teach yourself Italian* (Vellaccio and Elston, 1998).

for the other languages “introductions are a form of social ceremony...As such, they involve complex assessment of the relationships between the people involved—age, gender, social status, etc.—and a particular formal exchange” (p. 277). Cook calls for increased awareness of the social roles within society and teaching the correct form of address for these particular roles. Failing to address social stratification and the way it affects the simplest exchanges is a disservice to students who may develop an inaccurate view of the target language society as classless. Furthermore, failing to teach students how, where, when, and who should be addressed formally may lead to students’ casting as rude or uneducated, presumptuous or crass—positions that each carry with them a stigmatized social class identities.

Money as a non-issue. The assumed audience of many foreign language textbooks is that of students, travelers, or potential travelers (i.e., study abroad). As such, the topics of the textbook tend to reflect basic and functional language related to school or travel rather than adult subject matter. For example, Cook points out that money is rarely a topic in foreign language textbooks: “Most adults worry about their lack of income and their high level of expenditure, about the price of CDs or the exchange rate against the Euro. Other than prices at shops, money is never a topic in coursebooks, presumably because students and tourists are not part of the labour force” (pp. 278-9). The conspicuous absence of money contributes to the unrealistic projection of world full of “lively young people without cares in the world or plans for the future, except tomorrow’s party” (p. 277). Such a world may be particularly alienating for a foreign language student who works a full or part-time job and takes responsibility for his own

maintenance or tuition. Furthermore, students may be painfully aware of how much the foreign language requirement is costing them in tuition.

Consumption assumptions. Following Sleeter and Grant's textbook evaluation categories (1991), Ritchie (2005) shows that one high school French textbook, *Allons-y*, (Sudlow, 1999) written for the Australian market contains the sort of class bias that socializes students into the middle-class by communicating a middle-class worldview. Ritchie notes that it depicts "most people living in houses, and using speech and wearing the sort of clothing one associates with the middle class" (p. 6). Additionally, the text depicts the kind of material consumption typical of the middle class "by showing people in cafés, going to theme parks and museums, skiing in the French Alps, scuba diving in Western Australia, staying at Club Med in Morocco, and sailing along the canals of France" (p. 6). A mixed race group of lower class textbook characters holds "low-paying jobs...such as waiters, waitresses, or market sellers" (p. 7). All upper class people (including royalty) are white. Ritchie (2005) contends that her analysis of social class supports the claim that texts are written for a white, middle-class audience made by Sleeter and Grant (1991). Working class students are not reflected in such a textbook and, by extension, may feel that the foreign language world is one they can inhabit only marginally, if at all.

Lack of positive visual depiction. In a quantitative study, Arikan (2005) evaluated the age, gender, and social class of persons depicted in the visual materials for two English as a Foreign Language textbooks: *Think ahead to first certificate* (Naunton, 1993) and *The New Headway: Intermediate Student's Book* (Soars & Soars, 2003). The percentage for each class category (Lower, Middle/Lower, Middle, Upper, Celebrity) was

calculated using the total number of images. The criteria used to determine which class category an image depicts is not given. The images for each course book contained respectively 58.13% and 84.44% images of middle class people. The next highest category was that of 'celebrity' which contained 20.93% and 5.5% respectively. Each book contained 2 images of lower class people or 2.2.% and 4.65% of the total images. Arikan feels the inclusion of celebrity success stories significantly contrasts with the invisibility of the lowest classes. The author adds, "Furthermore, not a single picture shows the members of the lower classes as decent, upright, and honorable members of the society but all lower classes are depicted as beggars asking for money or as cast outs such as punks or hippies in their 'unique' outfits and habits" (p. 37). Like Ritche's analysis (2005), the lack of positive visual depictions of lower class people in this study precludes the lower and working class student from seeing himself reflected positively in the world of foreign language.

Negative ideas about work. Unlike the textbook, which is typically written to present grammar as well as culture for a specific audience enrolled in a particular educational environment, grammar reference books have a different aim. They are typically used for individual study; for example, in preparation for a trip or to get by while living in another culture. As such, they are usually thought to be even more neutral than the textbook in that the only thing they contain are grammatical explanations with examples. To test this idea, Leahy (2006) examined German grammar books with an eye to the 'linguistics of representation,' which "ask[s] question[s] about what kinds of representation of reality were created by the language used" (p.120).

Employing the techniques of corpus linguistics, Leahy (2006) scanned the text of an unspecified number of German grammar books and eliminated any explanatory language. This created “a collection of texts consisting of examples (phrases and full sentences), exercises and solutions: a German grammar book corpus” (Leahy 2006, p.120). Using this corpus, Leahy analyzed word frequency lists and the frequency with which they co-occurred with particular words.

German words for work, company, boss, office, and the verb ‘to work’ all “pointed to a dominant representation of work in the corpus” (p.120). Her research further investigated the contexts in which work terms existed in order to “reveal the highly discernible (and far from innocuous) images of a world of work which confront learners of German when they engage with the ‘neutral’ language of the grammar book” (p. 121). By scrutinizing the contexts and high frequencies for co-occurrence, the ‘world of work’ that immersed was one of compulsion (‘needing to work’), time-consumption (‘a lot of work’), priority over other activities (for example with the family) and an overwhelming nature of work. Leahy notes, “work does not emerge as an activity which is eagerly undertaken” (p. 121). Additionally, work is portrayed as damaging to one’s health.

Summary. Textbook studies reviewed above show a lack of social class identity options, little social stratification and corresponding linguistic awareness, the assumption that money is in good supply, material consumption as the norm, no positive visual depictions of poor people, and the reality of work as something negative. Taken together, these studies suggest that when left unquestioned, the foreign language textbook can present learners with a classist worldview of the target language culture. In the following

section, I discuss textbook interpretation and the role of the instructor in problematizing the world presented in the foreign language textbook.

Foreign Language Textbook Interpretation

To discuss first-generation college students and their foreign language learning experiences, we must begin by understanding the role the textbook plays in language learning generally. The textbook—the vehicle by which the material to be learned routinely enters the classroom—is a complicated piece of literature because its contents are understood to be objective, factual representations of reality (de Castell, 1990). In my review, I will address the interpretability of textbooks and the implications of accepting textbook representations at face value.

Textbooks differ from literary texts in that they are considered to be fact-stating or objective (de Castell, 1990). On the surface it would seem that due to the nature of the genre, fact-stating texts do not face the same issues of interpretation as literary texts. Yet, a reader's objective is to glean meaning from textbooks and, in this process, interpretation must take place. De Castell analyzes the role of the reader in interpretation and delineates how the interpretation of fact-stating texts differs from that of literary texts. I use her analysis as a starting point in order to better understand the interaction of the language textbook, the teacher, the classroom community and the language learner in the process of meaning-making.

It is of crucial importance that we understand two things about the textbook. First, as de Castell (1990) argues, the textbook genre is understood to be the objective presentation of sanctioned, correct, bias-free information, but such fact-stating texts

actually reflect the values of those responsible for its publication. This includes the authors, illustrators, editors, reviewers, publishers and marketing managers (see Apple 1986: Luke 1988). Second, textbook meaning depends on the values, experiences and sensitivities of its reader. Contrary to the common understanding of textbooks, there is no one reading of supposedly value-free, factual information. Rather, there are as many interpretations of textbook meaning as there are readers. As Apple and Christian-Smith (1991) claim in the quotation cited in the previous section, a reader may approach the text in several ways: un-negotiated, negotiated, or oppositional.

De Castell (1990) reviews the development of literary theories of interpretation. These theories hold that recovery of the underlying meaning is available by reading a text through the lens of an author's biography and historical period; or, in the case of New Criticism, the idea that one objectively verifiable "correct" interpretation is accessible by working to eradicate one's own subjectivities (p. 77). Unlike these previous ideas, theories of reader-response hold that the reader is an active participant in the construction of meaning (p. 77). De Castell draws on two theories of reader-response, Rosenblatt (1978) and Fish (1980), which are useful tools for our understanding of how meaning is derived from the textbook by the teacher, the classroom community and the language learner.

Rosenblatt (1978) conceives of reading as a transaction between the reader and the text. As such, reading and interpretation unfold as a complicated exchange between the author's codes and values and the reader's codes and values. For my study, it is important to understand that the author's and reader's codes and values reflect their social class statuses. The act of reading, therefore, lines up two sets of values, that of the authors

and all those responsible for the text's publication, and those of the reader. In places, there will be perfect understanding—moments where the systems or filters by which the two interpret the world overlap. In other moments, the reader's worldview and author's worldview will not align. At these points, it is the reader who struggles to make meaning or shape the information to fit his/her understanding of the world. Rosenblatt explains, "the reader brings the text to completion" (as cited in de Castell, p.77). This understanding of the interpretation process has particular implications for the first-generation/working class college student whose particular set of values and conversant code may be less frequently aligned with those of the textbook authors and those responsible for the text's publication (see Apple, 1986).

Fish (1980), on the other hand, posits that interpretation depends on an interpretive community rather than any individual reader. He sees meaning as shaped and constrained by public norms. He states, "meanings are the property neither of fixed and stable texts, nor of free and independent readers, but of interpretive communities" (as cited in de Castell, p. 77). Fish's theory of reader-response complicates the implications of Rosenblatt's theory for first-generation and working class college students because it recognizes the tangled way cultural norms, both within the classroom and university environment as well as those of the target language society, play into a learner's understanding of the textbook. In other words, it is not merely the personal code and value system of a student that influences interpretation, but also the context in which he reads that shapes meaning.

What are the public norms of the classroom and how do they constrain meaning? According to Fishman (1966), schools are monoculturally middle class institutions within

a polycultural society (as cited in Meyer 1975, p. 79). This means that the working class or first-generation student is being socialized into the norms of the monoculturally middle class institution. Teachers of all backgrounds have also been socialized to middle class institutional cultural norms. Textbooks play a large role in this socialization process by presenting facts in a manner presumed to be suitable for students from any background. It has been argued that this has the effect of homogenizing a diverse population (de Castell, 1990).

Student interpretation of the textbook. Next I will review two examples that illustrate each of the above reader-response theories in relation to student textbook meaning-making. The first example (Canagarajah, 1999), includes a study of textbook defacement by Tamil speakers learning English at the University of Jaffna, Sri Lanka. The second example (Durham, 1995), is an analysis of the *French In Action* controversy in which Yale students charged the textbook authors with sexism. Each study will illustrate how language learners interact with the textbook and create meaning based on their code and value systems as well as the public norms of their interpretive communities. Similar interaction with the textbook is an object of analysis in my study of students from working class backgrounds who may also be the first of their families to attend college.

Canagarajah's analysis of Tamil-speaking students' textbook defacement represents the cultural clash between the codes, values and public norms of the "center" (or Western culture) and those of the "periphery" (or former colonies of the West) and illustrates how meaning is made by individuals within a particular interpretive community. *American Kernel Lessons: Intermediate* was published in 1978 and donated

to the University of Jaffna by the Asia Foundation in the 1980s. In Canagarajah's view, this textbook presents situations "such as commuting by plane, cooking with a microwave, or shopping in departments stores—[which] assume an urbanized, Western culture that is still largely alien to rural students, and likely to clash with their traditional values" (p. 86). Additionally, the researcher notes that discourse patterns present in the practice dialogues reflect particular "cultural biases regarding appropriate language use" (p. 86). For example, one section entitled "A Talkative Lady" depicts a woman who misses her train because she is lost in conversation. The researcher feels this situation and others like it send particular cultural messages to the students that are in conflict with their cultural values. He states: "The message indirectly and unintentionally conveyed to students in this passage is that they should value a strictly focused, goal-oriented, utilitarian conversational style, whereas Tamil discourse values the digression and indirection typical of predominantly oral, rural communities" (p. 87). Another episode shows a couple planning a party to celebrate the husband's promotion. The wife in this scenario is upset since expenses for this unanticipated party will mount up with other recently incurred extra expenditures related to the purchase of their new home. According to Canagarajah, this unfamiliar scenario presents Tamil students with a foreign value system. He explains that, "[s]uch 'budget talk', based on the middle-class values of consumerism, thrift, delayed gratification, and social mobility, are quite alien to rural students, whose circumstances are such that they can only spend as and when they earn" (p. 87). In Canagarajah's estimate, the Tamil students studying English using this textbook will need to deal with the value system its storylines promote. The above analysis illustrates Rosenblatt's theory of reader reception and exemplifies the sort of

code and value clash that can occur between the student/reader and the textbook author(s). In the next section, I will highlight the portion of Canagarajah's study that looks at the ways in which students respond to this cultural code and value clash in order to illustrate how students from non-middle class backgrounds may interact with foreign language textbooks presenting a middle class world view.

Canagarajah (1999) examined the textbook marginalia of the Tamil students of English to "provide insights into the attitudes of the students toward the textbook, and their strategies for dealing with the hidden curriculum of the course" (p.88). He finds several gloss categories. Traces of the students' nationalist feelings are present in the features of a famous Tamil resistance fighter added to a textbook character, resistance symbols, resistance song verses and drawings of the weapons typically used by the resistance. A second type of gloss Tamilizes the textbook characters with traditional garb and forehead markings. Tamil proverbs, film titles and refrains from film soundtracks found in the margins seem to comment on the textbook scenarios and storylines. The final category of gloss relates to romance and sex. Canagarajah informs us that Tamil students read certain textbook scenes as romantic due to the close proximity of the two sexes. He highlights such an example: "[t]he picture of Fletcher driving alone at night with Marilyn (Unit 14c) appears romantic for most students, when both are in fact hotly pursuing a group of criminals" (p. 90). He reports that other scenes where the two sexes appear in close proximity are erotically highlighted and seem to "titillate students, since such levels of intimacy are taboo in their own culture" (p.90). Canagarajah argues that the sexually-charged glosses were often written in English "[s]ince such sexual relationships are often identified by Tamils with what they consider a permissive Western culture,

different from the stereotypically conservative Asian ethos” (p. 90) These four gloss categories indicate distinct points at which the students’ cultural values and codes interact with those of the textbook author.

Canagarajah interprets this textbook defacement as a kind of oppositional coping strategy on the part of the students that resists cultural reproduction by fashioning “more favorable subjectivities and identities” (p.91). He understands this to be a counter-discourse that distances them from textbook ideology. He states: “The textbooks’ discourses put students at a disadvantage, making them feel alien, incompetent, inferior, and powerless; their own discourses provide them with confidence, familiarity, respectability and greater power in their own socio-cultural milieu” (p.91). Canagarajah finds their marginalia counter-discourse seeks to protect the identity features they value (rural, Tamil, religious, activist) by creating a discourse “universe” in which “they can feel comfortable, confident, and sheltered” (p.91). Canagarajah’s analysis fits neatly with Rosenblatt’s theory of reader reception. His examination and interpretation of marginalia shows the ways in which individual value systems and codes interact with those of the textbook and students’ attempts to understand the content on their own terms by reframing the content with marginalia and other defacement.

While Canagarajah’s analysis as it stands is extremely convincing, the data source cannot tell us where the students’ values and codes do in fact overlap with those of the textbook authors. We have no examples of “positive” interaction with the textbook or another source of data, like student interviews, that might reveal other interpretations of the text. We might also challenge Canagarajah on how the data was collected. In this Sri Lankan learning environment, the textbooks were not the property of individual students;

rather they were distributed at the beginning of every class and collected at its conclusion. If we take this into account, his analysis might only apply to a limited number of student graffitists.

On the other hand, if we apply Fish's theory of reception, the role the defaced textbooks play in meaning-making within the learning community is evident. This data was collected in the early nineties, which means the textbooks were in circulation for 10 or more years before the researcher began his analysis. Thus, the marginalia and glosses may reflect the public norms of the community that acted to constrain and sanction the way the discourses of the English textbook were received over a decade or more. For example, a Tamil student who enters the classroom in 1990 may be using a copy of *American Kernel Lessons* that contains resistance marginalia from 1983, 1985 and 1987. These layers of gloss reinforce an interpretive norm that reframed the textbook contents in terms of the Tamil nationalism valued by the community. Another example might be the way the textbook's Western cultural discourse is reframed by the marginalia expressing Tamil traditional cultural values. Through years of use and the layering of marginalia, a kind of Tamilization of the textbook indicates the interpretive norms by which the student is to read the textbook stories within this particular community.

I do not wish to imply that the same kind of research situation is present in the US foreign language classroom for first-generation and working class students. If a US student were to purchase a used textbook, he might similarly confront the marginalia of other students. However, given the organization of the used textbook market in the US, such marginalia may not represent the interpretive norms of the student's immediate community. Likewise, if we were to assess a particular student's meaning-making

process via marginalia analysis, we might not find much to examine. Many college students and, I would argue, especially first-generation and working class college students, refrain from writing in their costly textbooks in order to preserve their resale value.

Nevertheless, I reviewed Canagarajah's study in order to demonstrate the kind of value/code clash that occurs when a student's set of cultural values confronts that of the textbook authors. Additionally, his marginalia analysis illustrates the way in which an interpretive community might inform and direct a student's meaning making. My study addresses the degree to which students perceive themselves, their classmates, and native speakers are represented in the textbook and materials used in foreign language class in terms of social class and socioeconomic status. I also ask how much students believe those traits *should* be represented in the text and materials for themselves, their classmates and native speakers. The study reviewed below highlights the role of the teacher as lead authority in the interpretative community of the classroom and how s/he can shape student textbook interpretation.

Teacher as Master Interpreter. I highlight the following study to illustrate yet another way in which student cultural codes and values systems, along with the interpretive community (in this case of the Academy) and its leaders (in this case, professors and teachers) shape and constrain meaning. Durham (1995) shows how the text and video for *French in Action* (Capretz et al., 1987), an intermediate French textbook, can be read as sexist or feminist, depending on the cultural viewpoint of the reader and/or his ability to read the text critically.

Durham (1995) recounts an incident at Yale University in 1990 where four students submitted formal complaints about their introductory French textbook, *French In Action* (Capretz et al., 1987), because they found it to be sexist. The Yale French Department investigated the accusations and sided with the students. Durham argues that the Yale university students filing the complaint against *French In Action* for its alleged sexist portrayal of women belays their ignorance of French cultural norms and lack of critical awareness for their own cultural norms. She shows that students and professors alike used their own cultural biases to read the text and were not able to decode the textual significance on its own terms. As de Castell (1990) proposes, without this critical lens, students understand the *contents* of textbook, but have no tools to understand its *meaning*. In this case, all parties, teacher, students, and the board that reviewed the charge of sexism, missed the meaning of the text due to their own ethnocentric readings. To illustrate this disconnect, I will review one example addressed by Durham.

In one video lesson, Mirelle, the main female character of *French In Action*, remains silent as Jean-Pierre attempts to engage her in conversation and pick her up. While the Yale University students read this as a powerless response, Durham points out that Mirelle's silence is a culturally appropriate way to rebuff such advances. She explains, "Mirelle is not necessarily silenced as a woman; her refusal to speak effects the culturally approved strategy for denying any relationship between herself and Jean-Pierre can, does or will exist" (1995, p. 157). In contrast, American cultural norms allow for women to engage in "friendly" conversations with unknown men. However, from the French point of view, such engagement is a sign of a woman's promiscuity (Carroll

1988). Durham claims that American women often invite men to pick them up by engaging in conversation (1995, p.157).

Without the aid and guidance of a cultural expert like a professor, students were not shown how to read the interaction in a culturally appropriate way. Much like the Tamil students' romantic interpretation of textbook characters depicted in close proximity, this particular French lesson serves to reinforce the Yale students' American cultural sensitivity to sexism and female oppression via silencing and passivity rather than develop a French cultural awareness that could be useful to them in their travels abroad, for example. The example described above illustrates how failure to model critical, culturally aware textual interpretation misses learning opportunities and leaves open the question of the teacher's role in textbook interpretation.

The teacher operates as an authority and lead interpreter in any classroom context. She reflects the ideologies of the institution and department as well as the culture of higher education and his social class. While some teachers may be conscious of the fact that teaching is a historically situated, social act and possess a critical awareness of language and culture, others simply "go by the book" and defer to it as an authoritative source. The level teachers critically engage with the text falls at various points along this spectrum. Yet, however a teacher interacts with the text, she serves as a model for the way students interact with the book. If a teacher is not culturally aware or fails to challenge students' ethnocentric reading of the textbook, situations like those described in the above studies arise. As evidenced by the reactions of the Tamil students of English and the American students of French described above, the language teacher as master interpreter must engage students in a kind of apprenticeship by which they, as novice

interpreters, not only learn the contents of the textbook, but also learn to glean the underlying meaning through critical, culturally appropriate analysis.

Summary. As reviewed above, the textbook is unlike a literary text due to its fact-stating nature and the subsequent understanding that the textbook genre presents an objectively written compendium of an established body of knowledge. Teachers and students alike may accept the contents of foreign language textbooks in an un-negotiated way due to this belief about textbooks. They may not believe such a genre requires interpretation. As I have suggested, all textbooks require interpretation. Foreign language textbooks in particular require interpretation because they have something in common with literary texts. That is, the words on the page do more than simply refer to their English equivalents, they create a kind of fictional foreign world or imagined community of which students are encouraged to envision being a part. A teacher with critical awareness will model how students might interrogate the foreign world created by the language textbook as well as the target language communities they are supposed to represent. These worlds are rarely problematized by the text itself.

Teaching students how to think critically about pictures and dialogues used to illustrate the meaning of vocabulary items, grammar structures, and cultural practices requires teachers to work against the banking-model of education to which textbooks so easily lend themselves, and employ an educational model in-line with the problem-posing and consciousness raising advocated by educators like Paolo Freire (2000). When students and teachers do not hone their critical interpretive skills, the hidden messages contained in the curriculum are transmitted unchecked. For the students described by Canagarajah (1999) and Durham (1995), no attempt to clarify culturally appropriate

behavior was made by the teacher. Other misinterpretations about target culture include stereotypes and/or the unintentional privileging of a particular point of view or identity. In the section below, I illustrate how Communicative Language Teaching may compound the effect of social class bias in the foreign language textbook by highlighting students' socioeconomic difference.

Communicative Language Teaching and Social Class

At the time of this study, foreign language teaching assistants at the University of Wisconsin-Madison were trained to use a Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) teaching approach. Based on a philosophy of teaching rather than a method for teaching (Richards & Rodgers, 1986), the basic premise of CLT is that students learn language by using it in a meaningful way (Savignon, 1983). I will show how CLT socioeconomic difference and background of foreign language students unlike any other orientation to foreign language teaching.

Since CLT is described as an approach to teaching based on a philosophy of communicative language use, interpretations of how to elicit such language use will differ from teacher to teacher. Nevertheless, CLT language programs all have these components in common: (1) Activities are designed to elicit communication that is personally meaningful to the student; (2) Authentic texts and visual materials are used; (3) Class time is used for communicative activities while grammar is to be studied outside of class (Swaffar, Arens, & Barnes, 1991). CLT classroom activities include “interactive language games, information sharing activities, task-based activities, social interaction, and functional communication practice” (Hadley 2001, p. 117). In my

experience, these activities usually involve the asking and answering of personal questions. Though such questions seem innocuous on the surface, participation in these communicative activities require students to provide the details of their personal lives (e.g., family professions, likes, dislikes, hobbies, and habits) and viewpoints in a way that highlights their social class background and identity.

For example, in my experience as a teaching assistant for Italian, students were frequently asked to share their Spring Break plans both in class conversation and in the writing portion of chapter tests. Talking about what students will do over break is a very convenient way to practice the future tense. However, if we take into consideration the definition of class referenced above which posits that class is what people *do* with their resources, to ask students where and how they will go on vacation is likely to highlight their socioeconomic differences (Connell et al., 1982). For example, 26 students at the University of Wisconsin-Madison were asked to write down their plans for Spring Break in March of 2012. Four students shared plans that involved traveling by plane to places like Colorado, Puerto Rico, New Mexico, and New York City. Four planned to drive out of state to Illinois, Pennsylvania and Alabama. The remaining 18 stated they would be at home for the duration of break. While simply traveling rather than staying at home may not indicate the financial constraints, other details in their answers indicate socioeconomic difference. The student who said she was flying to Colorado, for example, planned to ski.

At the University of Wisconsin-Madison, most incoming foreign language teaching assistants (TAs) are required to attend a “microteaching” training workshop before they begin their first semester of teaching (University of Wisconsin-Madison

Language Institute, 2011). This workshop initiates new TAs into CLT. At the time of this study, Ben Rifkin's 2003 article "Guidelines for Foreign Language Lesson Planning" which includes an historical overview of the "recent history of foreign language teaching and the theoretical foundation of the communicative approach to foreign language teaching" was required reading for the workshop (p.167). This reference for incoming teaching assistants provides a sample lesson plan that models how to teach the topic of housing to students of Russian (see Appendix E).

Rifkin's lesson plan has six elements designed to practice new housing vocabulary as well as review "targeted constructions important for this topic (location; possession; verbs of standing, hanging, lying)" (2003, p.176). First, he suggests the teacher introduce students to the topic with "a short reading featuring homes and apartments" assigned as homework (p.176). In class, students begin with reading comprehension exercises for "a short essay from an illustrated magazine about new trends in home design for the wealthy 'new Russians'" (p.176). Follow-up discussion questions revolve around "the cultural differences in what constitutes a desirable home for new Russians and what they consider a desirable home for themselves" (p.176). The listening component of this lesson involves the viewing of a "Russian television program in which a star describes her new home" (p. 176). After drilling "expressions for location...and possession with inanimate objects," the lesson plan outlines activities for pair work (p. 176).

Pair work activities consist in one student describing a floor plan while his partner draws it and then comparing the drawing to the master floor plan. This activity concludes with a discussion of the "aspects of the home plans they personally like and dislike and

why, and what aspects of the home plans the Russians featured in the reading and viewing activities might like or dislike and why” (p. 167). The final in-class activity is a pre-writing activity that asks students to work with a partner to brainstorm vocabulary for a composition on the topic “My Ideal Home.” The composition may be written “from their own personal perspective or from the perspective of a famous personality (real or fictitious)” (p. 167). The proposed topic for the next two days of class is a “comparison of homelessness in the United States and Russia and the issue of affordable housing in both cultures” (p. 167).

In terms of CLT, this lesson plan is exemplary; it thoroughly covers relevant grammar points and all four communicative skills (reading, writing, speaking, listening) while providing students with opportunities for authentic communication about housing and design preferences as well as cultural differences and social problems. However, this seemingly balanced coverage also creates the possibility for student discomfort and/or alienation. First, the discussion topics require students to state what constitutes a desirable home for themselves as compared to the ‘new’ Russians. Comparison between themselves and a newly elite class within the target language society not only highlights cultural difference (as intended), but any socioeconomic difference between each pair of students. Second, students are asked to compare themselves to a super-elite class like that of Russian stars. Though discussion centers on their personal opinions regarding the features of the star’s home, the activity assumes that students aspire to own similarly extravagant homes. Finally, students are asked to brainstorm vocabulary with their partners in order to describe “My Ideal Home.” By using the extravagant homes as

models of the ideal, this activity suggests students aspire to something in-line with the classroom narrative of material luxury.

When presented with a mismatch between students' life experiences or aspirations and the assumptions about those life experiences or aspirations, instructors commonly encourage students to "make it up" or "pretend" in order "just to practice." For example, in this last activity, Rifkin (2003) gives students the option of writing the composition from the point of view of a famous person (albeit real or made-up) if they prefer not to describe their ideal home from their own point of view. This suggestion and analogous advice exemplifies a contradiction I have found in the CLT classroom: students are asked to speak about themselves in a restrained manner that does not implicate social problems or difference. If a student's life experience falls outside the norm of the curriculum and/or he prefers not to share his ideals, he is encouraged to pretend he is someone else, as Rifkin suggests, a famous person.

For those who cannot contribute to the classroom narrative, being encouraged to "make it up" amounts to performing an identity other than one's own. This betrays the primary objective of CLT: meaningful communication. How does such a performance affect a student's language acquisition? Later in this chapter, I will review other well-known language teaching methods to show that CLT is unique in the way it highlights students' socioeconomic differences.

Other Language Teaching Methods and Social Class

In contrast to CLT, other teaching philosophies/approaches/methods/techniques do not highlight students' class identity. For example, three "traditional" pre-1970s methods—the Grammar-Translation method the Direct Method and Audiolingual methodology—have a different focus. None of them require students to employ language to communicate their own meanings in response to open-ended prompts or questions as commonly practiced in CLT (for a review of these methods, see Hadley, 2001).

Unlike CLT, the Grammar-Translation method focuses on the written use of the target language. A typical lesson involves translating authentic text into the native language of the students or focusing on one particular grammar concept and translating sentences that highlight it. For example, a dry presentation of the rules for the use of *de* in French might be followed by an exercise that asks students to translate sentences from French to English and from English to French. Such an exercise is shown in Figure 1 (Rivers, 1975, p. 108):

Figure 1. Translation Exercise

Exercise B: Translate to French

- a. Have we the horse's hay?
- b. You have the horse's oats.
- c. Have you the cloth shoe of the physician's sister?
- d. No, madam; I have the lady's silk dress.

While the main goal is to develop translation skills in order to access literature, a secondary goal is to enhance the understanding of one's own language structure via comparison between the native and target language. "Much of class time was devoted to talking about the language; virtually no time was spent talking in the language" (Hadley 2001, p. 107). The translation approach was seen as an intellectual discipline designed to "develop the mind" by working it like a muscle (Bensler & Schulz, 1980, p. 90). Unlike CLT, which uses personal questions to develop oral communication skills and encourage authentic communication, the focus and objectives of the Grammar-Translation method are met using written exercises that do not implicate a student's social class identity.

The Direct Method is dissimilar to the Grammar-Translation method because it focuses on oral communication rather than written expression. By exposing students to large amounts of language and fostering 'direct' associations between words and objects, the Direct Method attempts to imitate how children learn their first language (Hadley, 2001).

Although it is similar to CLT in that it emphasizes oral communication, it differs in that understanding the teacher generated output is primary. For example, teachers using this method rely on prompts and pictures to help students connect word and object. In this way, teachers avoid giving definitions in the native tongue.

Formulaic question-answer exchanges, attention to correct pronunciation, deductive grammar learning, and a focus on context to deduce meaning are all salient features of the Direct Method. “Often direct methods make heavy use of audio-visual materials, using film strips, slides, film, or series of drawings or pictures accompanied by tapes or records. These materials are used to present language in context, to model the utterances, clarify meaning through the visuals, and serve as basis for the question-answer exercises” (Bensler & Schulz, 1980, p. 89). Since the emphasis of this method is to develop language for typical, formulaic interaction rather than providing open-ended questions or speaking prompts, it does not create a space where in order to participate in oral activities, a student must reveal personal information indicative of his class status.

Like the Direct Method, Audiolingual methodology is structured to develop native-like oral communication, there is similarly no room for student invention. Using the findings of behaviorist psychology as its basis, Audiolingual methodology was thought to be a scientific way to learn a language through a stimulus-response mechanism. To this end, students were not allotted time to ponder prompts. Instead, they were expected to respond immediately to audio stimuli (Hadley, 2001). As such, the main activities were repetition and transformation pattern drills (Chastain, 1976).

A typical lesson began with a dialog that addressed the theme of the chapter. Chastain (1976) explains,

[A] characteristic of the dialogs in early audio-lingual texts was that they were to be linguistically and culturally authentic. Linguistic authenticity meant that the utterances in the dialog were to be true to native speech. Thus, any structure might occur in any given dialog. However, only selected structures were to be learned in each unit.” (p. 114)

Once the dialog is introduced, students are given repetition pattern drills. The first is a repetition drill that isolates the forms to be learned. Figure 2 is translated from Chastain (1976, pp. 114-115).

Figure 2. Repetition Drill.

Repeat		
Michel walks in the park.	I walk under the trees.	You work at home.
He stays in the garden.	I work with mother.	You prepare dinner.
Annette works in the kitchen.	I give money.	Do you prepare dinner?
Mother gives money.		

The second repetition pattern drill is a substitution drill that requires students to modify a model sentence by using the provided prompts. *Figure Example 3* is translated from the Chastain (1976, p. 115).

Figure 3. Substitution Drill.

<i>Madame</i>					
<i>Duval</i>					
<i>He</i>	<i>prepares dinner.</i>				
<i>Mother</i>					
<i>She</i>					
<i>The girl</i>					
<i>He</i>	<table style="border-collapse: collapse; margin-left: 20px;"> <tr> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;"><i>Works</i></td> <td rowspan="3" style="padding: 0 10px;"><i>in the garden.</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;"><i>Walks</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px 5px;"><i>Stays</i></td> </tr> </table>	<i>Works</i>	<i>in the garden.</i>	<i>Walks</i>	<i>Stays</i>
<i>Works</i>	<i>in the garden.</i>				
<i>Walks</i>					
<i>Stays</i>					

After students have performed these drills, a grammar summary is presented followed by transformation pattern drills (Chastain, 1976). Examples of transformation pattern drills include changing sentences from the singular to the plural, transforming the tense from the present to the past, question and answer exercises, and substituting different subjects and modifying the verb accordingly. Students are also asked to memorize set dialogues (Chastain, 1976).

Since language is understood to be a learned behavior, Audiolingual methodology specifically avoids any opportunity for mistakes so that “incorrect” usage is never learned. Thus, these sorts of exercises do not require a personalized response by the student, a situation where opportunity for error is great. All language practice is prescribed for the student. As such, repeating and minimally manipulating preset language chunks or memorizing dialogs never brings a student’s background or social class identity into classroom discussion.

In contrast to the methods described above, CLT regularly highlights a students’ socioeconomic differences. When teachers utilizing a CLT approach ask students to design and draw a dream home using the vocabulary of a particular chapter as prescribed by Rifkin, the assumption is that all students aspire to own large homes at some point in the future. This exercise is problematic because it may be imposing an imagined community on the student. According to Norton and McKinney (2011), imagined communities “refer to groups of people, not immediately tangible and accessible, with whom we connect through the power of imagination” (p.76). An *imposed* imagined community is present in the CLT classroom if the lines of questioning and the focus of activities force students to affirm or aspire to a membership in a group with a particular life experience.

Whenever a class activity calls on students to voice their ideals or values as compared to the textbook, their classmates, the rich and famous, or, as Rifkin would have it, to a class of people like the ‘new’ Russians, it may actually result in the imposition of a particular aspiration or value system to a particular future and a particular imagined social class community.

Chapter Summary

This section included studies from the field of education as well as SLA that demonstrate how textbooks lack social class diversity in their pictorial, situational, and lexical representations. I highlighted the middle class values in foreign language textbook evaluations in terms of attitudes toward work, money, and material consumption. I explored how textbooks are assumed to be factual, unbiased representations of the truth (de Castell, 1990). Such a belief can be problematic as in the cases presented by Canagarajah (1999) and Durham (1995), unless textbook material is critically engaged, ideally in a way modeled by the teacher. Finally, I demonstrated how Communicative Language Teaching compounds the effect of class bias found in foreign language textbooks by highlighting students’ socioeconomic differences unlike other approaches to foreign language teaching.

Chapter 4: Methods

Pilot Study

Identifying and recruiting pilot participants. For the pilot study (IRB approved protocol SE-2011-0668), I initially wished to recruit participants from the Working Class Student Union (WCSU) because I believed self-identification with a working class identity would eliminate the complication of defining social class. Although there are some members of WCSU who identify as allies (myself included), it was probable that the majority of those who join this student group self-identify as working class. I surmised that allied members would have a good understanding of their social class identity and feel confident self-identifying according to their own understanding of their social class identity, whatever it might be.

Unfortunately, the organization struggles to attract members. From my observations while participating in the group, there were several reasons for its struggle to grow. While first-generation and working-class students may be aware of the group, they may not have the free time to participate in its activities due to family obligations and work commitments. Given time constraints, working class/first-generation students may choose to participate in another extracurricular activity instead of an identity-based organization. Another reason for low membership may be related to a stigmatized label like “working class” which may deter some students from participating. Working class students at four-year universities may not have had the opportunity to do the necessary identity work that leads to class awareness and develop pride in their roots. Another possible reason for low membership may be that of class confusion; that is, believing one is middle class rather than working class as over 53% of US citizens do (Pew, 2008). It also could be that these and other students do not attribute the difficulty they may have

adjusting to university life to their social class status. Such students would benefit from the support and camaraderie of such a group.

For the pilot study, I recruited additional first-generation status (i.e., neither parent has attended at four-year institution) participants from outside the Working Class Student Union. Only four of the ten people I interviewed were affiliated with WCSU, but nearly all of the remaining six—though they were not members of WCSU—also readily identified as working class. All pilot student participants had first-generation status. Pilot study participants' affiliations with The University of Wisconsin-Madison are listed in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1

Pilot Study Participant Pseudonyms, Affiliations, and Languages Studied

Pseudonym	WCSU affiliation	Language studied	University affiliation
Aimee	Yes	German	Grad
Ann	No	French	Grad
Astrid	Yes	Swedish	Grad
Emily	No	Spanish	Grad
Kay	Yes	Spanish	Undergrad
Irina	No	German	Grad
Lindsey	Yes	Indonesian	Grad
Octavian	No	Spanish	Grad
Jonah	No	Norwegian	Alum
Lee	No	German	Staff

Recruiting revisions for full study. For the pilot study, I recruited members of the WCSU as well as first-generation college students who had studied a foreign language. However, in the recruitment materials, I did not specify when or where participants should have studied a foreign language.

While completing the interviews, I found participants' memory of their foreign language experiences were not fresh because they were not currently enrolled in classes. Though these participants still offered me much important information, I felt they may have been able to provide me more detailed information if they could refer to recent experiences. I concluded that I needed to focus my attention on those currently enrolled in foreign language for the full study.

Additionally, I saw that it was imperative the participants' foreign language learning experience occur in a foreign language classroom at the same institution so that I could see how and whether the social class differences I identified on the University of Wisconsin-Madison campus (i.e., the social class implications of Sconnie and Coastie stereotypes) might manifest in the classroom. I also attempted to control for language studied. Therefore, I only recruited students currently enrolled in French, Italian, and Spanish at the University of Wisconsin-Madison for the full study. I chose these languages because I felt I had sufficient facility in them to critique their curriculum. I was also familiar with the organization and course administration in Department of French and Italian, as well as the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Inclusion of pilot study interviews with full study data. By specifying when, where, and which foreign language was studied, I sought to gain coherence in my research. However, I may have lost some of the considered insights that come with time. Although these ten pilot study participants were further removed from their foreign language classroom environment,

they had had time to reflect, integrate, and theorize their experiences. They also possessed a more nuanced understanding of social class that reflected their age, additional education, and real world experience. Despite the fact that the pilot participants had studied a variety of foreign languages in a variety of locations at various points in the past, the pilot study group offered considered insights about social class and how it relates to the foreign language classroom.

I will include interview data in the results chapters that follow where I deem these pilot participants offer deeper insight than those interviewed in the full study. Although pilot participants differ from the full study participants in some respects (i.e., age, affiliation with the university, foreign language studied, and year of study), their stories nevertheless illustrate well the foreign language learning experiences of first-generation and working class students. I will clearly indicate which interview data is from the pilot study. Some of the interview data from the pilot study was previously published in *Language Learning* (Young & Astarita, 2013).

Full Study

The present study consists in a mixed methods study of college students who were enrolled in French, Italian, and Spanish foreign language courses at the University of Wisconsin- Madison in the Spring of 2012 (IRB approved protocol SE-2012-0283). In order to fully describe and contextualize the foreign language learning experiences of these college students at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, data were gathered from the following three sources: on-line survey, semi-structured interview, and document analysis of *Avanti!*, the beginning Italian textbook used by the largest group of participants. For the purposes of comparison and contextualization, survey data were gathered from the non-first generation classmates and first generation students alike; however only first-generation and working class college students were

interviewed. By using this triangulation method (e.g., a varied combination of data sources) to access the lived experience of first-generation and working class college students in the foreign language classroom, I highlight commonalities while situating them in relation to other foreign language learners in the University of Wisconsin-Madison learning environment.

Participants who chose to complete the on-line survey had the opportunity to volunteer for the interview portion of the study by leaving an e-mail address. I contacted volunteers who indicated they were first-generation and/or working class via e-mail to arrange for the interview. Interviews took place in a private setting, usually a private study room at a campus library during the Spring, Summer, and Fall of 2012. Survey data were collected using Qualtrics, an on-line survey host and analyzed with the help of several statisticians. Interview data were transcribed and coded in two phases using Nvivo, a computer software that assists the researcher to organize and identify themes in the data. Textbook pages were scanned for document analysis.

Research questions. The following three questions guided the study: (1) How is socioeconomic difference recognized and highlighted in the foreign language learning environment? (2) What are participants from particular backgrounds' feelings, dispositions to discussion topics, and participation strategies in the foreign language learning environment? (3) How do participants from particular social class backgrounds enrolled in beginning Italian perceive representation in textbook?

Instruments for Data Collection

The pre-pilot exploratory interviews with members of the Working Class Student Union helped me develop the survey instrument and interview protocol for the pilot study. The pilot study served to test the survey instrument and interview protocol. While I substantially revised

the survey instrument for the full study, the interview protocol elicited data well and it remained unchanged.

Survey. Quantitative data was collected via on-line survey (see Appendix F). The survey was intended to gauge the experiences and feelings of the University of Wisconsin-Madison college students in the foreign language classroom as well as collect general demographic data (e.g., biographical).

The central questions relating to feelings were developed based on Aries (2008). The key demographic questions addressing social class are based on the General Social Survey, which has been in use since 1972 (Hout, 2008). Finally, the demographic questions relating to race, ethnicity, and first-generation status were revised based on the admissions application to The University of Wisconsin System (Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System, 2010). Additional demographic questions regarding gender, sexual orientation, work, residency, tuition, and living arrangements were modeled on an on-line survey posted by the Multicultural Students Center (*n.d.*). The remaining questions I developed based on preliminary data from informal interviews with a member of the Working Class Student Union during the summer of 2010 as well as my observations while participating in the group throughout the 2010-2011 academic year. Professor Monika Chavez assisted me to format and revise the survey questions after the pilot study.

There were six sections to the survey covering the following topics: language selection, noticing, feelings, discussion topics, and demographic information. Question 1.1 asked which language course participants were currently enrolled in. Question 1.2 requested the course number and Q1.4 asked the reason participants enrolled in a particular language. Questions 1.6

and 1.7 asked how much participants perceived their classmates (Q1.6) and instructor (Q1.7) took notice of their age, sexual orientation, social class, race/ethnicity, and socioeconomic status in what they said and did by indicating a percentage. The scale for these two questions was divided into 10% increments from 0% (“In none of what I say and do.”) to 100% (“In all of what I say and do.”)

Questions 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 asked participants to choose a point on a 6-point scale running between two contrasting word pairs to indicate how comfortable/uncomfortable, adequate/inadequate, valued/not valued, heard/unheard, a part of the group/not a part of the group participants presently felt (Q2.1), would like to feel (Q2.2) and perceived their classmates felt (Q2.3).

Questions 3.1 and 3.2 addressed classroom discussion topics. Q3.1 asked how frequently participants perceived they were asked to discuss a list of 12 topics on a 6-point Likert scale. Q3.2 asked their disposition to discussing them. Participants could indicate one, two, three, or all four dispositions including: “I would feel comfortable...,” “I would be selective...,” “I wouldn’t know the vocabulary...,” and “I would avoid speaking about this topic.”

Questions 4.1 asked participants to indicate on a 7-point Likert scale how frequently they believed instructional materials were used in and out of class. Questions 4.7, 4.10, 4.13 addressed how much participants perceived their social class identity and socioeconomic status (Q4.7) were represented in the materials and activities of their language classes as well as that of classmates (Q4.10) and native speakers (Q4.13). Questions 4.8, 4.11, 4.14 asked participants to reflect on the ideal representation of these identity aspects for the same groups.

Questions 6.2 and 6.3 were open-ended questions that asked participants to describe social status on the UW-Madison campus (Q6.2) and reflect on their own social status the UW-Madison campus (Q6.3). Question 6.15 and 6.18 addressed social class. Participants were asked to select one of four choices (Lower Class, Working Class, Middle Class, Upper Class) to describe their family's social class (Q6.15) and the majority of their classmates (Q6.18). An open ended follow-up question asked students how they knew their classmates' social class (Q6.19).

Questions 6.25-6.27 addressed parental education. Q6.25 asked whether either parent had earned a four-year college/university degree. Questions 6.26 and 6.27 asked the highest level of educational attainment of participants' father (or guardian) and mother (or guardian), respectively. Question 6.28 asked participants to report the approximate combined annual household income for their parents or guardians. Q6.37 asked participants how many hours they worked on and off campus during the academic year.

Finally, Q6.41 asked students to leave their e-mail address to be entered into a drawing for a \$50 Amazon gift certificate. Question 6.42 solicited participants for a follow-up interview and asked about their availability.

Semi-structured interview protocol. A semi-structured interview protocol was developed based on exploratory interviews with students enrolled in Italian 101 and members of the Working Class Student Union. In the Fall of 2009, I interviewed three students enrolled in Italian 101 and observed their class. Using a draft protocol, I interviewed one member of the Working Class Student Union in Spring 2010 for approximately 2 hours. In the summer of 2010, I recorded approximately 14 hours of informal unstructured interviews with a key member of the

Working Class Student Union. At times, these interviews included other members of the organization.

The interview protocol I developed based on these exploratory interviews included an excessive number of questions (see Appendix G). However, since the interview was semi-structured, the number of questions I asked depended on the length of the interview and whether it was necessary to use slight reformulations or different adjectives in a given line of questioning. Rather than set out a structured interview protocol with set questions, I wanted to maintain some flexibility.

The semi-structured interview protocol consisted of 54 questions. The first set of questions addressed the current or most recent foreign language in which the participant was enrolled (Q1-3). These questions were intended to bring the experiences of a particular foreign language class to the forefront of his/her mind. I asked that the participant answer the following questions in terms of this experience in order to solicit the most detailed answers possible.

The second set of questions asked participants to describe what he/she felt the instructor and fellow classmates noticed most about him/her (Q4-5) and how they might describe him/her to someone else (Q6-7). These questions were intended to help me understand how the participant believed he/she was perceived by others in the class. I also asked the participant to describe himself (Q8) and say how he/she believed he/she was different from his/her classmates (Q9). These questions were intended to help me understand how a participant's understanding of himself/herself differed from how he/she believed others perceived him/her.

The next set of interview questions addressed social class identity. Rather than provide a definition of social class, I asked participants to give their understanding of the term in questions 10 and 11. Before I asked them to talk about their social class identity, I first inquired whether

there were students of their same social class in their foreign language classroom and how they knew these classmates where of the same social class (Q12). I asked participants to state whether he/she thought he/she was of the same social class as his/her instructor and how he/she knew this (Q13). I asked participants to tell me more about their social class identity and that of their family in questions 14, 15, and 16. I asked them to tell me whether they believed others in their foreign language class knew their social class identity (Q17) and how they knew (Q18). These questions were intended to give me an idea of the classroom environment and how social class was indexed and perceived within it.

Questions 19-23 attempted to gauge whether participants felt they needed to alter their social class identity in the foreign language classroom. Question 19 asked whether participants felt they needed to 'pass' as a different social class. Question 20 asked whether they felt they needed to hide their social class. Question 21 asked whether they 'made things up' in order not to call attention to themselves in class. Question 22 asked whether they avoided talking in class. Question 23 asked whether participants felt 'uncomfortable, alienated or like an outsider' in class. These questions were intended to help me understand how participants' social class identity impacted participation as well as how their social class identity was interpolated in the foreign language classroom.

The next set of questions addressed relationships with in the classroom learning environment. Question 24 asked about friendships and whether these friends were of the participant's same social class. Question 25 asked whether the instructor ever assumed anything about the participant his/her classmates. Question 26 and 27 address participants' reasons for taking this particular foreign language and whether these reasons differed from/alienated them from their classmates.

Questions 28 and 29 addressed work commitments during the academic year and whether they interfered with foreign language study in terms of extra-curricular activities (like language tables) and/or group work. Since first-generation/working class students are likely to work while in school, I wished to understand the effect of working on foreign language study.

Questions 30, 31 and 32 inquired as to whether taking a foreign language was beneficial/detrimental (Q30), whether it had any unintended effect on the participant's life (Q31), and whether it was a burden to the participant in any way (Q32). These questions were designed to elicit talk about the negative impact of taking a foreign language (if any) on participants' lives.

Questions 33-42 all addressed the foreign language classroom experience. The first half (Q33-38) asked participants to say what they thought about the textbook generally (Q33), whether they could relate to the characters (Q35) and situations (Q34) found in the textbook and whether the textbook contains characters that do things they would do and if they resembled participants (Q36). Question 37 asked whether participants could find the words to describe themselves and their families (Q38). Question 39 inquired whether not knowing any of this vocabulary impeded their learning, made them uncomfortable or alienated them. Question 40 asked whether there were any specific experiences/events, texts, textbook exercises, films, activities, examples, drawings, depictions, descriptions from class that stood out to them or illustrated how you related to the class materials? These questions were designed to uncover how the participant interacted with class materials.

Questions 41-48 addressed class participation. Question 41 attempted to understand whether anything about the class felt foreign (other than the language and culture). The question was intended to see whether students were attuned to the middle class values present in class. The following questions addressed participation. Participants were asked whether they felt they

could share/participate in class (Q42) and whether their stories/life experiences were accepted in class (Q43). Question 51 asked whether participants felt like they needed to say or refrain from saying certain things/ behave in a certain way to be accepted by their teacher and/or classmates. Questions 46 and 47 asked whether participants ever felt untrue to themselves, family or your origins in foreign language class (Q46) and whether they felt they needed to compromise their values or priorities (Q47). Finally, question 48 asked whether any of this affected their language learning. The goal of these questions was to determine the effect of social class identity and associated affective responses on participation in foreign language classroom learning.

The final five questions were broad in scope. They asked participants to theorize their experiences learning a foreign language. Question 49 asked whether they felt it was possible to be multilingual and from their class background. Question 50 asked whether the way they think of themselves has changed as they've taken a foreign language or the way they think of their families has changed (Q51). Question 52 asked whether learning a foreign language expanded their access to certain things. Question 53 asked how the participants' social class affected their language learning and whether it made it easier or more difficult. The final question asked how learning a foreign language affected participants' understanding of their own social class identities (Q54).

Document analysis. I scanned pages from *Avanti!* (Aski & Musumeci, 2010), the beginning Italian textbook used by 68 of the 101 participants enrolled in first and second semester Italian at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Chapters and activities that highlight social class and socioeconomic indicators were targeted for analysis.

Research Context, Population, and Sample

Dane county, Wisconsin. The University of Wisconsin-Madison is located in the south central area of the state known as Dane county. Among the 50 states, Wisconsin currently ranks first in high school graduation for white non-Hispanics, but thirtieth for Blacks (*Race for Results*, 2014, p.2). Disparities between the educational achievement of white and black populations living in Dane county manifest as lower rates of college enrollment for black students.

According to the *Race to Equity* report published by Wisconsin Council on Children and Families, only 50% of African American high school students graduated on time and “black 12th graders were only half as likely as white 12th graders to take the ACT exam” (2013, p.9).

Diversity at UW-Madison. For the 2011-2012 academic year (the time of data collection), the total enrollment at UW-Madison was made up of 76% White/unknown students 14% minorities, and 10% international students (Office of the Provost & Office of Budget, Planning and Analysis, 2012, p.7). The data collected for this study reflects this ratio. Of the participants who completed the online survey, 85% were White/unknown, 11% were minorities, and 4% were international students. Table 4.2 shows that the proportion of participants who completed interviews also reflected these ratios. There were no participants who identified as African American in this study.

Table 4.2

Diversity of UW-Madison Enrollment for Academic Year 2011-12 and Participant Ratio

	Percent of			Percent of		
	UW- Madison enrollment	UW- Madison enrollment	Completed survey	Percent of completed surveys	Percent of Interviews interviews	
White/unknown	32,174	76%	86	85%	13	81%
All minorities	5,894	14%	11	11%	2	13%
International	4,373	10%	4	4%	1	6%
Total	42,441	100%	101	100%	16	100%

Gender. There were nearly equal numbers of women and men enrolled at the University of Wisconsin-Madison during the 2011-2012 academic year (Office of the Provost & Office of Budget, Planning and Analysis, 2012, p.4). Table 4.3 shows the ratio of men and women who completed the online survey does not reflect the student body's gender diversity; over twice as many women participated. However, the ratio of men and women participants who completed a follow-up interview better reflected the student body.

Table 4.3

Gender Diversity of UW-Madison Enrollment for Academic Year 2011-12 and Participant Ratio

	UW- Madison enrollment	Percent of UW- Madison enrollment	Completed survey	Percent of completed surveys	Interviews	Percent of interviews
Men	20,653	49%	31	31%	7	44%
Women	21,788	51%	70	69%	9	56%
Total	42,441	100%	101	100%	16	100%

First-generation status. Of the 101 participants who completed the online survey, 30 had first generation status. Unfortunately, the number of all those enrolled at UW-Madison in the 2011-12 academic year who have first-generation status is not available for the total student population (42,411), nor are they available for those enrolled in individual language courses. However, the *Diversity Forum* reports that 21.8% of the 28,737 *undergraduates* enrolled in Fall 2011 had first-generation status (Office of Academic Planning and Institutional Research, 2014). If we assume this ratio is true for the entire population, we might conclude that first-generation status students were slightly over-represented in the participant pool at 30% of the total number of participants. This is merely a rough estimate and it is impossible to know whether it is true without the first-generation status figures for the entire university enrollment and individual language course enrollment.

Language course enrollment. At the time of this study, 955 students were enrolled in the targeted foreign language courses. As mentioned above, the number of students enrolled with first-generation status as well as the gender and racial/ethnic diversity of these courses is unknown. However, Table 4.4 shows the total population of each course and its representation in the online survey and interview samples. Note that nearly half of the Italian 201 course participated in the study. This is likely due to the fact that it was taught by the Italian course coordinator who gave me permission to recruit in Italian courses. She may have encouraged her students to participate more than other teaching assistants due to this added knowledge about the project.

Table 4.4

Language Course Enrollment and Study Participation

Language	Course	Completed	Percentage of	Completed	Percentage of
Course	enrollment	survey	course	interview	course
			enrollment		enrollment
Italian 101	154	24	16%	3	2%
Italian 102	157	28	18%	4	3%
Italian 201	31	16	52%	3	10%
Italian 203	49	9	18%	1	2%
Italian 204	47	4	9%	0	0
French 101	153	10	7%	4	3%
French 102	114	7	6%	1	1%
Spanish 102	250	3	1%	0	0
Total	955	101	11%	16	2%

Language choice. Students enroll in particular languages for various reasons. Table 4.5 shows the multiple reasons participants indicated for taking a particular language. It should be noted that particular languages also carry particular prestige. Spanish is known to be a practical choice to expand career options while French and Italian may be selected for leisure pursuits like travel. Electing to study one language over another is a cultural choice rooted in one's educational background and social origin (Bourdieu, 1984).

Given the number of participants in this study was not equally divided among the three languages, it is difficult to compare motivations. However, in Table 4.5 we see that the majority

of students enrolled in Italian planned to use it when traveling and indicated they were studying it to develop another hobby/interest. Far fewer intended to use it in their careers. Participants enrolled in French answered similarly. All three participants enrolled in Spanish indicated they would use Spanish in their careers as well as to travel.

Table 4.5

Participants' Reasons for Enrolling in Particular Foreign Languages

	N	Fulfill language requirement	Use primarily in career	Use secondarily in career	Use in academic studies	Use on study abroad	Use while traveling	Develop another interest/hobby	Use with friends	Use with family	Learn about heritage	To be different
Italian	81	37	10	39	48	59	76	74	39	20	15	58
French	17	4	4	12	7	11	17	16	8	2	1	15
Spanish	3	2	0	3	2	2	3	2	1	0	0	2
Total	101	43	14	54	57	72	96	93	48	22	16	75

Note. Multiple answers allowed, Q1.4, see Appendix F

Recruitment and Participation

Survey. I asked the foreign language coordinators in French, Italian, and Spanish whether I could recruit participants for my survey in the introductory sections of foreign language courses currently in progress at the end of the 2012 Spring semester. This timing ensured that participants' had nearly completed one semester or more of foreign language in the learning environment I wished to target. I visited all sections of Italian to give my pitch in person.

Due to limited time, I had to rely on email to recruit from French and Spanish. With the permission of the language coordinators, I sent my solicitation to the teaching assistants of French 101 and 102 as well as Spanish 102 and asked that they forward the email to their class list. (Spanish 101 was not offered in the Spring semester of 2012.) Refer to Table 4.6 for the number of participants grouped according to language enrollment.

Follow-up interview. At the end of the online survey, students could volunteer to participate in a follow-up interview by leaving an email address. Of the 101 participants who completed the survey, 99 volunteered for the follow-up interview. Thirty of these volunteers had first-generation status. Although I did not recruit from Spanish 203, one participant who gave a follow-up interview spoke to her experience while enrolled in the course for two weeks prior to dropping it and enrolling in French 101.

Table 4.6

Percent of Participants Who Gave Interviews Grouped by Language Course Enrollment

	Participant		Percent of total
	language enrollment	Follow-up interview	participants
Italian 101	24	3	13%
Italian 102	28	4	14%
Italian 201	16	3	19%
Italian 203	9	1	11%
Italian 204	4	0	0
French 101	10	4	40%
French 102	7	1	14%
Spanish 102	3	0	0
Spanish 203*	(1)	(1)	(100%)
Totals	101	16	16%

Note. * = participant dropped the course and enrolled in French 101

Identifying participants for the follow-up interview. Of the interview volunteers, I invited for an interview those who indicated they were raised in a working class family as well as those whose parents did not complete a four-year degree. Sixteen students completed the interview; their pseudonyms are listed in Table 4.7.

Table 4.7

Follow-up Interview Participant Pseudonyms, Language Studied, and Social Class Background

		Language	
	Pseudonym	studied	Family social class background
1	Cameron	Italian 101	I feel like our family works hard and...My parents both worked like a lot of jobs when I was growing up and...they weren't born with a silver spoon in their hand or anything like that...
2	Carrie Ann	Italian 102	<p>INTERVIEWER: Um, so in your survey, you said, you identified yourself as middle class and you identified your family as working class. Can you explain that difference?</p> <p>RESPONDENT: I guess I'm not sure the differences between the middle class and the working class. Um, I would say one of those two...I guess, um, probably m-, middle class. Um, just because, um, like I have to work and like you have to have a job and like, um, get like, like sustain yourself, but I also had a lot of opportunities and, um, more opportunities than I would have if I was in maybe a different class. Um, and I guess, yeah, like based on my parents, um, like, and their jobs and social classes would probably be the same, and so, yeah. I guess probably</p>

-
- 3 Dexter French 101 I came from a pretty low-class family...I'm an independent, first of all, so I don't get any family contribution. I wouldn't have anyway because they don't have anything to contribute.
- 4 Eclipse French 101 My parents are both immigrants from Guatemala—and together, I think they make like \$40,000 a year. And I, I'm here on scholarship and grant money. So, I kind of just tend to consider myself lower class in terms of income.
- 5 Ellen Italian 201 How long has it been, two years now, my mom had to declare bankruptcy. Uh, my sister did the same not too long ago. My brother got his car repossessed, so...There's just a lot of like financial...irresponsibility just going through my family, which kind of causes that, um, which is something I really want to avoid, learning from that example, so.
- 6 Eric French 101 My parents worked in blue collar—
So that, to me, is like a working class.
- 7 Harold Italian 101 We never came from much. I always say, for my family's, uh, background, we were farmers who lost our farms, then we worked in factories and we lost those, too, so now all we've got left is our minds and hopefully we don't lose those. Um, that's kind of what, uh, we've been pushing forward.
-

8	John	French 102	<p>RESPONDENT: So yeah, because I'm an international student, so, maybe the class system is different back home and compared to America here, so—I don't think it's the same, yeah.</p> <p>INTERVIEWER: In the survey, you did say that you identify as working class and that your family is middle class.</p> <p>RESPONDENT: Yeah, I mean, like for me, class is something that you have to gain and you work through. It's not like inherited, so, yeah, it's just different.</p>
9	Katniss	Italian 201	<p>Neither of my parents went to, um, college, My dad was a mechanic. My mom, well, she works for the county.</p>
10	Melissa	Italian 102	<p>My parents are definitely middle, middle class if not middle upper class. They both have very stable jobs and make a decent amount of money. We're able to do the things that we'd like to do when we have just a little bit of, you know, extra money for things that come up, like emergencies and whatever. So, we're always comfortable. I'm the one paying for school and stuff...Like I said, if my, I need something, if I'm, I'm never going hungry. I'm not like worried about my school loan because my parents would always like pick those up if I needed them to.</p>

-
- 11 Michelle Italian 101 It's not fun to say my dad's a farmer.
I feel like probably other kids' parents like have important jobs, like CEOs or something. I feel like everybody else comes from like a more, like more income.
- 12 Sam Dropped Spanish 203 and enrolled in French 101 My house that I have, like with my mom, we have no running water or heat or anything, and so, um, and any clothes that I get or anything, my aunt, you know, buys for me. So I kind of like identify with the lower class.
- 13 Santino Italian 102 I got a scholarship and financial aid, ...But I think a lot of the, a lot of parents help out their kids. I don't know, whenever we complain about buying books and stuff, a lot of people said that like their parents bought them for them and—I didn't have to buy my own books either because of my financial aid, but—
- 14 Sofia Italian 102 INTERVIEWER: Um, so, in the survey, you said that you identify as working class. Both you and your family.
RESPONDENT: Yes.
-

-
- 15 Sophie Italian 201 INTERVIEWER: Um, so in the survey you said that you identify as working class and your family you identify your family as working class. Can you tell me something about that?
- RESPONDENT: Um, yeah. I mean, I guess working and middle class, like I would guess my family would fall kind of in between there.
- 16 Steve Italian 203 I'm paying my own way through college, I'm still claimed by my parents like on taxes and whatnot—but, I mean, I, I pay my rent. You know, I pay my tuition. I'm, you know, so many grand in debt. I work at factories in the summer.
-

Data Analysis

Survey. Survey data was collected online using Qualtrics. I exported this data to SPSS. Using this program I cleaned the data of missing values, assigned values for qualitative responses, and gave labels to all responses. Participants were grouped based on first-generation status and family social class background. This way I was able to compare the two large groups—first gen ($n = 30$) and not first gen ($n = 71$)—as well as the seven family social class background subgroups described below.

The 30 participants with first generation status are grouped by the social class in which they were raised: lower class ($n = 3$), working class ($n = 12$), middle class ($n = 14$), upper class ($n = 1$). The 71 participants without first-generation status were also grouped by the social class in which they were raised: working class ($n = 8$), middle class ($n = 52$), upper class ($n = 11$). No participant without first-generation status identified as being raised in a lower class family.

Rationale for social class groupings. This study has been guided by the self-understandings of the Working Class Student Union members. The Working Class Student Union serves those who self-identify as working class and those who are the first in their families to attend college. According to WCSU, one in six students have first-generation status at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. While the University does keep data on first-generations status, it does not collect data about the social class identity of those who enroll. Social class identity is not a protected status like gender, creed, race or ethnicity. According to WCSU, 46% of the general population identifies as working class.

I have chosen *not* to define social class identity. To me, doing so smacks of distasteful racial definitions like the “one drop” or 1/6 rule. Much like a person may identify more or less with one race/ethnicity/nationality over another, I chose to honor participants’ self-understandings and identification as being raised in a working class family. First-generation status and working class identity do not always overlap. Of the 30 first generation participants, only 12 identify as working class.

Socioeconomic difference variables. I accept participants’ self-identification as being raised in a family from a particular social class background and use this information to form the seven participant groups. In chapter 5, I also identify socioeconomic difference variables to find relationships between each of the seven participant group’s answers and how much they perceived their socioeconomic status was noticed in class. These socioeconomic difference variables are derived from survey answers pertaining to parental educational attainment (Q6.26, Q6.27) reported family income (Q6.28) and numbers of hours worked on- and off-campus (Q6.37, see Appendix F). They are not used to define the seven social class groups.

Statistics. My sample size was not large ($N = 101$). I used descriptive statistics to get the summary values (mean, frequency, median, and standard deviation). If standard deviations (SD) were greater than 2, I considered them too large. To compare frequencies and determine whether the probability of departure from expected frequency was due to chance, I employed chi-square and set the significance level at .05. To measure the relationship or dependence between different variables, I used Pearson's product-moment coefficient, commonly called simply "the correlation coefficient." The Pearson correlation is +1 in the case of a perfect direct (increasing, positive) linear relationship (correlation) and -1 in the case of a perfect decreasing (inverse, negative) linear relationship. Values that fall between -1 and 1 indicate the degree of linear dependence between the variables. As the coefficient approaches zero, there is less of a relationship (closer to uncorrelated). The closer the coefficient is to either -1 or 1, the stronger the correlation between the variables. I defined the following criteria for the correlation between different variables: If the absolute coefficient is less than 0.20, then these two variables are not correlated. If the absolute coefficient is equal or greater than 0.20 and less than 0.50, then these two variables are weakly correlated. If the absolute coefficient is equal or greater than 0.50, then these two variables are strongly correlated (Brown, 2001).

Interviews. For this research project, I envisioned the survey data as the skeleton and the interviews as fleshing out the statistical analysis. Digital files for each interview were transcribed and uploaded to Nvivo, a software that make the coding process easy—no colored pens required!

Coding. Since the semi-structured interviews included follow-up questions specific to the survey, I employed structural coding for my first cycle coding (Saladana, 2009) to categorize data by interview question. This way, I could compare answers to interview questions that followed up on specific survey questions. Next, I performed a second phase coding intended to

highlight emergent themes across the data as a whole. I organized the codes into nodes to help me make sense of the data and the themes I could see.

Chapter Summary

To answer my research questions relating to the effect of social class on foreign language learning, I employed a mixed methods design. An online survey and semi-structured interview protocol was developed based on pre-pilot interviews with members of the Working Class Student Union and revised based on the pilot study results. Participants were recruited from beginning French, Italian, and Spanish courses in person and via email. In total 101 participants voluntarily completed the online survey. Self-identified working class and/or first-generation college students who volunteered were contacted to complete a follow-up interview. Interviews with 16 self-identified working class and/or first-generation college students participants were transcribed and coded in a two phase process. Survey data were cleaned and grouped by first-generation status and family social class background. Analysis of survey responses included descriptive statistics as well as correlations, difference of means, and statistical analysis that gauged proportional differences.

Chapter 5: How is Socioeconomic Difference Recognized and Highlighted in the Foreign Language Learning Environment?

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to establish that *socioeconomic difference* is highlighted and emphasized in the foreign language classroom environment. To build this argument, I use a variety of data sources which operationalize several terms related to socioeconomic difference: *social status*, *social class*, and *socioeconomic status*. Together, these operationalized terms measure what I call socioeconomic difference.

Social status recognition on campus. To situate the foreign language classroom in the context of The University of Wisconsin-Madison (UW-Madison) campus, I first examine data from two open-ended short-answer questions in which respondents describe their general understanding of *social status* on campus and assess their own social status in this context (see Appendix F, Q6.2 & Q6.3).

Social class recognition in the foreign language classroom. After I establish that participants have varied understandings of social status in the macrocosm of the campus environment—including (but not limited to) *social class* as it is commonly understood in society (i.e., lower, working, middle, upper class)—I next look at the way social class is recognized in the microcosm of the foreign language classroom. To do this, I present responses to two online survey questions in which respondents assess their foreign language classmates' social class and describe what indicates classmates' social class to others in this environment (see Appendix F,

Q6.2 & Q6.3). I evaluate these responses in relation to the social class background of the family in which participants' indicated they were raised on the online survey (see Appendix F, Q6.15).

Socioeconomic status recognition in the foreign language classroom. Since participants are able to identify their classmates' social class background and motivate their identification by naming specific indicators of social class, I further explore the way socioeconomic difference is recognized in the classroom by examining how much participants' feel their own *socioeconomic status* is noticed by classmates and instructors in what they said and did (see Appendix F, Q1.6 & Q1.7). To do this, I present statistical analysis that measures the correlation between responses from these two online survey questions and participants' demographic information that indicate socioeconomic difference such as parents' educational attainment, reported family income, and number of hours worked during the semester (see Appendix F, Q6.26-6.28, Q6.37).

Working class/first-generation college students in the foreign language classroom. To deepen our understanding of the way socioeconomic difference is recognized and highlighted in the foreign language learning environment at the level of the individual, I will conclude this chapter with an analysis of in-person follow-up interviews with first-generation and/or working class (WC) participants. These volunteers speak to the quality of the way socioeconomic difference is recognized and highlighted in the foreign language classroom (i.e., positively or negatively).

Social Status at The University of Wisconsin-Madison

Participants' understanding of social status. In the online survey, I included an intentionally vague, open-ended question: "How would you describe social status on the UW-Madison campus?" (see Appendix F, Q6.2) The question was crafted in a way that left the word 'social' unclear. The goal of writing such an open-ended, undefined question was to glean participants' own understanding of social status. In other words, rather than imposing a definition, I asked participants to define social status for themselves.

The short answer responses were coded into several categories. Some students interpreted 'social' to mean how much socializing or partying they did. Others surmised that social status referred to social class categories used in the wider world (i.e., middle class). Still other participants named things specific to the university environment to explain social status at UW-Madison. In Table 5.1, I have listed the 12 codes that organized the data, frequencies, and a few examples for each code to give a flavor of how participants interpreted and defined social status:

Table 5.1

Respondents' Interpretations of Social Status on UW-Madison Campus

Category	Responses	
	N = 90	Example responses
Social class / socioeconomic status	19	“Most of the students come from higher social class, with fewer low-income students who receive financial aid.”
		“UW Madison social status tends to be poor college students from middle class status. I think almost everyone works while in college to help pay for the tuition, housing, and food costs here and quickly learn to be independent.”
		“Rich, upper-middle class white kids.”
		“Mostly very wealthy individuals from the East Coast and MN.”
		“One group who’s parents are paying all tuition and can afford to take it easy in college and another group who have to work and finish early so they can afford to graduate.”
Non-issue / unimportant	11	“It’s a big enough campus where there really aren’t social statuses that I am aware of.”
		“Not really an issue”
		“There is not a huge importance of social status on campus. Everyone is here to learn.”
Student status	8	“Many students on the UW-Madison campus are looked up to because it is such a prestigious university.”
		“Currently, I feel that the only status anyone recognizes is that of a student or a professor.”
Unsure	8	“I’m not sure on the definition of social status”
		“I am not really sure what you mean by social status. The amount of friends you have? Where you fit in among the GDI’s or Greek participants? Party people or not party people?”

		<p>“In terms of popularity I don’t think it is important. It is more important to do what you enjoy and become involved in clubs and organizations to meet more people who share those same interests. It is more important than having a real status.”</p>
Activities	7	<p>“Everyone is here to get an education so there aren’t true cliques, but athletes tend to believe that they’re above everyone. Then you have the people who party often and talk about it all the time who seem to be with each other, as well as the greek community.”</p> <p>“How socially involved you are whether it be with friends and their social activities (someone who drinks a lot would be social but not in the same way someone really involved would be considered social.) The variety of activities one participates in, etc.”</p>
Diverse environment	7	<p>“Social status here is what I would expect to find most places. There are people with few friends, and people with many friends. People who are well liked and people who are not so well liked. You can find whatever social group you want, partiers, straightedge people, super studious people and less studious people.”</p>
Welcoming / inclusive place	7	<p>“Social status is harder to see here (versus high school) for me because there are so many people from varying backgrounds and you have no idea where they came from.”</p> <p>“Inclusive of everyone.”</p> <p>“VERY welcoming and nurturing.”</p>
Socializing	7	<p>“Very social.”</p> <p>“What you do and who you know.”</p> <p>“Average”</p>
Other	7	<p>“Wonderful.”</p> <p>“I’m a member of the majority.”</p> <p>“A lot of white people”</p>

Major	4	“I guess social status to me is determined by what your major is.”
		“Social status is usually defined by one’s major, year of study and organizations they are active in.”
Possessions	3	“The amt of iphones and macs I see everywhere is expensive. I have a Mac, but I saved for it. I can’t afford an iphone and my parents won’t pay for one, which is fine.”
All equal	2	“I think everyone is pretty equal here.”

An emic understanding of social status on campus. Without providing any definition or guideline for the meaning of ‘social status’ in the online survey, participant responses grant us an emic understanding of the way campus social status is determined. For 29% of respondents, the factors that determine one’s campus social status are internal to campus (i.e., student status, campus activities, socializing, or one’s major). For 24% of respondents, the factors that determine social status are external to campus (i.e., social stratification labels, where you are from, economic resources, particular possessions).

Economic constraint and social status. In one response to the open-ended short-answer question, a participant made the connection between his/her ability to participate in campus activities and the economic resources available to him/her: “It definitely seems everyone has money... What stinks is most people view going out as the social activity, but I don’t have the \$ to go out, so I feel I’m very out of social groups because I can’t.” For this student, social status was the interplay of one’s resources and the way it allowed or prevented participation in a predominant socializing activity.

Blindness to social status. While some participants were unsure how to answer the question (9%) and a handful of participants’ responses were grouped as unrelated in the ‘other’

category (8%), the majority of participants felt social status was not present on campus. These participants stated that campus was diverse (8%), welcoming/inclusive (8%), that everyone was equal (2%) or that social status was simply not an issue or unimportant (12%). These responses indicate that social class traditionally defined (e.g., lower, working, middle, upper) is not the predominant lens through which respondents understand social status at the UW-Madison. Though admirable, I believe blindness to social status is indicative of a privileged position, whereby those who have higher social status do not see it and attribute their social status to other factors. McIntosh suggests privilege operates like an invisible backpack that provides daily benefits to the privileged person while remaining unseen by others and perhaps unnoticed by the wearer (McIntosh, 1988).

Meritocracy. These responses could also reflect the idea that college is a meritocracy discussed in chapter 2. In the following participant's view, all students have equal social status because they are all attending a prestigious school, but s/he recognizes that the student body is conscious of where they stand in relation to others and eager to position themselves using certain social status indicators:

[Social status is] of extreme importance among undergraduates. Living in the [L]ucky building, having one's parent's buy them Ugg boots, being on a UW team. UW-Madison is a prestigious school, full of people that like to remind others of that fact. And to show that in a sea of others that are just as important for attending, they are just a little more important... for whatever various reason.

According to this participant, all students have the same level of importance. Yet, despite this common ground, the participant names particular living arrangements, possessions, and activities indicate an elevated status on campus.

Participants' self-assessment of social status on campus. Participants were also asked to specify their own social status on campus: "What's your social status on the UW-Madison campus?" (see Appendix F, Q6.3). We know that respondents use their previously stated definitions of social status to assess their own status on campus because six of the nine codes for this open-ended question are also used to code definitions of social status. In Table 5.2, I have listed the nine codes that organized the data, frequencies, and a few examples for each code to give a flavor of respondents' self-assessments of their social status:

Table 5.2

Respondents' Self-assessment of Social Status on UW-Madison Campus

Category	Responses	
	N = 89	Example responses
Social class / socioeconomic status	18	<p>"I'm low on the social scale, in regard to my family having no money."</p> <p>"Small town middle class student trying to make it big."</p> <p>"Average? I go out with my friends, but I also do well in school."</p>
Socializing	18	<p>"A mix of both; I love to have fun with my friends as well as do well in school, all while living a Christ centered life."</p> <p>"I stay inside mostly and keep to myself a good portion of the time."</p> <p>"In the middle- not extremely popular but not lonely either."</p> <p>"I'm just a freshman, trying to figure out things!"</p>
Student status	17	<p>"I'm just a normal student trying to get a degree and a job."</p> <p>"Just an average student, used to be an athlete."</p>
Activities	9	<p>"I am pretty social. I was in...dance club, live in one of the most social dorms, went on a volunteering trip for spring break with a student org, and have a job."</p> <p>"Active and involved, but I don't over book my time and enjoy my 'alone time' as well. I consider myself well balanced: I work, volunteer, study, and have fun with friends."</p>

		“Higher end.”
Reference unclear	9	“Average.”
		“Wonderful.”
		“Low-key.”
External social network	7	“I’ve always lived off campus, so I don’t know many people and I’m not really sure how social status pertains to me.”
		“To be honest, I’m not quite sure yet.”
Unsure	5	“I’m not entirely sure as I’ve never felt social status was that important, so I don’t really notice it.”
		“International computer science major”
Major	3	“I would be a Dietetics Major.”
		“I work before, in between, and after classes almost every day of the week. I am just trying to lessen the debt I leave school with.”
Work commitments	3	“Definitely not part of the more well to do kids. I work 2 jobs and can’t afford to go out lots with friends.
		“I am working and trying to finish as soon as possible.”

In Table 5.2, we see that 20% of participants view their social status relative to the social stratification labels used in wider society, but the majority or 53% use campus-related indicators to gauge their social status relative to others. While 10% of responses did not have a clear referent, two new themes were present in the data: social network external to campus and work commitments.

Social status external to campus. Eight percent of respondents expressed that they could not understand their social status relative to UW-Madison because they did not participate in the

campus community. These students stated being older, returning or transfer students, or that they lived-off campus and maintained a different social network.

Social status and work commitments. Three percent of respondents interpreted social status to mean how much they socialize, but they did not simply write that they don't go out. Instead, they indicated that their work commitments limit the time and money available to them for socializing. Relative to others who do not have to work and can socialize freely, they have a different social status.

Summary. When asked to describe social status on The University of Wisconsin-Madison campus without clearly defining the term, only 24% used social class and socioeconomic-related descriptors. Twenty-nine percent of respondents gauged social status using campus-related factors such as student status, activities, socializing, and major. Thirty percent of students did not “see” social status on campus. Yet, when asked to describe their own social status on campus, nearly all respondents could “see” social status and identify themselves relative to others.

Recognizing Social Class in the Foreign Language Classroom

Assessing classmates' social class. As discussed above, nearly a third of respondents claimed not to “see,” social status on campus. However, when forced to select a name (lower, working, middle, upper) to describe the majority of their foreign language classmates' social class in the online survey, the majority indicated their classmates were middle class and they were able to motivate their responses in an open-ended follow up question (see Appendix F, Q6.18 & Q6.19). Without an absolute definition of social class, these answers are best

understood relative to the social class with which the respondents identified (see Appendix F, Q6.15). Table 5.3 breaks down the respondents assessments of their classmates' social class according the social class background of the family in which respondents indicated they were raised.

Table 5.3

Assessment of Classmates' Social Class Grouped by Respondents' Background

Q6.18. If you were asked to use one of four names for your classmates' social class, which would you say the majority belongs in?

Respondents' background	Lower class (LC)	Working class (WC)	Middle class (MC)	Upper class (UC)	Totals
LC	0	0	1	0	1
WC	0	4	7	1	12
MC	3	12	52	10	77
UC	0	3	4	1	8
Totals	3	19	64	12	98

Table 5.3 shows respondents' assessment of their classmates' social class relative to respondents' family social class background. Looking at this data, we see that respondents'

understandings of their classmates' social class makes sense relative to their own social class identity. For example, reading across the rows, all of the respondents who identified themselves as coming from UC backgrounds indicated the majority of their classmates were from WC or MC backgrounds. That is, of a different (lower) social class.

Social class indicators in the foreign language classroom. An open-ended follow-up to Q6.18 elicited various explanations for how participants identified the social class background of the majority of their classmates (see Appendix F, Q6.19). Their responses fell into nine major categories presented below in Table 5.4.

Table 5.4

Indicators of Social Class in the Foreign Language Classroom

Descriptive categories	Number of responses	Percentage of responses
Assumption	19	21%
Self-presentation, demeanor, interaction	18	20%
Clothing / possessions	13	14%
I don't know / uncomfortable	11	12%
Student status	10	11%
Hometown	9	10%
Family details	5	6%
Travel experience	3	3%
Amount of financial assistance / work status	3	3%
Total	91	100%

Self-presentation, demeanor, and interaction. Respondents noted that a combination of factors indicated the social class of the majority of their classmates. For these respondents, it was more than self-presentation or dress that indicated their classmates' social class; it was these observations plus knowledge gained from interaction: "From the way they dress and the content

of their conversations.” Such conversations were described as occurring both when “hanging out” outside of class and in class discussion. One respondent described the way s/he knew her classmates’ social class this way: “It is hard to tell, since we are all students here to learn. But mostly from hearing about their lives through conversations in Italian. What they do, where they go, their spring breaks, etc.”

Clothing and possessions. Dress, clothing, and possessions were major indicators of classmates’ social class. One participant described the absence of particular possessions indicated the social class background of her classmates: “I’m just guessing because we didn’t have a lot of snobby, obviously rich people with Prada bags, expensive sunglasses, designer clothing, etc.”

Student status. Many participants felt their classmates’ statuses as students were the way to identify their social class: “I would assume they are middle class because they attend a university.” Conversely, student status could also indicate LC or WC status: “Students are by and large poor, even if their parents have money the student themselves doesn’t own their own house or have their own financial stability.”

Hometown. Classmates’ hometowns were indicative of social class for respondents. One participant used the Scennie / Coastie campus stereotype (described in Chapter 1) to explain the social class of the majority of students in his/her foreign language class: “There are some working class kids and upper class coasties, but there are also many people from midwestern states that I assume to be middle class.” Similarly, another respondent generalized, “Most people from Wisconsin are probably middle or working class, ergo, their children would belong to these classes.” Another respondent could differentiate based on specific towns: “Many of them are

from Wisconsin, and we often talk about their families and hometowns. I know many of these hometowns and associate them with certain levels on the socioeconomic ladder.” Studying in Wisconsin from out of the country also indicated social class status: “...some students are international students, and I would assume that because they are studying here, in Wisconsin, their families must have a fair amount of money.”

Family details. Information about one’s family shared in class also indicated the social class of their classmates to participants. One participant said social class of classmates’ was known, “Based on the descriptions of their life experiences and family structures.” Parental occupations were also indicators; one participant wrote: “I sat between the 2 daughters of lawyers. There was the son of a high school English teacher and a son of a professor.” Another participant observed, “Many do not have jobs (a topic discussed in class) and their parents have typical middle class professions.”

Travel. Travel experience and the intention to go abroad also served to explain classmates’ MC and UC status. As one participant from a MC family explained, “Most students who go to UW, and especially students who can/will study abroad, are middle class.”

Amount of financial assistance/work status. Respondents cited parental assistance with the costs of college and/or the necessity to work as an indicator of social class. One participant noted, “Some of their parents bought them cars for college.” Another respondent noted the topics discussed: “Things like; the amount of money they recently spent at the mall (\$900), the fact that they have time to go out drinking most nights (because they don’t have a job), their desires for top price items (name brand shoes and purses).”

Summary. In this section, I showed that when forced to choose a traditional label to identify the social class of the majority of their classmates, the majority believe their classmates are middle class. Twenty percent of respondents claimed their assessment of their classmates' social class was an assumption while the remainder naming the following indicators of social class: self-presentation/demeanor/interaction (20%), clothing/possessions (14%), student status (11%), hometown (10%), family details (6%), travel experience (3%), and financial assistance/work (3%). In the next section, I will examine the amount participants feel their classmates and instructor take notice of their socioeconomic status in the foreign language classroom.

'Taking Notice' of Socioeconomic Status

In the previous two sections, I showed how social status is interpreted and assessed by participants on the UW-Madison campus as well as how participants understood and assessed social class in the foreign language classroom. In this section, I will take the opposite angle and explore how much participants' report their socioeconomic status is perceived by others in the foreign language classroom. To do this, I examine of two online survey questions.

Survey Q1.6 asked: "In how much of what you say and do in language class, do your *classmates* take notice of your socioeconomic status?" Survey Q1.7 asked: "In how much of what you say and do in language class, does your *instructor* take notice of your socioeconomic status?" For each question, participants indicated a percentage that represented the proportion of what they said and did in which their classmates or instructor noticed their socioeconomic status. The scale was divided in 10% increments and ranged from 0% "In none of what I say and do" to 100% "In all of what I say and do." (see Appendix F, Q1.6 & Q1.7)

Statistical analysis. Using Pearson product-moment correlation, I was able to gauge whether there was a linear correlation between how much participants felt their classmates and instructor noticed their socioeconomic status and the following socioeconomic difference variables: parents' educational attainment (Q6.26, Q6.27), family income (Q6.28), number of on-campus and off-campus work hours (Q6.37, Appendix F). Results for perceived classmate noticing are found in Table 5.6 and results for perceived instructor noticing are found in Table 5.7

Quantification of socioeconomic difference variables. Each socioeconomic difference variable was derived from responses to survey questions. Parental educational attainment levels (Q6.26, Q6.27) were assigned a number ranging from 1 ("less than high school") to 8 ("professional degree"). Family income responses were assigned a value in \$10,000 increments beginning with 1 which represented "less than \$30,000" (Q6.28). Participants provided the amount they worked by entering the number of hours worked on- and off-campus (Q6.37, see Appendix F) and these numbers were used as entered.

Subgroups. In order to gain a more nuanced understanding of the data, I broke participants into seven subgroups based on social class and first-generation status. Participants' social class identity was assigned according to their selection of lower class (LC), working class (WC), middle class (MC) or upper class (UC) when answering online survey question Q6.15: "If you were asked to use one of four names for your family's social class, which would you say your family belongs in?" First-generation status was determined according to their selection of *yes* or *no* when answering online survey question Q6.25: "Has either of your parents or guardians earned a four-year college/university degree?" (see Appendix F). Tables 5.6 and 5.7 show first-

generation (FG) participants and participants without first-generation status, grouped by the social class in which they indicated they were raised (i.e., LC, WC, MC, UC).

Table 5.6 presents the correlation between the amount each group perceives classmates notice socioeconomic status (Q1.6) and socioeconomic difference variables (i.e., parental educational attainment, family income and number of hours worked during the semester). Table 5.7 presents the correlation between each group's responses to Q1.7 (instructor noticing of socioeconomic status) and socioeconomic difference variables. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients greater than 0.5 indicate a strong degree of relationship and coefficients between 0.2 and 0.5 indicate a weak degree of relationship (Brown, 2001).

Table 5.6

Pearson's Product-moment Correlation (r) Between Perception of Classmate Socioeconomic Status Noticing (Q1.6) and Socioeconomic Difference Variables for Participant Groups

Participant Group	N	Socioeconomic difference variables				
		Maternal education	Paternal education	Family income	Work on campus	Work off campus
LC (FG)	3	0.87**	0.50**	-1.00**	0.50**	NA
WC (FG)	12	-0.36*	-0.06	0.10	0.21*	0.12
WC	8	0.66**	0.23*	0.01	0.32*	-0.28*
MC (FG)	14	-0.32*	0.14	-0.06	-0.38*	0.61**
MC	52	0.01	0.26*	-0.11	-0.02	0.08
UC (FG)	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
UC	11	0.06	-0.50**	0.21*	0.78**	-0.37*

Note. Q1.6 = "In how much of what you say and do in language class, do your classmates take notice of your socioeconomic status?"; r^* = weak correlation, r^{**} = strong correlation; Statistical tests could not be performed for UC (FG) due to sample size.

Table 5.7

Pearson's Product-moment Correlation (r) Between Perception of Instructor Socioeconomic Status Noticing (Q1.7) and Socioeconomic Difference Variables for Participant Group

Participant Group	N	Socioeconomic difference variables				
		Maternal education	Paternal education	Family income	Work on campus	Work off campus
LC (FG)	3	0	1.00**	-0.50**	1.00**	NA
WC (FG)	12	-0.29*	-0.18	0.10	0.22*	-0.06
WC	8	-0.09	0.50**	-0.43*	-0.05	-0.33*
MC (FG)	14	-0.14	0.06	-0.03	-0.28*	0.63**
MC	52	0.01	0.22*	0.01	0.05	0.17
UC (FG)	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
UC	11	0.22*	-0.45*	0.08	0.58**	-0.41*

Note. Q1.7 = "In how much of what you say and do in language class, does your instructor take notice of your socioeconomic status?"; *r** weak correlation, *r*** strong correlation; Statistical tests could not be performed for UC (FG) due to sample size.

Correlation between perception of noticing and socioeconomic difference variables.

Reading across Tables 5.6 and 5.7, we gain an understanding of how socioeconomic difference variables related to each participant group's responses to online survey Q1.6 and Q1.7. Below I describe the strength and direction of these relationships.

First-generation participants raised in LC families

Parents' education. For first-generation participants raised in LC families, there is a strong positive correlation between how much they report classmates notice their socioeconomic status and how much education their mother and father had. The coefficient indicates that as their parents' education increases, the more they report their classmates notice their socioeconomic status.

There is also a perfect positive correlation between the amount their instructors notice their socioeconomic status and their father's education. The coefficient indicates that as their father's educational attainment increases, the more they report their instructor notices their socioeconomic status.

Family income. For first-generation participants raised in LC families, there is a strong negative correlation between how much they report their classmates and instructor notice their socioeconomic status and their reported family income. The coefficient indicates that as their reported family income decreases, the more they report their classmates and their instructor notice their socioeconomic status. While the amount participants' indicate their instructors notice their socioeconomic status is strongly negatively correlated to reported family income, the

amount participants reported their classmates notice their socioeconomic status is perfectly negatively correlated.

Work hours. For first-generation participants raised in LC families, there is a strong positive correlation between how much they report their classmates and instructor notice their socioeconomic status and how many hours they work on campus. The coefficient indicates that as the number of hours worked on campus increases, the more they report their classmates and instructor notice their socioeconomic status. Participants report that the amount their instructor notice their socioeconomic status exactly mirrors the number of hours they work on campus. It is a perfect positive correlation.

First-generation participants raised in WC families

Mother's education. For first-generation participants raised in a WC families, there is a weak negative correlation between how much they report their classmates and their instructor notice their socioeconomic status and how much education their mother has. This coefficient indicates that as their mother's education decreases, the more they report their classmates and instructors notice their socioeconomic status.

Family income. For first-generation participants raised in WC families, there is no notable correlation between how much they report their classmates and instructor notice their socioeconomic status and their reported family income.

Work hours. For first-generation participants raised in WC families, there is a weak positive correlation between how much they report classmates and their instructor notice their socioeconomic status and how many hours they work on campus. The coefficient indicates that

as the number of hours worked on campus increases, the more they report their classmates and their instructor notice their socioeconomic status.

Participants without first-generation status raised in WC families

Mother's education. For participants without first-generation status raised in WC families, there is a strong positive correlation between how much they report their classmates notice their socioeconomic status and how much education their mother has. The coefficient indicates that as their mother's education increases, the more they report their classmates notice their socioeconomic status.

Father's education. There is also a weak positive correlation between how much participants without first-generation status raised in WC families report classmates and their instructor notice their socioeconomic status and how much education their father has. The coefficient indicates that as their father's education increases, the more they report their classmates and their instructor notice their socioeconomic status. The correlation is weak in terms of how much these participants report their classmates notice socioeconomic status and strong for instructors.

Family income. For participants without first-generation status raised in WC families there is a weak negative correlation between how much they report their instructor notices their socioeconomic status and their reported family income. The statistical analysis show that as their reported family income decreases, the more their instructor notices their socioeconomic status.

On-campus work hours. For participants without first-generation status raised in WC families, there is a weak positive correlation between how much they report their classmates

noticed their socioeconomic status and how many hours they work on campus. The coefficient indicates that as the number of hours worked on campus increases, the more they report their classmates notice their socioeconomic status.

Off-campus work hours. There is a weak negative correlation between how much they report classmates and their instructor notice their socioeconomic status and how many hours they work off campus. The coefficient indicates that as the number of hours worked off campus decreases, the more they report their classmates and instructor notice their socioeconomic status.

First-generation participants raised in MC families

Mother's education. For first-generation participants raised in MC families, there is a weak negative correlation between how much they report classmates notice their socioeconomic status and how much education their mother has. The coefficient indicates that as their mother's education decreases, the more they report their classmates notice their socioeconomic status.

Family income. For first-generation participants raised in MC families, there is no notable correlation between how much they report their classmates and instructor notice their socioeconomic status and their reported family income.

On-campus work hours. For first-generation participants raised in MC families, there is a weak negative correlation between how much they report their classmates and instructor notice their socioeconomic status and how many hours they work on campus. The coefficient indicates that as the number of on campus work hours decreases, the more they report their classmates and instructor notices their socioeconomic status.

Off-campus work hours. There is a strong positive correlation between how much they report their classmates and instructor notice their socioeconomic status and how many hours they work off campus. The coefficient indicates that as the number of hours they work off campus increases, the more they report their classmates and instructor notice their socioeconomic status.

Participants without first-generation status raised in MC families

Father's education. For participants without first-generation status raised in MC families, there is a weak positive correlation between how much they report classmates and instructor notice their socioeconomic status their father's educational attainment. The coefficient indicates that as their father's education increases, the more they report their classmates and instructor notice their socioeconomic status.

Family income. For participants without first-generation status raised in MC families, there is no notable correlation between how much they report their classmates and instructor notice their socioeconomic status and their reported family income.

Work hours. For participants without first-generation status raised in MC families, there is no notable correlation between how much they report classmates and instructor notice their socioeconomic status and how many hours they work on or off campus.

First-generation participants raised in UC families. Only one participant indicated that neither parent had completed a college degree and as being raised in an UC family. No statistical analysis could be performed for a group with only one participant.

Participants without first-generation status raised in UC families

Mother's education. For participants without first-generation status raised in UC families, there is a weak positive correlation between how much they report instructors notice their socioeconomic status and how much education their mother has. The coefficient indicates that as their mother's education increases, the more they report their classmates notice their socioeconomic status.

Father's education. There is a strong negative correlation between how much they report classmates notice their socioeconomic status and how much education their father has. There is also a weak negative correlation between how much they report classmates notice their socioeconomic status and how much education their father has. The coefficient indicates that as paternal education decreases, the more they report their classmates and instructor notice their socioeconomic status. A stronger inverse relationship exists between how much classmates notice their socioeconomic status than instructors.

Family income. For participants without first-generation status raised in UC families, there is a weak positive correlation between how much they report classmates notice their socioeconomic status and their reported family income.

On-campus work hours. For participants without first-generation status raised in UC families, there is a strong positive correlation between how much their classmates and instructor notice their socioeconomic status and how many hours they work on campus. The coefficient indicates that as their work hours on campus increase, the more they report their classmates and instructor notice their socioeconomic status.

Off-campus work hours. There is a weak negative correlation between how much they report classmates and instructor notice their socioeconomic status and how many hours they work off campus. The coefficient indicates that as their work hours off campus decreases, the more they report their classmates notice their socioeconomic status.

Summary. The above analysis shows that participants from particular social class backgrounds reported their classmates and instructor noticed their socioeconomic status more or less depending on the following socioeconomic difference variables: parental educational attainment, family income and number of hours worked on and off campus. Specifically, maternal education attainment affected the amount first-generation participants reported their socioeconomic status was noticed and paternal educational attainment affected this amount for participants without first-generation status.

Family income affected the amount socioeconomic status was noticed for LC, UC, and WC participants without first-generation status. The number of on-campus work hours affected the amount all participants reported their socioeconomic status was noticed except for those without first-generation status raised in middle class families. The number of off-campus work hours affected the amount socioeconomic status was noticed for first-generation MC participants, WC participants without first-generation status, and UC participants.

While these survey questions indicate that certain socioeconomic difference variables had an effect on the amount participants' reported their classmates and instructor noticed their socioeconomic status, this analysis cannot tell us the *quality* of the noticing. When students indicated the amount their classmates and instructor noticed their socioeconomic status, we do not know how or why they felt this way and whether or not it was a positive or negative

experience. Some of the noticing is likely due to context. If a participant felt her socioeconomic status stood out in class in comparison to her classmates, perhaps she indicated as such. The context could be that of the whole class or simply in comparison to one regular activity partner whose socioeconomic status differed from the participant's. Whether the difference was noticed and interpreted positively or negatively, we cannot know. In order to gain insight into the quality of the noticing, in the next section I will present my analysis of interview data from WC and/or first-generation participants who volunteered for a follow-up interview to the online survey about their foreign language learning experiences.

Insights from First-generation and Self-identified WC Participants

In this section, I will present data from the 16 follow-up interviews I completed in the semesters immediately following survey data collection. (Refer to Tables 4.3 and 4.4 for interview participants language course enrollment and other demographic details.) The interview data assists us to understand the way socioeconomic difference (including socioeconomic status and social class identity) is experienced in the foreign language classroom.

Reflections on noticing socioeconomic status and social class background. In the full study interviews, I asked a host of questions that elicited information about noticing socioeconomic difference in the foreign language classroom. Specifically asked follow-up interview participants to elaborate on their selections for survey questions about how much they indicated their classmates (Q1.6) and instructor (Q1.7) noticed their socioeconomic status and whether it felt positive or negative (see Appendix F).

I also asked whether there were other students of the participant's same social class in their language courses (see Appendix G, Q12). Data elicited from these questions reflect the coding categories for assessment of social status on campus (Table 5.1) and social class in the foreign language classroom (Table 5.4) explored in the first two sections of this chapter and provide context for the responses.

Clothing. Participants who gave follow-up interviews frequently cited that clothing choices contributed to how much they, their classmates, and their instructors noticed socioeconomic status.

INTERVIEWER: You said your classmates took notice of your socioeconomic status in 60% of what you said and did. How did that play out?

SAM: Um, I guess it was fine and everything, but I would, sometimes I would walk in to the class and everything and everybody would just be staring at me because, I mean, you know, like teenagers nowadays, they wear nicer clothes and everything, you know. It's that whole UGG boots or whatever, and it's like, I never wore any of that, so I would just come in with whatever. And, you know, it's always that kind of embarrassing thing, when you have to get in front of everybody and talk and . . .

For Sam, the quality of the noticing was negative. She explains that she feels self-conscious about her clothing and felt everyone was staring at her when she walked into class.

For Eric, who was a bit older than his classmates and attending business school, the quality of the noticing was different. He explains that he thought when his classmates and

instructor took notice of his clothing, they probably drew positive conclusions about his socioeconomic status:

ERIC: I think mainly because I'm from the business school, you know, already have my MBA. I come dressed up sometimes to class, you know, so it's like very apparent that I'm not poor, you know. I'm going to a really great school. I'm at the graduate level, that it's something that's, you know, um, I think that's easily, um, noticeable.

In these two examples, participants' understanding of the way they dress and the way it reflects on them can be positive or negative. But, in both cases, they are aware of how clothing indicates their socioeconomic difference from other classmates.

Hometown. Aside from sharing one's name, the first bit of personal information students typically exchange in foreign language class is where they are from. As discussed above in the first two sections of this chapter, participants cited their classmates' hometown as one of the ways they were able to note socioeconomic differences and similarities. For Cameron, the type of neighborhood where she grew up was a point of identification with another student:

INTERVIEWER: Um, were there people of your social class in your Italian class?

CAMERON: Um, I think so, definitely, yeah...Um, because we had similar experiences...I'm thinking of a girl in particular. We just, we kind of both had the same background, so.

INTERVIEWER: How did you know that?

RESPONDENT: Um, because we both, um, were working like a lot of jobs to stay in school and, um, we both had, I don't know, similar experiences growing up in like poor neighborhoods.

Whereas for Cameron, a general idea of her classmates neighborhood and circumstances indicated a similarity, for others familiar with Wisconsin, particular cities could indicate a student's socioeconomic similarity or difference. This was the case for Sofie:

INTERVIEWER: Do you think your fellow classmates knew your social class background?

SOFIE: Ye-, I would think that they had a pretty good idea, of just like from saying what my parents were doing and saying where I was from. Like those, I think, are both pretty accurate to being in working class.

INTERVIEWER: Where are you from, by the way?

SOFIE: Kenosha, Wisconsin.

General assumptions about the size of a city could also indicate socioeconomic difference. Carrie Ann surmises that her fellow "big city" students drew conclusions about her life experience based on the fact that she was from a small rural town. As Carrie Ann explains, "I lived in a rural community, whereas a lot of other people lived in more of an urban or metro...big cities..." In the context of her class, being from a small town made her stand out:

INTERVIEWER: It sounds like you had to share where you were from...did you feel that your classmates took note of that?

CARRIE ANN: Um, I think yes, um, just because I feel like there wasn't as many from small towns, and so like, they took note, like, oh, you're from a small town, like maybe you haven't done this, or like you haven't experienced like, I don't know, city life or something like that.

Context will inform how being from a particular place is viewed and understood in terms of socioeconomic difference. Conversely to Carrie Ann's experience, Harold estimates his class was made up of about 80% Wisconsinites, so the two classmates that stood out to him were from elsewhere:

INTERVIEWER: Um, so, were there people of your same social class in your Italian 101 class?

HAROLD: I would say so. Um . . .

INTERVIEWER: How did you know?

HAROLD: A lot of people that are from Wisconsin, particularly I want to say, because I'm from northeast Wisconsin, and, which I always thought was kind of a misnomer because it's really just east Wisconsin because there's a lot more of Wisconsin further north. But we call ourselves from northeast Wisconsin. Um, we've always, like economically and, uh, I guess socially, we've always been kind of a mixture and a hodgepodge of manufacturing towns on the lake, fishing as well, stuff like that.

But, uh, as you move further inland, that didn't always carry over, but it tended to carry over when you moved further south, to like the Milwaukee area, and then with Madison

being the capital, I mean, there was some, you know, back and forth between Milwaukee and Madison, like culturally sharing social sort of things. So, a lot of the people from that area tend to have the same mannerisms, uh—

INTERVIEWER: Which area?

HAROLD: From like northeast Wisconsin

INTERVIEWER: Your area—

HAROLD: Yeah, I mean—there are a few subtleties, like pop versus soda and water fountain versus bubbler, but other than that—there's a lot of, just we talk about our lives similarly. We describe, like, I mean, it also helped that when we were doing, like, the family section, when we were talking about, you know, different words for parent and siblings, and we had talked about their occupations, and a lot of them are in the same boat.

You maybe have one parent that makes significantly more than the other but not so much that you would say, oh, they're, like a doctor or a celebrity, but, and the other one is usually doing a more, I guess, lower-paying job and just economically we kind of were in the same boat. And I guess, uh, ethnically, a lot of us, there was a lot of Germans, Italians, Irish, because we talk, um, and I get a lot of crap from my friends that I've met here that are from Europe, because for them we're Americans. Genealogy doesn't matter. Uh, but genealogy has always been, at least in, at least in northeast Wisconsin, as far as I know from here because I'm getting the same responses when I ask questions, like, well, what were your grandparents, stuff like that, uh, genealogy was always a big thing.

And then the Germans, the Italians and the Irish have always been, uh, Irish and Italians historically more, but Germans at some points, too, have always been kind of in the same boat class-wise, and we've, I don't know, I think we've just developed a similar way of speaking and talking about our lives and stuff like that. So, I've always felt that I can usually pick out people that are of a similar standing of me.

INTERVIEWER: So, you talked about in class when you were discussing families and family members' occupations—that kind of tipped you off that people had similar backgrounds to you.

HAROLD: Yeah.

INTERVIEWER: Are there any other activities or topics of conversation that helped you see like, oh, that person's background is way different than mine or similar to mine or . . .

HAROLD: Well, like there were some people that, just the way they interacted with us, because most of us were from Wisconsin. I mean, it's a Wisconsin school. That's going to be the majority of the people there. Uh, I know there was one girl from the Northeast, of the country—she's from New England, and I don't know, she just, I, I can't like define it that easily. I mean, obviously she's still an American, so there's a lot that we all have in common as a country, but her, just some of the things, her way of speaking was very different. It felt a lot more clipped—and didn't like to tell story, everybody around here likes to tell stories, long, intricate, sometimes boring stories. She did not like to tell stories. She, if you asked her a question, it's almost as if it was a competition to see how few words she could answer it with. And she just didn't really fit in very well with the

way she spoke and just felt kind of cold to us. I don't know why. I mean, it's not like she was mean. She just didn't feel very engaged. Um, there were, there was a Chinese student as well, but, and I know a lot of people felt she was a bit odd because she didn't talk a lot.

INTERVIEWER: So when you say like the girl from the Northeast or the Chinese student didn't speak a lot or spoke in a clipped manner or very—used very few words, are you speaking about conversations in English or Italian?

HAROLD: Uh, both. Uh, in English, they didn't really we-, interact with us that much, uh, the rest of us that were generally from Wisconsin. In Italian, I noticed they, I, and I don't know if she was doing it willingly or not, but the girl from New England really did not want to seem to get the pronunciations down. She always pronounced it as you would with, like, an American English accent... And she really didn't try to, like if we were to answer, supposed to answer in a full sentence, she tended to answer, like, in one or two words. She really didn't want to, I guess, elaborate on it or . . .

Harold's classmates were mostly from Wisconsin. He observed that classmates from northeastern Wisconsin had particular mannerisms and habits of speech that he understood to be indicative of regional culture and similar socioeconomic roots. Harold attributed the silence of his Chinese classmate and the clipped speech of his classmate from New England to their geographic provenance. The inability or lack of interest in telling stories marked these students sociocultural background as distinct from his own.

Self-presentation, demeanor, interaction. A combination of factors including specific information shared in class like one's hometown coupled with a general appraisal of one's

demeanor (i.e., interest in telling stories, as described above) and self-presentation (i.e., clothing) contributed to participants' noticing of socioeconomic difference. As John describes, he could sense his classmates' background by "...the way...people...dressed and the way they spoke,...like you...sense, you know, someone is like...from a higher social class—just from the way they look and the way they speak and the way they carry themselves..." He felt that others could sense his background in the same way:

INTERVIEWER: You... said that, uh, your classmates noticed your socioeconomic status in 10% of what you said and did in class. What do you think they were noticing?

JOHN: Just the way I carry myself maybe.

In Steve's self-assessment, his hardworking demeanor likely indicated socioeconomic difference to others, especially the instructor:

STEVE: I'm paying my way through college. My parents, um, neither of them has a bachelor's degree. Um, so I guess you could say I'm a first-generation student and I feel like...I was trying to be hardworking in the class...like if I was rich, I could possibly be more passive because, let's say, I don't have to worry about integrating courses into my career so much because I always have a fallback with my parents' money or something like that.

Steve describes a class presentation in which he felt he went "above and beyond" by connecting the material he learned in Italian to something he was studying in Art History. He could have done something easier, but he chose not to, which he felt indicated his need to do well and get a job after college.

Work status. Both parents' employment and student employment indicated socioeconomic difference in the classroom. In Sophia's case, her instructor had a very clear idea because, "she knows I'm another TA,...and we know like how much we're making as TAs and...she knew...what my situation would be like—as far as being a grad student..." Assumptions based on shared employment indicated socioeconomic status to the instructor.

As Katniss describes, particular classroom exercises allowed classmates to note socioeconomic difference between classmates: "...we had a section on...our parents' work...or past work...I know we discussed our parents' job status... I know we talked about if some of us are working as students and some weren't."

INTERVIEWER: So in that activity, you think your classmates took notice of your socioeconomic status?

KATNISS: Um, probably, just because, you know, everyone's parents had different positions. Some, some people, their parents didn't work. Some people, they had better, more higher-paying jobs, like lawyers or doctors or something along those lines. Other people had, um, lower-paying jobs, like, um, working for the county or the state or something like that.

INTERVIEWER: So, when you were sharing your parents' positions, uh, what do you think it indicated about your socioeconomic status?

KATNISS: Um, probably just that I'm middle class. Um, like neither of my parents went to college. So, um, I think that indicates more that, and they both work for the state, which took cuts within the last year, so.... Yeah, so, I mean, it wasn't like specifically

brought up or targeted or anything like that, just—you know, listening and judging, well, not judging, but, that sounds harsh, but...taking notice of what other people's parents did and stuff like that, so.

Katniss recounts how sharing work histories indicated socioeconomic difference among classmates. Specifically, whether or not students were working in college and the types of positions their parents held.

Activities. As discussed above in the first section of this chapter, the ability to participate in particular socializing activities was indicative of social status on campus. In Michele's view, this was also indicative of her socioeconomic difference in foreign language class:

INTERVIEWER: All right, and you also said that your classmates take notice of your socioeconomic status in about 30% of what you say and do. What do you mean when you say that?

MICHELE: Well, like my weekends are really boring [chuckles], and I just kind of focus on school more.

INTERVIEWER: So, you think they noticed that you weren't saying something other than study and stuff like that—

MICHELE: Yeah, probably. It was kind of like the same three or four words every time.

Leisure activities in particular were indicative of socioeconomic difference. As Sophia explains, she drew assumptions about her classmates' socioeconomic status based on their activities and experiences:

INTERVIEWER: And what sort of things do you think you might have shared in the small groups with your fellow students that would indicate your socioeconomic status?

SOPHIA: Um, probably like describing different experiences because we would talk about trips...we went on maybe with family members and...based on that information, or when we would just share interests like based on the interests that we had and what that would require from like a financial standpoint, I guess...Some of the fellow classmates, they would share like these really extravagant trips and experiences they had growing up, so you kind of get an idea like, okay, they, you know, have come from a different experience than someone else that they shared very little as far as like things like that, because we did talk a lot about...recreational activities and...like what trips we'd been on...with our school...That probably factored in to making certain assumptions or things like that.”

Leisure activities like travel with family as well as the lack of activities, as Michele shared, indicated socioeconomic status to others.

Financial assistance. Santino and Ellen differentiated their social class from others by the amount of assistance they receive:

INTERVIEWER: Um, so in the survey you said that you identify yourself, your family and your family as working class, and you also identified the teacher as working class. Um, but you identified your fellow students as middle class.

SANTINO: Um, well, I, I just said my teachers because they have, she has, I don't know, she's like on her own, I guess. And she works for own and she is, is a student, and I

thought of my classmates kind of like just because they still have their parents to help them out, I kind of think.

INTERVIEWER: Do your parents help you out?

SANTINO: I mean, I had, I had a, I got a scholarship and f-, financial aid, so they didn't really have to—but I think a lot of the, a lot of parents help out their kids, they kind of help them.

INTERVIEWER: Hmm. And how, what sort of things tipped you off that maybe your fellow classmates still received help from their parents?

SANTINO: Um, I don't know, whenever, whenever we complain about buying books and stuff, a lot of people said that like their parents bought them for them and I didn't have to buy my own books either because of my financial aid, but—I think that was one of the main things, too.

For Santino, knowing that his classmates were not paying for their own books indicated their middle class identity. Ellen also made assumptions about how much her classmates' parents contributed to their education based on their clothing and hometown:

ELLEN: I feel like all of them had like more money than I do—like coming from wealthier families.

INTERVIEWER: How do you know that?

ELLEN: Um, well, one girl said she was from Brookfield, which just like is automatically in my mind like Brookfield, a very rich area of Wisconsin. A lot of them just had like really nice clothes, so that might just be good fashion sense or [chuckles] like they have more money to buy clothes like that....like one girl was a foreign-exchange student, so I would assume that she has money... I'm in FASTrack and, like, I get a full ride and I feel like most of the people probably have higher EFCs than I do and don't get that.

INTERVIEWER: EFCs, what's that?

ELLEN: Estimated family contribution.

Ellen gauged her socioeconomic status relative to others according to the amount of financial assistance she assumed her classmates received.

Age. In the classroom context, age was also cited as an indicator of social class background. For Dexter, the fact that he fell between two age groups in his class meant that he stood out:

DEXTER: Um, I was kind of going back to the age thing with that, because that—to me, defines a lot of your social class—economic class as well,...especially in college, if you're all in the same school, is age and age groups really kind of define where you fit in to the whole spectrum. I mean, we had two women in there who were in their 50s. And they were really kind of like, you know, set aside from the group. And then there was the group, who was all like 19 to 21. And then really I was the only one who was kind of in the middle.

So, um, yeah, there was that air of, when you talk to people, you can tell they might speak differently to you than they do to people in their direct peer group... Especially...when I would tell them I spent like six years of my life just kind of bouncing around the country, doing different stuff, and then just decided to go to school, I think that's really like weird to a lot of them, because ... that's not what most people do. And they don't imagine that that's a doable thing.

Dexter felt his age indicated his social class to others. He was not typically college-aged and had not followed a standard route to college. He felt his life experiences "bouncing around" the country working minimum wage jobs during the time one might typically be in college indicated something about his social class background to his classmates.

Race/Ethnicity. For Eclipse, race and ethnicity were indicative of his classmates and instructor's social class background:

INTERVIEWER: Um, were there people of your same social class in French 101?

ECLIPSE: Um, I believe so, but I don't know for sure. I, I don't really, I try not to, I guess, like judge people by social class. So I don't take too much note of any features like that.

INTERVIEWER: Um, so when you say like I think so but I'm not sure, what sort of things might have tipped you off?

ECLIPSE: Um, ethnicity, I think. I just, I feel like I tend to think that, uh, Hispanic people are more among the same class as me...I think I just, I, in my mind, I, uh, tend to see white people as being a higher social class.

Eclipse took notice of race and ethnicity as indications of social class background. At UW-Madison, the student body is predominantly white.

Summary. Interviews with self-identified WC and first-generation foreign language students give insight to the ways social class identity and socioeconomic background manifests itself in the foreign language classroom. Particular pieces of information like hometown or regional provenance, students' work status or particular positions held by their parents, leisure activities like travel experience, relative age, and relative amount of financial assistance all contributed to participants' assessment of socioeconomic difference in the context of the foreign language classroom. Outward signs like clothing choice, race or ethnicity, and a combination of information, self-presentation and demeanor while interacting all indicated social class identity and socioeconomic status to participants. These interviews help to situate survey responses about classmates and instructors noticing socioeconomic status and assist us to understand the positive or negative quality of noticing socioeconomic difference with in a particular classroom context.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter I have used qualitative and quantitative data to frame my study on the role and impact of social class in foreign language learning. In the first section, I showed how participants assess social status on campus. Only 24% of respondents named factors external to campus (i.e., social stratification labels, where you are from, economic resources, particular

possessions) to determine social status on UW-Madison campus. A slightly greater proportion reference things internal to campus life (29%) in order to determine social status at UW-Madison (i.e., student status, campus activities, socializing, or one's major). But, the largest proportion of respondents (30%) claimed that social status was a not present or not an issue on UW-Madison campus.

Despite the fact that participants' have varied understandings of social status on campus (if indeed they believe it exists) and do not overwhelmingly use classic social class labels (i.e., lower, working, middle, upper), participants can and do gauge the social status (however defined) of others. When asked to choose a traditional label to identify the social class of the majority of their classmates, 8% believe their classmates are UC, 76% believe their classmates are MC, 12% believe their classmates are WC and 1% believe their classmates are LC. These assessments reflected participants' own social class identification, in that those who believed they were UC indicated the majority of classmates were of a lower class relative to them. Respondents motivated their assessments of their classmates' social class standing by naming particular indicators including self-presentation/demeanor/interaction, clothing/possessions, hometown, family details, financial assistance/work, student status.

In order to determine participants' own feelings about how socioeconomic difference was highlighted in the foreign language classroom, I correlated how much participants indicated their classmates and instructor noticed their socioeconomic status to socioeconomic difference variables (i.e., parental educational attainment, family income and number of hours worked on and off campus). Results showed that maternal educational attainment affected the amount first-generation participants felt their socioeconomic status was noticed and paternal educational

attainment affected this amount for participants without first-generation status. Family income affected the amount socioeconomic status was noticed for LC participants, WC participants without first-generation status, and UC participants. The number of on-campus work hours affected the amount socioeconomic status was noticed for first-generation participants from all class backgrounds as well as WC participants without first-generation status and UC participants. The number of off-campus work hours affected the amount socioeconomic status was noticed for first-generation MC participants, WC participants without first-generation status, and UC participants.

In order to understand how first-generation and WC participants experience socioeconomic difference in the foreign language classroom, in the last section I presented interview data from 16 volunteers who were first-generation or WC. The interview data show that hometown or regional provenance, students work status or particular positions held by their parents, leisure activities like travel experience, relative age, and relative amount of financial assistance all contributed to participants' experience of socioeconomic difference in the context of the foreign language classroom. Additionally, clothing choice, race or ethnicity, and a combination of information, self-presentation and demeanor while interacting all indicated socioeconomic difference to participants.

The interview data from first-generation and WC participants supports the quantitative data in that participants were able to explain the degree to which they felt classmates and instructors noticed their socioeconomic status and what particular things indicated their socioeconomic status to others. They were also able to identify students of their same social class

background among their classmates by the some of the same indicators of social status on UW-Madison campus and social class in the foreign language classroom named by all participants.

Given that socioeconomic difference is recognized and highlighted in the foreign language classroom, what is the impact of calling attention to it in foreign language learning? This will be discussed in the next chapter.

Chapter 6: What are Participants from Particular Backgrounds' Feelings, Dispositions to Discussion Topics, and Participation Strategies in the Foreign Language Learning Environment?

Introduction

This chapter explores the reported feelings of participants in their foreign language classroom environment, their disposition to discuss topics in class, and their participation strategies. The data presented below come from two sources: the online survey and follow-up interviews with first-generation and/or working class (WC) participants.

Feelings in foreign language class. The first set of survey questions addressed how participants felt in the foreign language classroom (Q2.1), how they would like to feel (Q2.2), and the way they thought their classmates felt (Q2.3, Appendix F). These questions asked students to indicate their feeling using a scale for how comfortable, adequate, part of the group, valued, and heard they felt in the classroom.

Disposition to discussion topics. The second set of survey questions addressed how frequently participants perceived they were asked to talk about particular discussion topics (Q3.1) and whether they would feel comfortable, would be selective, lacked the vocabulary, or would avoid speaking about these discussion topics (Q3.2, Appendix F).

Participation strategies of working class and/or first generation participants. Finally, to flesh out and deepen our understanding of participants' reported feelings in the classroom learning environment and their disposition to the topics discussed, I present data from interviews with first-generation and/or WC participants who offer insights into their feelings and dispositions to talk about particular topics when participating in foreign language classes.

Feelings in the Foreign Language Classroom Environment

Online survey questions. Survey Q2.1-2.3 used the same format to ask participants how comfortable, adequate, part of the group, valued, and heard they felt (Q2.1), how they would like to feel (Q2.2), and how they thought classmates felt (Q2.3) in the classroom by making a selection on a 6-point scale running between opposite word pairs: “Please read each contrasting word pair and indicate how you feel/would like to feel/think classmates feel in language class on the scale that runs between them” (Appendix F). The contrasting word pairs were: entirely comfortable/entirely uncomfortable, highly valued/not valued at all, totally adequate/totally inadequate, completely heard/completely unheard, very much part of the group/not part of the group at all. When reading Tables 6.1-6.5, note that the lower the number, the more positive participant groups reported feeling. For example, 1.00 indicates entirely comfortable, totally adequate, highly valued, completely heard or very much part of the group while 6.00 indicates entirely uncomfortable, not valued at all, totally inadequate, completely unheard, not part of the group at all.

Understanding survey Q2.1 and Q2.2 in relation to one another. The survey questions may be understood in relation to one another. Q2.1 measures a participant’s present feeling in class and Q2.2 measures the level a participant would like to feel. If we look at the data for these two questions together, we see the absolute difference between the two means (known as the mean absolute difference or MAD) indicates the disparity between the participant groups’ current feeling in foreign language class and their desired feeling.

Understanding survey Q2.1 and Q2.3 in relation to one another. Q2.1 measures a participant’s present feeling and Q2.3 measures a participant’s perception of their classmates’

feeling in foreign language class. If we look at the data for these two questions together, we see the mean absolute difference (MAD) indicates the disparity between the participant groups' current feeling in foreign language class and their perception of classmates' feeling.

Participant groups. Participants' social class identity was assigned according to their selection of lower class (LC), working class (WC), middle class (MC) or upper class (UC) when answering online survey question Q6.15: "If you were asked to use one of four names for your family's social class, which would you say your family belongs in?" First-generation status was determined according to their selection of *yes* or *no* when answering online survey question Q6.25: "Has either of your parents or guardians earned a four-year college/university degree?" (Appendix F). Given that there is only a single participant who identified as first-generation and UC, this group is not considered in the data analysis. However, it is listed as UC (FG) in the tables below.

Languages studied. Since the number of participants totaled only 101, this analysis of reported feelings in the classroom does not take into consideration either the foreign language studied (French, Italian or Spanish) or the course. The number of participants from particular backgrounds (i.e., first-generation status, social class background) in each language/level combination is not sufficient for statistical analysis.

"Feeling uncomfortable" in the foreign language classroom. Reading the first row of Table 6.1, we can see that the mean response of first-generation participants raised in LC families for their present feeling of discomfort in foreign language class is 3.00 and the mean response for how they would like to feel is 1.33 (closer to "entirely comfortable" on the 6-point scale). So, first-generation participants raised in LC families desired to be more comfortable than

they reported being. The gap between their feeling of discomfort and desired feeling is 1.67 (the MAD for Q2.1 and Q2.2). If you compare this number to other participant groups, you will see that first-generation participants raised in LC families desired to be more comfortable in foreign language class to the largest degree.

In the first row of Table 6.1, we can see that the mean response for first-generation participants raised in LC families perception of classmates' feeling of discomfort (2.67) is slightly closer to "entirely comfortable" on the 6-point scale than their own reported present feeling of discomfort in foreign language class (3.00). So, first-generation participants raised in LC families perceived their classmates were slightly more comfortable than they were. The gap between their present feeling of discomfort and what they perceived their classmates' feeling of discomfort to be is 0.33, the MAD for Q2.1 and 2.3. If you compare this number to other participant groups, you will see that first-generation participants raised in LC families perceived their classmates were only slightly more comfortable than they were in the foreign language classroom, but participants raised in UC families, where one parent had graduated from college, perceived they were much more comfortable than their classmates.

The mean responses to Q2.1, Q2.2, and Q2.3 by participant groups that differed the most from the mean responses of all participants were given by first-generation participants raised in LC families. They reported feeling least comfortable in the foreign language classroom and the greatest desire to feel more comfortable. On the other hand, UC participants differed the most from all participants' mean responses for perceiving how uncomfortable their classmates were in class. The UC group reported that they felt much more comfortable than their classmates and this differed from the all participants' mean responses by a full point.

Table 6.1

Participant Group Mean Response for “Feeling Uncomfortable”

		Q2.3				
Participant group	N	Q2.1	Q2.2	Perception of		
		Present feeling of discomfort	Desired feeling of discomfort	classmates’ feeling of discomfort	MAD for Q2.1 and Q2.2	MAD for Q2.1 and Q2.3
LC (FG)	3	3.00	1.33	2.67	1.67	0.33
WC (FG)	12	2.08	1.17	3.17	0.91	1.09
WC	8	2.25	1.50	2.63	0.75	0.38
MC (FG)	14	2.07	1.21	2.14	0.86	0.07
MC	52	2.02	1.29	2.48	0.73	0.46
UC (FG)*	1	2.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
UC	11	2.09	1.18	3.64	0.91	1.55
All participants	101	2.09	1.27	2.64	0.82	0.55

Note. Means calculated from 6-point scale, 1 = comfortable, 6 = uncomfortable; MAD = Mean Absolute Difference; FG = first-generation status; * = excluded from analysis due to small sample size

“Not feeling valued” in the foreign language classroom. Looking at Table 6.2, we can compare means between participant groups and compare each group with all responses. Reading

down, we see that first generation participant groups felt less valued in foreign language class than participants with at least one parent who had graduated from college.

Reading across, we see that—with the exception of first-generation participants raised in LC families for whom there was no desire to feel more valued than they reported—all participants wished to feel more valued than they reported feeling. The largest gap between reported and desired feeling of being valued can be seen in first-generation participants raised in WC families.

Reading across to see the difference between how valued participants from particular backgrounds felt as compared to how valued they perceived that their classmates felt, we see that first-generation LC participants were the only ones who perceived that their classmates felt more valued than they did. In contrast, UC participants perceived the greatest difference between how their classmates felt less valued than they did to the largest degree.

The mean responses to Q2.1, Q2.2 and Q2.3 that differed the most from the mean responses of all participants were given by first-generation participants raised in LC families who reported feeling least valued in the foreign language classroom. First-generation WC participants reported the greatest desire to feel more valued and differed the most from the MAD for Q2.1 and Q2.2 of all participants. On the other hand, UC participants differed the most from all participants mean responses for perceiving how valued their classmates were in class. This group felt much more valued than their classmates and this differed from the MAD for Q2.1 and Q2.3 of all participants.

Table 6.2

Participant Group Mean Response for “Not Feeling Valued”

Participant group	N	Q2.1	Q2.2	Q2.3	MAD for Q2.1 and Q2.2	MAD for Q2.1 and Q2.3
		Feeling not valued	Desired feeling of not valued	Perception of classmates' feeling not valued		
LC (FG)	3	2.67	2.67	2.33	0	0.34
WC (FG)	12	2.17	1.50	2.25	0.67	0.08
WC	8	1.88	1.50	2.13	0.38	0.25
MC (FG)	14	2.21	1.71	2.29	0.50	0.08
MC	52	1.96	1.56	2.06	0.40	0.10
UC (FG)*	1	1.00	1.00	1.00	0	0
UC	11	2.00	1.55	2.55	0.45	0.55
All participants	101	2.03	1.59	2.17	0.44	0.14

Note. Means calculated from 6-point scale, 1.00 = valued, 6.00 = not valued; MAD = Mean Absolute Difference; FG = first-generation status; * = excluded from analysis due to small sample size

“Not feeling part of the group” in the foreign language classroom. Looking at Table 6.3, we can compare means between participant groups as well as the difference between each group’s response and the mean response of all participants. Reading down, we see that first-

generation participants raised in LC families felt least part of the group; their mean responses differ from other participant groups by a full point.

Reading across, we see that all participants wished to feel more part of the group than they reported feeling. The largest gap between reported and desired feeling of being part of the group can be seen in first-generation participants raised in LC families.

Reading across to see the difference between how much part of the group participants from particular backgrounds felt as compared to how much part of the group they perceived their classmates felt, we see that first-generation participants raised in LC families and UC perceived the biggest differences in how much part of the group they felt and how much part of the group their classmates felt. First-generation participants raised in LC families perceived their classmates felt more part of the group than they did. At the other extreme, UC participants reported their classmates felt less part of the group than they did.

The mean responses to Q2.1, Q2.2 and Q2.3 that differed the most from the mean responses of all participants were by first-generation participants raised in LC families who reported feeling least part of the group in the foreign language classroom and the greatest desire to feel more part of the group. This differed the most from the MAD for Q2.1 and Q2.2 of all participants. First-generation participants raised in LC families also differed most from the mean responses of all participants in perceiving how much part of the group their classmates were in class. This group intuited that they felt less part of the group than their classmates and this differed the most from the MAD for Q2.1 and Q2.3 of all participants

Table 6.3

Participant Group Mean Response for “Not Feeling Part of the Group”

Participant group	N	Q2.1	Q2.2	Q2.3	MAD	MAD
		Feeling not part of the group	Desired feeling of not part of the group	Perception of classmates’ feeling not part of the group	for Q2.1 and Q2.2	For Q2.1 and Q2.3
LC (FG)	3	3.00	1.67	2.33	1.33	0.67
WC (FG)	12	2.00	1.42	2.42	0.58	0.42
WC	8	2.25	1.88	2.63	0.37	0.38
MC (FG)	14	2.29	1.57	2.36	0.72	0.07
MC	52	2.21	1.60	2.15	0.61	0.06
UC (FG)*	1	1.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	0
UC	11	2.00	1.18	2.55	0.82	0.55
All participants	101	2.19	1.55	2.29	0.64	0.10

Note. Means calculated from 6-point scale, 1 = part of the group, 6 = not part of the group; MAD = Mean Absolute Difference; FG = first-generation status; * = excluded from analysis due to small sample size

“Feeling inadequate” in the foreign language classroom. Looking at Table 6.4, we can compare means between participant groups as well as to all participants’ responses. Reading down, we see that all first-generation participant groups felt more inadequate than participant groups without first-generation status.

Reading across, we see that all participants wished to feel less inadequate than they reported feeling. The largest gap between reported and desired feeling of inadequacy can be seen in first-generation participants raised in LC families.

Reading across to see the difference between how inadequate participants from particular backgrounds felt as compared to how inadequate they perceived their classmates felt, we see that those who did not have first-generation status perceived the biggest differences in how inadequate they felt and how inadequate their classmates felt. Conversely, UC participants reported the largest gap between how inadequate they felt and how inadequate they perceived their classmates felt. They believed their classmates felt much more inadequate than they did.

The mean responses to Q2.1, Q2.2 and Q2.3 that differed the most from the mean responses of all participants were by first-generation participants raised in LC families who reported feeling most inadequate in the foreign language classroom and the greatest desire to feel less inadequate. This differed the most from the MAD for Q2.1 and Q2.2 of all participants. UC participants differed the most from the mean responses of all participants for perceiving how inadequate their classmates felt in the class. The group intuited that they felt less inadequate than classmates and this differed the most from the MAD for Q2.1 and Q2.3 of all participants.

Table 6.4

Participant Group Mean Response for “Feeling Inadequate”

Participant group	N	Q2.2		Q2.3		
		Q2.1 Feeling of inadequacy	Desired feeling of inadequacy	Perception of classmates’ feeling of inadequacy	MAD for Q2.1 and Q2.2	MAD for Q2.1 and Q2.3
LC (FG)	3	2.67	1.33	2.67	1.34	0
WC (FG)	12	2.42	1.25	2.83	1.17	0.41
WC	8	2.00	1.63	2.63	0.37	0.63
MC (FG)	14	2.21	1.29	2.43	0.92	0.22
MC	52	1.98	1.37	2.50	0.61	0.52
UC (FG)*	1	2.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00
UC	11	2.00	1.27	2.82	0.73	0.82
All participants	101	2.09	1.35	2.58	0.74	0.49

Note. Means calculated from 6-point scale, 1 = adequate, 6 = inadequate; MAD = Mean

Absolute Difference; FG = first-generation status; * = excluded from analysis due to small sample size

“Feeling unheard” in the foreign language classroom. Looking at Table 6.5, we can compare means between participant groups as well as to all participants’ responses. Reading down, we see that UC participants felt least heard.

Reading across, we see that with the exception of first-generation LC participants, all participants wished to feel their voices were more heard than they reported. The largest gap between reported and desired feeling of being unheard can be seen in first-generation

participants raised in MC families. Those who did not have first-generation status and were raised in MC and UC families also had comparably large differences. That is, these groups had the greatest desire to be heard in class.

Reading across to see the difference between how much participants from particular backgrounds felt their voices were unheard and how much they perceived their classmates felt unheard, we see that first-generation participants raised in WC families perceived the biggest difference in how heard they felt and how heard their classmates felt. That is, these participants believed they felt their voices were more heard than their classmates.

The mean responses to Q2.1, Q2.2 and Q2.3 that differed the most from the mean responses of from all participants were by WC participants without first-generation status who reported feeling their voices were most heard. However, the amount first-generation WC participants desire that their voices be heard differed the most from all participants' mean responses. This group also intuited that they felt their voices were more heard than classmates to a degree that differed the most from MAD for Q2.1 and Q2.3 for all participants.

Table 6.5

Participant Group Mean Response for “Feeling Unheard”

Participant group	N	Q2.2		Q2.3		
		Q2.1 Feeling unheard	Desired feeling of being unheard	Perception of classmates’ feeling unheard	MAD for Q2.1 and Q2.2	MAD for Q2.1 and Q2.3
LC (FG)	3	2.00	2.33	2.00	0.33	0
WC (FG)	12	2.00	1.58	2.67	0.02	0.67
WC	8	1.75	1.63	2.13	0.12	0.38
MC (FG)	14	2.14	1.50	2.07	0.64	0.07
MC	52	2.08	1.50	2.21	0.58	0.13
UC (FG)*	1	1.00	1.00	1.00	0	0
UC	11	2.18	1.55	2.45	0.63	0.27
All participants	101	2.05	1.54	2.25	0.51	0.20

Note. Means calculated from 6-point scale, 1 = heard, 6 = unheard; MAD = Mean Absolute Difference; FG = first-generation status; * = excluded from analysis due to small sample size

Summary. By comparing means for the 7 groups, we are able to see which participants from particular backgrounds reported feeling the least/most comfortable, valued, part of the group, adequate and heard. First-generation LC participants felt least comfortable and least part of the group. All first-generation participant groups reported feeling less valued and less adequate than other groups. WC participants with at least one parent who had graduated from college felt their voices were most heard.

With one exception, all participant groups reported a greater desire to feel more comfortable, valued, part of the group, adequate and heard. However, using the mean absolute difference (MAD) for Q2.1 and Q2.2, I was able to calculate which participants from particular backgrounds felt the greatest desire to feel more comfortable, valued, part of the group, adequate and heard. The largest gap between how participants felt and how they would like to feel can be seen in the mean responses of LC participants who reported the greatest desire to feel more comfortable, part of the group and more adequate. The mean responses of first-generation WC participants represented the greatest desire to feel more valued. All MC and UC participants' mean responses were similarly high with regards to their desire to feel more heard.

Finally, using these data we were able to compare participant perceptions of classmates' feeling comfortable, valued, part of the group, adequate and heard to participants' own feelings. The MAD for Q2.1 and Q2.3 gives us an idea of how participants from particular backgrounds experienced these feelings in the context of the classroom. UC participants perceived they were more comfortable than their classmates to the largest degree. First-generation LC participants were the only group to perceive classmates were more comfortable than they were. UC participants also perceived they were more valued than their classmates to the largest degree. LC students perceived their classmates felt more part of the group to the largest degree while UC student perceived their classmates were less apart of the group to the largest degree. UC participants perceived they were more adequate than their classmates to the largest degree. First-generation WC participants reported feeling more heard than their classmates to the largest degree.

In order to gain a better understanding of the feelings of participants from particular backgrounds, the next section will examine classroom discussion topics. The idea is that feelings

of comfort, value, solidarity with the group, adequacy and whether one feels heard may be related to the ease with which a participant takes part in class discussion on a particular topic. The following analysis examines the relationship between participants' social class background and their disposition to discuss particular topics in the foreign language classroom.

Disposition to Class Discussion Topics

This section provides background information necessary to explore the relationship between participants' social class background and their dispositions to discussing particular topics. First, I present participants' perception of the frequency with which particular topics were discussed. Next, I present participants' dispositions to discussing them.

Frequency of discussion topics. Reading Table 6.6, we can see which topics participants perceived they were asked to talk about most frequently in foreign language class (see Appendix F, Q3.1). Participants report being asked to discuss their hobbies, vacation experiences, aspirations for the future, and hometowns with the most frequency. The next group of topics participants perceived they were sometimes asked to talk about were their living arrangement, ideal home, ideal vacation, and family tree. Finally, participants reported being asked a few times about their parents' ages, parents' jobs, parents' pastimes/hobbies, and were never asked about their parents' living arrangements. Since the standard deviation (SD) is less than two, we know that each of the 12 topics were discussed by participants with about the same reported frequency.

Table 6.6

Perceived Frequency of Topics Discussed in All Foreign Language Classes

Q3.1 Have you ever been asked to talk about the			
following topics in language class?	Median	Mean	SD
Pastimes / hobbies	5.00	4.55	1.22
Vacation experiences	5.00	4.35	1.20
Living arrangement	4.00	3.65	1.42
Aspirations for the future	4.00	4.15	1.37
Hometown	4.00	4.12	1.43
Ideal vacation	4.00	3.77	1.52
Family tree	4.00	3.58	1.45
Ideal home	3.00	3.08	1.55
Parents' ages	2.00	2.63	1.55
Parents' jobs	2.00	2.29	1.35
Parents' hobbies / pastimes	2.00	2.27	1.49
Parents' living arrangement	1.00	1.90	1.28

Note. N = 101; 6 = Very frequently; 5 = Frequently; 4 = Somewhat frequently; 3 = Sometimes;

2 = A few times; 1 = never

Disposition to class discussion topics. Looking at Table 6.7 below, we can see which topics participants reported feeling comfortable talking about and which ones they would be selective about what they share in class, which topics they don't have the vocabulary to discuss, and which ones they would avoid speaking about all together (see Appendix F, Q3.2). The survey was designed so that participants could select multiple answers. For example, participants

could indicate they felt comfortable speaking about a topic, but they wouldn't know the vocabulary or that they felt comfortable, but they would be selective about what they shared on a particular topic.

Table 6.7

Frequencies for Disposition to Classroom Discussion Topics

Discussion topics	I would feel comfortable being asked about...	I would be selective about what I share on...	I wouldn't know the vocabulary to express what is true for me about...	I would avoid speaking about...
Pastimes/hobbies	98	5	2	0
Vacation experiences	97	3	3	0
Living arrangement	87	16	0	0
Aspirations for the future	85	16	7	1
Hometown	90	11	1	1
Ideal vacation	93	7	3	0
Family tree	88	11	4	3
Ideal home	84	13	4	0
Parents' ages	84	9	3	6
Parents' jobs	66	21	12	7
Parents' pastimes/hobbies	74	14	9	7
Parents' living arrangement	72	15	6	10

Note. N = 101

Pastimes and hobbies. Of the 12 topics listed, the highest number of participants 97% reported feeling comfortable speaking about their pastimes and hobbies. A handful (5%) said they would be selective about what they share and just 2 thought they wouldn't know the vocabulary to discuss their pastimes and hobbies. None indicated they would avoid the topic.

Vacation experiences. A majority of respondents 96% reported being comfortable discussing their vacation experiences and 3% said they would be selective about what they share or that they wouldn't know the vocabulary. None reported they would avoid speaking about vacation experiences.

Living arrangement. A majority of respondents 86% reported being comfortable discussing their living arrangement and about 16% said they would be selective about what they share. None reported not knowing the vocabulary or that they would avoid speaking about living arrangements.

Aspirations for the future. A majority of respondents or 84% reported being comfortable discussing their aspirations for the future and 16% said they would be selective about what they share. A few participants or 7% reported not knowing the vocabulary and one indicated that s/he would avoid speaking about aspirations for the future.

Hometown. A majority of respondents or 89% reported being comfortable discussing their hometown and 11% said they would be selective about what they share. One participant reported not knowing the vocabulary and one indicated that s/he would avoid speaking about their hometown.

Ideal vacation. A majority of respondents or 93% reported being comfortable discussing their ideal vacation and 7% said they would be selective about what they share. Three

participants reported not knowing the vocabulary and none indicated that s/he would avoid speaking about ideal vacation.

Family tree. A majority of respondents or 87% reported being comfortable discussing their family tree and 11% said they would be selective about what they share. Four participants reported not knowing the vocabulary and three indicated that s/he would avoid speaking about family tree.

Ideal home. A majority of respondents or 83% reported being comfortable discussing their ideal home and 13% said they would be selective about what they share. Four participants reported not knowing the vocabulary and none indicated that s/he would avoid speaking about their ideal home.

Parents' ages. A majority of respondents or 87% reported being comfortable discussing parents' ages and 11% said they would be selective about what they share. Four participants reported not knowing the vocabulary and three indicated that s/he would avoid speaking about parents' ages.

Parents' jobs. Of the 12 topics listed, the fewest number of participants of 65% were comfortable discussing their parents' jobs. In fact 21% reported they would be selective about what they shared. Twelve participants or 12% reported not knowing the vocabulary and 7% indicated that they would avoid speaking about their parents' jobs.

Parents' pastimes/hobbies. A majority of respondents 73% reported being comfortable discussing their parents' pastimes/hobbies and 14% said they would be selective about what they share. Nine participants reported not knowing the vocabulary and seven indicated that s/he would avoid speaking about parents' pastimes/hobbies.

Parents' living arrangement. A majority of respondents or 71% reported being comfortable discussing their parents' living arrangement and 15% said they would be selective about what they share. Six participants reported not knowing the vocabulary and ten indicated that s/he would avoid speaking about their parents' living arrangement.

Summary. Participants reported feeling the most comfortable speaking about their pastimes/hobbies, vacation experiences, and ideal vacation. They reported they would be the most selective about what they share relating to their parents' jobs, living arrangement, and aspirations for the future. The top topics participants reported they wouldn't know the vocabulary to express "what is true for them" were their parents' jobs, their parents' pastimes and hobbies, and their aspirations for the future. Finally, they would most often avoid speaking about their parents' living arrangement, parents' pastimes and hobbies, and parents' jobs.

The topics participants reported feeling most comfortable discussing, they also reported were also frequently discussed in class. Topics relating to their parents were less frequently discussed and fewer participants indicated they would be comfortable discussing these topics. The following frequently discussed topics were also topics that participants indicated they would selectively share when discussing them: living arrangement, aspirations for the future, hometown, and family tree. The three topics participants indicated they would not have the vocabulary to express "what is true for them," were also not so frequently discussed. They were: parents' jobs, parents' pastimes and hobbies, and parents' living arrangement. Finally, the three topics least frequently discussed were also the three topics participants would most often avoid speaking about. They were parents' living arrangement, parents' pastimes and hobbies, and parents' jobs.

Relationship between Disposition to Topics and Social Class/First-generation Status

To determine whether there is a relationship between participants' disposition to particular topics and their social class background and/or first-generation status, in this section I group results by the seven social class groups and two first-generation status groups. I also perform statistical analysis to determine whether the way participants answered the discussion disposition questions differed by social class background and/or first-generation status.

Social class groups. Given Table 6.7 shows participants felt the least comfortable speaking about topics related to their families, I looked at the frequencies of the various dispositions to discussion topics to compare how participants from the seven social class groups answered. These seven participant groups are based on first-generation status and the social class of the family in which participants indicated they were raised (see Appendix F, Q6.25 & Q6.15). In Tables 6.8-6.11, I present the way each group indicated four dispositions to each of the 12 discussion topics.

Table 6.8

Percentage of Participants with Comfortable Disposition to Discussion Topics

I would feel comfortable being asked about...	All participants	FG lower	FG working	Not FG working	FG middle	Not FG middle	FG upper	Not FG upper
Pastimes/hobbies	97%	100%	75%	100%	93%	98%	100%	91%
Vacation experiences	96%	100%	100%	88%	71%	100%	100%	91%
Living arrangement	86%	67%	83%	100%	86%	88%	100%	91%
Aspirations for the future	84%	100%	92%	100%	71%	83%	100%	82%
Hometown	89%	67%	92%	100%	86%	90%	100%	82%
Ideal vacation	92%	100%	100%	100%	76%	90%	100%	91%
Family tree	87%	67%	92%	88%	86%	90%	100%	82%
Ideal home	83%	100%	67%	100%	76%	83%	100%	82%

Parents' ages	83%	100%	83%	63%	86%	83%	100%	91%
Parents' jobs	65%	33%	75%	38%	64%	69%	100%	73%
Parents' pastimes/hobbies	73%	33%	75%	63%	71%	75%	100%	82%
Parents' living arrangement	71%	33%	58%	75%	76%	71%	100%	82%
N	101	3	12	8	14	52	1	11

Table 6.9

Percentage of Participants with Selective Disposition to Discussion Topics

I would be selective about what I share on this topic...	All participants	FG lower	FG working	Not FG working	FG middle	Not FG middle	FG upper	Not FG upper
Pastimes/hobbies	5%	0	8%	0	0	4%	100%	18%
Vacation experiences	3%	0	0	13%	29%	0	100%	27%
Living arrangement	16%	33%	8%	0	7%	13%	100%	18%
Aspirations for the future	16%	0	8%	0	21%	17%	100%	27%
Hometown	11%	33%	0	38%	21%	12%	100%	9%
Ideal vacation	7%	0	0	0	21%	10%	100%	9%
Family tree	11%	33%	8%	0	7%	10%	100%	0
Ideal home	13%	0	25%	0	14%	12%	100%	0

Parents' ages	9%	0	8%	25%	7%	10%	100%	0
Parents' jobs	21%	33%	17%	25%	71%	19%	100%	18%
Parents' pastimes/hobbies	14%	33%	8%	13%	21%	13%	100%	9%
Parents' living arrangement	15%	33%	17%	13%	21%	13%	100%	9%
N	101	3	12	8	14	52	1	11

Table 6.10

Percentage of Participants Lacking Vocabulary to Discuss Topics

I wouldn't know the vocabulary to express what is true for me about this topic...	All participants	FG lower	FG working	Not FG working	FG middle	Not FG middle	FG upper	Not FG upper
Pastimes/hobbies	2%	0	17%	0	0	2%	100%	0
Vacation experiences	3%	0	0	0	0	2%	100%	0
Living arrangement	0	0	0	0	14%	0	100%	0
Aspirations for the future	7%	0	8%	13%	21%	2%	100%	9%
Hometown	1%	0	8%	0	0	0	100%	0
Ideal vacation	3%	0	0	0	0	2%	100%	9%
Family tree	4%	0	8%	0	7%	0	100%	9%
Ideal home	4%	0	8%	0	14%	6%	100%	9%

Parents' ages	3%	0	0	0	0	4%	100%	9%
Parents' jobs	12%	33%	8%	38%	21%	6%	100%	27%
Parents' pastimes/hobbies	9%	33%	17%	13%	7%	6%	100%	9%
Parents' living arrangement	6%	33%	8%	13%	0	4%	100%	9%
N	101	3	12	8	14	52	1	11

Table 6.11

Percentage of Participants with Avoidant Disposition to Discussion Topics

I would avoid speaking about this topic...	All participants	FG lower	FG working	Not FG working	FG middle	Not FG middle	FG upper	Not FG upper
Pastimes/hobbies	0	0	0	0	0	0	100%	0
Vacation experiences	0	0	0	0	0	0	100%	0
Living arrangement	0	0	0	0	0	0	100%	0
Aspirations for the future	1%	0	0	0	0	2%	100%	0
Hometown	1%	0	8%	0	0	0	100%	0
Ideal vacation	0	0	0	0	0	0	100%	0
Family tree	3%	0	0	0	0	2%	100%	0
Ideal home	0	0	0	0	7%	0	100%	0

Parents' ages	6%	0	8%	13%	7%	6%	100%	0
Parents' jobs	7%	0	0	13%	29%	8%	100%	0
Parents' pastimes/hobbies	7%	0	0	25%	7%	8%	100%	9%
Parents' living arrangement	10%	0	17%	25%	7%	10%	100%	0
N	101	3	12	8	14	52	1	11

First-generation LC participants. Tables 6.8-6.11 show that participants in this group reported being least comfortable discussing their parents' jobs, parents' pastimes/hobbies, and parents' living arrangement. The proportion of this group that indicated it would be selective about what it shared regarding living arrangement, family tree, parents' jobs, parents' pastimes/hobbies, and parents' living arrangement was the highest of all seven groups. It was also the highest of all seven groups for indicating not knowing the vocabulary to discuss parents' pastimes/hobbies, and parents' living arrangement. However, proportions for this group are elevated due to its small size ($n = 3$).

First-generation WC participants. Tables 6.8-6.11 show that participants in this group reported being least comfortable discussing their parents' living arrangement, ideal home, pastimes/hobbies, parents' jobs, and parents' pastimes/hobbies. The proportion of this group that indicated it would be selective about what it shared regarding their ideal home was the highest of

all seven groups. It was also the highest of all seven groups that indicated not knowing the vocabulary to discuss their pastimes/hobbies and parents' pastimes and hobbies which may explain why they were uncomfortable discussing these topics.

WC participants without first-generation status. Tables 6.8-6.11 show participants in this group reported being least comfortable discussing their parents' ages, parents' jobs, and parents' pastimes/hobbies. The proportion of this group that indicated it would be selective about what it shared regarding their hometown was the highest of all seven groups. It was also the highest of all seven groups for indicating not knowing the vocabulary to discuss their parents' jobs. The group also indicated it would avoid discussing parents' pastimes/hobbies and parents' living arrangement in the greatest proportion of all seven groups.

First-generation MC participants. Tables 6.8-6.11 show that participants in this group reported being least comfortable discussing their parents' jobs, living arrangement, aspirations for the future, and parents' pastimes/hobbies. The proportion of this group that indicated it would be selective about what it shared regarding their living arrangement was the higher than all seven groups with the exception of participants in first-generation LC. It was also the highest of all seven groups for indicating not knowing the vocabulary to discuss their aspirations for the future, which may explain why a large portion of this group indicated it wouldn't be comfortable speaking about it. It also indicated in a higher proportion than the other groups that it would avoid discussing parents' jobs.

MC participants without first-generation status. Tables 6.8-6.11 show participants in this group reported being least comfortable discussing their parents' jobs, parents' living arrangement, aspirations for the future, ideal home, and parents' ages. The proportion of this group that indicated it would be selective about what it shared regarding their ideal vacation was

the highest of all seven groups. It was also the highest of all seven groups for indicating not knowing the vocabulary to discuss their ideal home which may explain why this group was uncomfortable discussing the topic.

First-generation UC participants. Tables 6.8-6.11 show this group included only one participant who was comfortable discussing all topics, but would avoid discussing hometown.

UC participants without first-generation status. Tables 6.8-6.11 show participants in this group reported being least comfortable discussing their parents' jobs, parents' pastimes/hobbies, parents' living arrangement, aspirations for the future, hometown, and family tree. The proportion of this group that indicated it would be selective about what it shared regarding their vacation experiences and aspirations for the future was the highest of all seven groups.

Significant difference in dispositions between social class groups. Tables 6.8-6.11 show proportional differences between the way the seven social class groups indicated particular dispositions to some of the 12 topics. To understand whether the way each of the seven groups reported their dispositions to discussion topics differed in a statistically significant way, I performed a chi-square tests. However, none of the tests indicated that the percentage of participants reporting a particular disposition to a particular topic differed by social class background group.

First-generation groups. Looking at tables 6.8-6.11, I noted participant groups with first-generation status reported similar dispositions to particular discussion topics. For example, both first-generation participant groups raised in WC and MC families indicated they would be selective about discussing their ideal home in similar proportions. In Table 6.12, I tallied the frequencies in two groups by first-generation status to see whether it revealed a pattern in the

data. Differences of nine percentage points or more between the two groups can be seen in dispositions to several topics, including: living arrangement, aspirations for the future, family tree, and ideal home.

Table 6.12

Disposition to Discussion Topics According to First-generation Status

Discussion topics	I would feel comfortable being asked about...		I would be selective about what I share on...		I wouldn't know the vocabulary to express what is true for me about...		I would avoid speaking about...	
	First gen	Not first gen	First gen	Not first gen	First gen	Not first gen	First gen	Not first gen
Pastimes/hobbies	97%	97%	3%	6%	3%	1%	0	0
Vacation experiences	93%	97%	3%	3%	7%	1%	0	0
Living arrangement*	76%	90%	23%	13%	0	0	0	0
Aspirations for the future*	83%	85%	13%	17%	13%	4%	0	1%
Hometown	87%	90%	13%	10%	3%	0	0	1%
Ideal vacation	93%	92%	3%	8%	3%	3%	0	0
Family tree*	83%	89%	13%	10%	10%	1%	0	4%
Ideal home*	76%	86%	20%	10%	3%	4%	0	0
Parents' ages	87%	82%	7%	10%	0	4%	7%	6%
Parents' jobs	63%	66%	20%	21%	17%	10%	3%	8%
Parents' pastimes/hobbies	70%	75%	17%	13%	13%	7%	3%	8%
Parents' living arrangement	67%	73%	20%	13%	7%	6%	10%	10%

Note. First-generation ($n = 30$); Not first generation ($n = 71$); * = difference of 9% or more between groups.

Significant difference in dispositions between first-generation groups. Table 6.12 showed percentage differences between the way the way the two first-generation groups indicated particular dispositions to some of the 12 topics. In particular I noted differences of nine percentage points or more in each group's disposition to the following discussion topics: living arrangements, aspirations for the future, family tree, and ideal home. I performed a chi-square test to understand whether the way first-generation participants and participants whose parents both graduated from college indicated their dispositions to discussion topics in a statistically different way. The percentage of participants that indicated they “wouldn't know the vocabulary to express what is true for me” when discussing their family tree differed by first-generation status: $\chi^2(1, N = 101) = 4.09, p = .043$.

Summary. In this section, I showed how participants belonging to one of seven social class groupings reported particular dispositions to discussing topics in foreign language class. With the exception of first-generation UC participants, all groups were least comfortable discussing parents' jobs and parents' pastimes/hobbies. Proportional differences between the seven social class groups with regard to their dispositions about discussing the 12 topics were not statistically significant. However, when grouped by first-generation status, proportional differences stood out for each of the two group's dispositions to four discussion topics: living arrangement, aspirations for the future, family tree, and ideal home. In fact, there was a statistically significant difference in the way the two first-generation status groups indicated that they “wouldn't know the vocabulary to express what is true for them” when discussing their family tree.

In the next section, I will present data from first-generation and WC participants who offer insight into their reported feelings in the foreign language classroom, their dispositions to discussing particular topics, and strategies for participating in class discussions.

Participation Strategies of Working Class and/or First-generation College Students

Identity management strategies for participation. In this section, I will explore what lies behind the data presented above for first-generation and WC students' reported feelings in the classroom. I will also explore the motivations behind this group's dispositions to discussing particular topics, especially those related to family. I will highlight the various strategies first-generation and WC participants I interviewed described using to manage their identities. These strategies include withholding, modifying, and inventing information about themselves when participating in class that reflect Goffman's stigma theory (see Chapter 2).

Being "out" in the classroom. To begin, I would like to give space to Steve who eloquently explains the particular information management demands he felt when participating in beginning Italian courses:

INTERVIEWER: So in the survey, I made a note that you wrote you would avoid talking about your parents' ages, your parents' jobs and your parents' living arrangement. Do you remember, thinking back to Italian 101 and 102, if that came up, did you avoid talking about it and what you were feeling?

STEVE: Yeah. Um, I didn't like being first generation, I don't like bringing up my background so much because I feel like it, it hinders me, like it makes me, it gives like a viewpoint of me that I don't want.

I'm really dedicated to my studies, and especially extraneous studies, such as Italian, which doesn't apply towards my degree, and so when I'm doing it, I don't want something to hold me back, like a viewpoint, thinking since my father works in a factory—or my mother has an associate's degree—I don't want that to like hold me back. And so I didn't feel comfortable giving that information away, especially in the academic atmosphere that we're in. And then, in relation to my social peer network, I guess you could say, um, yeah, I feel like that's getting too personal.

Italian 203 was more integrative, such as like we read poems. We didn't, we weren't talking about family, and if it would include something in the poem, it was a poem, you know, like people won't take it for truth, you know, as much as what would be done in 101 and 102. And so I felt like I was more comfortable in 203 by far. Plus I was getting better at the language!

As Steve clearly states, there is a distinct difference between beginning language courses and upper division courses. He is conscious of his classmates' and instructor's "viewpoint" of him and he employs the strategy of withholding information to manage their perceptions. He fears that particular pieces of information may "hold him back." It is noteworthy that when the focus of the language course shifts from self to material outside the self like poems, Steve reports feeling more comfortable.

This quote reflects the topic of a broadcast by *State of Opportunity*, a special reporting project of Michigan Public Radio which aired "Coming out as poor at an elite university" (Guerra, 2015). The radio story describes the awkward and isolating experience of students explaining to classmates why their parents didn't attend college or what they do for a living. It relates the experience of one student who has to "come out" to professors when she is unable to

afford the books on the reading list. It also quotes a student whose professor insinuates you have to travel the world to be successful. Steve is attuned to the effect sharing particular aspects of his background in the university environment might have on his progress and he is careful about what he shares.

Withholding. Several participants described withholding information when participating in language class. They describe withholding information due to apprehension about how that information would be received based on experiences outside of the language classroom.

Two interviewees cited withholding information about their socioeconomic status. Eclipse—who primarily viewed social class identity in terms of ethnicity—makes a distinction between withholding information about his social class identity and withholding information about his socioeconomic status:

INTERVIEWER: Did you ever hide your social class in French 101?

ECLIPSE: I think, throughout my college career, I don't really hide my social class, but I hide the fact that I get, like my entire tuition is paid with basically grant money and scholarship and financial aid, and I don't really like to tell people that because I don't, like I don't know what other people would think about that, especially, well, because of the political climate. My girlfriend's father is very against like handouts, is what he calls them. So I just kind of stick away from telling other people how much money I receive, just to kind of, not to instigate anything.

While Eclipse would never hide his social class (which he views as his ethnicity), he has experienced negative feedback in the wider world about financial aid, so he does not readily share that information. Melissa is also very cautious about the information she shares in and out

of language class. She describes how she withholds information so that others do not realize she worries about money:

INTERVIEWER: When you were in your Italian class, did you ever feel like you needed to pass as a different social class?

MELISSA: Um, yep. I'd say most of the time, even not in Italian, but I, I think a lot of the time I do try to pass off as not having to worry about money and it's not an issue. Just so other people don't like stress for me, I guess.

INTERVIEWER: And how do you do that?

MELISSA: Oh, I don't know. I just try not to share information or I don't tell them like I had to ask my parents for money or something like that, I guess. Yeah, I don't know. I guess I just don't talk about it, is kind of how I try to pass off. Yeah.

Both Melissa and Eclipse use a withholding strategy to manage information that would indicate their socioeconomic status to others both in and out of language class. Other participants withhold information about other aspects of their lives including information pertaining to their families. Michele was 19 and newly married while enrolled in Italian 101. She describes the reasons why she withheld this information in class:

MICHELE: ...we talked about how many family members we had and how old they were. Stuff like that. We had to describe them, what they liked to do.

INTERVIEWER: And how did that feel for you?

MICHELE: Okay. My, my parents are a lot younger than most people's parents...I'm used to [people's surprise], because I know they're young. My mom just turned 40, I think my dad's 41, and most other people's parents are like in their 50s or so...

INTERVIEWER: Did you ever talk about your husband?

MICHELE: Uh, no, because it's weird, I guess, because most people don't expect you to be married. Because I'm only 19...Um, I got married in February...He is active duty, so he's in Korea.

INTERVIEWER: Oh, wow. That must be difficult. Did it ever come up in class?

MICHELE: Um, yeah. The one girl that I sat next to most of the time, she, we talked about it sometimes.

INTERVIEWER: Did it ever come up in any of the class activities?

MICHELE: Hmm, no, because I would just, I like, I would just describe like my mom and dad and my brothers...Just because, I don't know. Like people don't understand, I guess. Because they're like, wow, you're so young, are you sure you're ready for that, and I just don't like describing the whole situation...So I just, I mean, I just avoid it.

While Michele was aware that certain details of her life were unusual or unexpected for her age, she anticipated other's reactions and withheld information that would provoke an unwanted reaction. It is difficult to say whether her parents' ages and the fact that she was the young bride of an active duty military personnel indicated something of her social class background to her classmates. But it is fair to say that Michele recognized that these facts would mark her as different and she chose to employ a withholding strategy when discussing her family in class to avoid people's assessment of her.

Modifying. Participants also describe modifying information about themselves when participating in their foreign language classes. This participation strategy can take many forms. One way to modify information is to answer generically as John describes, "I'll just answer anything generically because you know, some people might not be comfortable answering a

question that is too personal, so a general response would be better.” Modifying for ease of participation can also require students to blend life experiences together as Dexter describes:

INTERVIEWER: So you told me, you have two families. How was it negotiating a “describe your family” type of an exercise?

DEXTER: I would switch back and forth, so sometimes I would use, it depended on the exercise and what I thought would be more interesting, according to which family. So, sometimes I would use the Texas family, sometimes I would use the Wisconsin family. Uh, sometimes I would mix them and just say like my actual mom does this, my actual dad does this just not mention that they do them across the country from one another.

While leaving out bits of information and make it easier to participate, a pilot participant called Kay describes how modifying in this way affects a story’s reception: “I actually do remember being uncomfortable because the last vacation that we’d had was to a funeral in New Orleans, to visit, well, I shouldn’t say visit, but to pay respects to a great-uncle of mine. I ended up just saying New Orleans, and everybody’s like, oh, cool, you know.” Even when modifying to ease participation, the reaction of Kay’s Spanish classmates highlighted her lack of travel experiences to herself. “I was pissed off because we didn’t get to do all the things that all these people got to do, you know, all of these stories that they were telling...I didn’t get to have the experience that I was seeing my peers regularly talk about. And so, I mean, I was angry but I wasn’t angry or, like, distrustful of the class necessarily, I was just more irritated with the circumstances.”

Cherry-picking. Another way to modify when strategically participating is to “cherry-pick” from one’s life experiences. Astrid, a participant from the pilot study described how she employed this strategy in her beginning language classes:

INTERVIEWER: Which activities...or topics of conversation revealed your social class?

ASTRID: You spend a lot of time talking about like your pastimes, what you like to do... I was very good at hiding behind, because I worked as a musician actually since I was in college, since I was an undergrad. I was a choir director. So it's like I had that capital to draw on, and I could always say stuff like, I play the piano, you know, that's my pastime, it's like, I listen to Beethoven, you know. I, it's like I knew that I should draw from that rather than...

INTERVIEWER: So what if you were answering like straight up?

ASTRID: Honestly, when I was taking French, I think I would have said I like to play pitch, because we used to sit around in my grandma's kitchen and we'd sit around their big table and eat candy and play pitch, and I loved it, but it's like, I was pretty sure middle-class people didn't do that. I don't know. Maybe, maybe they do, but it's like, no, I never would have answered honestly. And I do love to play piano. It's not like I'm lying necessarily. It was very much, I was cherry-picking what I can say.

Modifying information about one's self as a participation strategy includes "cherry-picking" from one's life experience for the most "acceptable" answers. The strategy can also be employed by blending information together or answering very generically.

Inventing. It is standard practice to encourage language students to "just make it up" when they do not have anything to say or if they cannot relate to the topic being discussed. Although Steve describes withholding information above, he also relied on the expectation that you can invent things if and when you want to: "I never feel like I have to really hide in language classes...just because at the beginning of the semester, it even says in the syllabus, you know, just make up something if you don't feel comfortable saying the real thing." Carrie Ann felt the impulse to invent things in class because of her perception of Italian culture: "I feel like Italian

culture is much more like sophisticated. It appears as like a higher class and so you want to like fit in to the higher class.”

A concrete example of why the inventing strategy was employed can be seen in a pilot study participant’s description of the way she negotiated an exercise in Indonesian class.

Lindsay’s classmates all happened to be upper class Malaysians and devout Muslims. Since she had once been married to a Muslim, she supposed she would be perceived negatively in class:

One of the things we had to do once was draw up a celebration that happens in your hometown and we had to make an advertisement and market this event that happens in our hometown. And so, in my hometown, it’s like we have the Brat Fest, which is like a huge, drunken, pig-ingesting beer orgy with tractor pulls and, like our county has maybe 15,000 people in it, and 100,000 people come and destroy the county and so, how am I going to talk about that? Like, other people are talking about, oh, Ramadan, we have, we go and visit our relatives, and I’m going to talk about we all get shit-faced and puke on each other and eat pork. And so I think I made up something about like a lumberjack festival and log rolling.

Lindsay is apprehensive about sharing what is true for her because she worries it will offend the religious sensibilities of her classmates and result in loss of status in the classroom:

LINDSAY: I know this because of enough times of talking about bacon or something and people being like, eww, that’s like eating shit. That’s how they think about it. Like if someone put bacon on their plate, it would be like a big turd that’s how offensive that is.

INTERVIEWER: So, in my, in my little town, we celebrate the two things that you guys just can’t even fathom putting in your mouths. Alcohol and pig.

RESPONDENT: Yes, and we all wear miniskirts while we're doing it and smoke cigarettes.

INTERVIEWER: And show off our tattoos.

LINDSAY: Yeah, and we had to draw it. We had markers and we had to like draw it and put it in Indonesian, you know, come to my town! So I was like, yeah, lumberjacks.

That's a better image.

Pork, alcohol, immodesty, and tattoos are all *haram* or sinful in Islam. Instead of describing the annual brat fest in her town which would have colored her classmates perception of her and resulted in a loss of status, Lindsay strategically participated in class by inventing a festival about lumberjacks.

Classroom context. The classroom context can determine a participant's ability to employ these participation strategies. Although her father is a Spanish-speaker, Sam says she never learned the language because, "I mostly grew up in like a white neighborhood with my white mother." In Spanish class, she felt her classmates expected her to know Spanish given her appearance:

SAM: Everybody that I was taking Spanish with was Caucasian and I was like the only Hispanic-looking one. And I was like the worst one in class also so like, a couple times people went up to me and they're like, aren't you like Hispanic? And I'm like, yeah. And they're like, and you can't speak Spanish? And I'm like, no [chuckles].

INTERVIEWER: How did that make you feel?

SAM: Um, I think that was also a part of the reason why I dropped Spanish, was because I knew that I was worse and, um, I, I was kind of getting this, like kind of attitude from this one girl in my class. Like she would purposely say things in Spanish or something,

because she knew that she was better than me at it. And I just felt like I wasn't very good at it as, and so I just, I don't know, dropped it.

Sam reports that a particularly toxic learning environment led her to drop Spanish 203 and enroll in French 101. In addition to being singled out for her ethnicity, other aspects of the classroom atmosphere contributed to Sam level of discomfort. Here she contrasts the differing social contexts of her Spanish and French classes:

INTERVIEWER: Do you think there were people of your social class in your foreign language class?

SAM: In French, yeah, I think they were more around my social class and everything. Um, Spanish, I have to say that there was a few that were a bit above.

INTERVIEWER: How did you know?

SAM: Um, I could just tell by their demeanor, how they dress, and also they would talk about things also, like what kind of car they had or if they wanted to go out and eat or if they were going to go like fake tanning and everything, I mean, you have to be more like, you know, have money in order to do that kind of stuff.

INTERVIEWER: What about in French class, how did you know, the people that you think were of your same social class, how did you know that?

SAM: Um, they just didn't wear, like they wore kind of clothes like that I did and, um, they just seemed more down-to-earth and everything.

INTERVIEWER: And more down-to-earth like in the way they dressed and things, or their behavior or—

SAM: Just their behavior and everything.

INTERVIEWER: You said that in the French class, you had more down-to-earth people, and in Spanish class, you had more people that felt like something higher. Could you compare between the classes, how many people were of that kind of upper whatever in Spanish class as compared to French class?

SAM: Yeah. Spanish, I'd say about like, I don't know, about 50%. And then French, I'd say about like 10%.

In addition to the racist assumptions about her language abilities, this emphasis on material goods and spending money contributed to Sam's feeling of alienation from the group. Below she describes how the atmosphere affected her participation:

INTERVIEWER: In your French class, did you ever feel like you needed to pass as a different social class?

SAM: Um, no, not really. Um, sometimes I feel crappy about my social class, but, I mean, it's not just in French class or anything like that. It's like, you know, it can happen to you anywhere. So, uh, no, I didn't really feel like I needed to do that.

INTERVIEWER: What about in Spanish class?

SAM: In Spanish? Yeah, I felt like I couldn't like reveal so much anything like that, because there were a couple girls and everything that were a bit harsher [chuckles].

INTERVIEWER: What did they do that was harsh?

SAM: Uh, they wouldn't do anything. They would just say some things, and, I mean, it was m-, mostly like one particular girl. Um, maybe it was just the way that she grew up or something, but she seemed a bit rude about things like that, like, you know, social class and everything.

INTERVIEWER: She's the one that you, when you dropped out, you were kind of relieved not to be around her anymore?

RESPONDENT: Pretty much, yeah [chuckles].

INTERVIEWER: So in Spanish class, did you feel like you had to hide your social class?

SAM: Um, just the same thing as French. Um, but I would try to wake up like really early and everything, because my Spanish class was early. To make sure that I picked out my clothes really well and that, you know, I dressed okay and everything, but usually for all of my other classes, I just throw anything on, but in Spanish, we were always up in front of the room talking, so, I made sure that I tried to [chuckles] pick out my clothes a bit better.

Compared to her French class, Sam's Spanish learning environment was particularly stressful and required several participation strategies. She woke up early and picked out her clothes carefully so that she wouldn't draw attention to herself while standing in front of the room during activities. She also describes withholding information about herself so as not to endure the harsh comments of her classmate.

As Sam says, she can feel "crappy" about her social class outside of language class too, "it can happen anywhere." The referent is not totally clear in this comment, but I believe Sam is referring to discrimination based on social class background or classism. I interpret her comment to mean that she could be made to feel crappy about her social class in a variety of contexts. While Sam said she didn't feel like she needed to try and "pass" as a different social class in her language classes, she was able to manage her identity with greater ease in the context of her French class.

Summary. Interview data from follow-up interviews with first-generation and WC participants offers insight into how students with a marked social class background manage their identities when participating in class. Identity traits such as religion and ethnicity may intersect with social class background and compound the need for identity management. Strategies for participation include withholding information, modifying information and inventing information. Class context plays an important role in the degree to which students from WC backgrounds or with first-generation status feel stigmatized and called to manage their social class identities.

Chapter Summary

This chapter weaves together the quantitative survey results relating the reported feelings and dispositions to particular class discussion topics for participants from particular social class backgrounds and the qualitative follow-up interview results with first-generation and WC participants. Taking these two data sources together, we are able to see how participants from particular backgrounds manage their feelings and dispositions to discussion topics by employing participation strategies in the foreign language classroom.

With few exceptions, all participant groups reported a desire to feel more comfortable, valued, part of the group, adequate, and heard. Each group's desire varied. First-generation LC participants felt least comfortable and least part of the group. They also reported the greatest desire to feel more comfortable and part of the group.

All first-generation participant groups reported feeling less valued and less adequate than other groups. First-generation WC participants reported the greatest desire to feel more valued while first-generation LC participants reported the greatest desire to feel more adequate. WC

participants with at least one parent who had graduated from college felt the most heard. All MC and UC participant groups reported a high desire to feel more heard.

With regards to the classroom context, first-generation LC participants were the only group to perceive classmates more comfortable than they were. They also perceived their classmates felt more part of the group to the largest degree. In contrast, UC participants perceived they were more comfortable, valued, adequate and part of the group than their classmates to the largest degree. Yet, first-generation WC participants reported feeling more heard than their classmates to the largest degree.

Participants reported feeling comfortable discussing those topics in foreign language class that were also the most frequently discussed (i.e., pastimes/hobbies, vacation experiences, and ideal vacation). Yet, other frequently discussed topics were also those that participants indicated they would be selective about discussing (i.e., living arrangement, aspirations for the future, hometown, and family tree). Topics less frequently discussed, participants reported they wouldn't have the vocabulary to discuss and they would avoid discussing in foreign language class (i.e., parents' living arrangement, parents' pastimes/hobbies, and parents' jobs).

Proportional differences between the seven social class groups with regard to their dispositions to discussing the 12 topics were not statistically significant. However, when grouped by first-generation status, there was a statistically significant difference in the way the two first-generation status groups indicated that they "wouldn't know the vocabulary to express what is true for them" when discussing their family tree.

Interview data with first-generation and WC participants reveal the way particular dispositions to discussion topics were handled with participation strategies. Withholding,

modifying or inventing information were all strategies participants used in the face of dispositions to particular topics to manage their identities and avoid stigmatization.

Chapter 7: How Do Participants from Particular Backgrounds Enrolled in Beginning Italian Courses Perceive Representation in the Textbook?

In this chapter, I will examine the textbook used in beginning Italian at the University of Wisconsin-Madison during Spring 2012. I examine this subgroup in particular because beginning Italian students made up the largest portion of my dataset. Whereas I was able to recruit in person for these courses, I relied on e-mail solicitations for participants enrolled in French and Spanish. This likely explains why participants enrolled in Italian make up the largest group of participants. I also chose to look at this subgroup to address my third research question because these participants all used the same textbook.

To gauge the degree to which the 68 participants enrolled in beginning Italian courses felt their social class identity and socioeconomic status were represented by their textbook, data for this chapter come from two sources: analysis of survey data and document analysis of their textbook *Avanti!* Survey questions address : 1) how frequently the textbook and supplementary materials were used in class, 2) what percentage of the materials and activities used in class reflect and *should reflect* the social class identity and socioeconomic status of participants, classmates, and native speakers. Document analysis will reveal the way activities in *Avanti!* highlight socioeconomic difference and conflate higher socioeconomic status with Italian culture.

Instructional Materials in Beginning Italian

Textbook. Looking at Table 7.1, we see that *Avanti!* was the most frequently used course material by participants enrolled in beginning Italian language courses. Of the 68 participants enrolled at The University of Wisconsin-Madison in beginning Italian courses (i.e., 101, 102,

201) for which *Avanti!* was a required book, 96% report using it very frequently or frequently in the online survey (see Appendix F, Q4.1). Furthermore, we know the textbook was central to the foreign language learning experiences of all participants in beginning Italian language courses because the standard deviation (SD) for this question about textbook use is less than one.

Supplementary materials. Of the course materials supplementary to the textbook, participants enrolled in beginning Italian, 82% report using the online workbook very frequently or frequently. Instructor created handouts were used very frequently or frequently by 71% of participants. Of the 67 respondents, 26% reported using the Video/DVD very frequently or frequently. Respondents reported using the paper workbook, audiolab book, supplementary exercise book and course packets very infrequently, if at all. Standard deviations for materials that supplemented the textbook indicate that their use varied greatly between Italian courses.

Table 7.1

Frequency of Instructional Materials Use by Beginning Italian Students

Instructional material	Very freq.	Frequently	Somewhat frequently	Somewhat infreq.	Infreq.	Very infreq.	Not applicable	Mean	SD
Textbook	59	6	2	0	0	1	0	1.22	.533
Workbook	5	3	1	1	3	3	52	6.10	3.586
Online wb	47	9	3	1	4	3	1	1.81	2.396
Audio lab*	5	5	4	2	4	6	41	5.56	4.728
Video/DVD*	3	15	20	8	6	4	11	3.76	3.586
Sup. book*	1	2	1	0	4	5	54	6.41	2.216
Course pac*	4	5	6	2	2	6	42	2.00	4.634
Instructor-created handouts	29	19	10	2	4	2	2	7.00	2.413

Note. N = 68; * = 67 responses

Avanti!, the textbook used by the 68 participants enrolled in beginning Italian contains, 16 chapters. Students enrolled in Italian 101 covered chapters 1-8 and those enrolled in 102 covered chapters 9-16. Students enrolled in the intensive 201 course covered all 16 chapters. Table 7.2 indicates the beginning Italian courses in which the 68 participants were enrolled and identifies the enrollment of follow-up interviewees by their pseudonyms.

Table 7.2

Enrollment Breakdown for Participants in Beginning Italian Courses and Follow-up Interviews

Course	Participant enrollment	Follow-up interviews	Pseudonyms of follow-up interviewees
Italian 101	24 (35%)	3 (4%)	Cameron, Harold, Michele
Italian 102	28 (41%)	4 (6%)	Carrie Ann, Melissa, Santino, Sofia
Italian 201	16 (24%)	2 (3%)	Katniss, Sophie
Total	68 (100%)	9 (13%)	

Summary. This analysis shows that the textbook is central to the beginning Italian language course curriculum. Of the 68 participants, nine gave follow-up interviews. These nine participants were not disproportionately representative of any one course. In the following section, I will turn a critical eye on *Avanti!* and evaluate it for the ways it highlights socioeconomic difference and/or equates Italian culture with middle class values or higher socioeconomic status. This textbook represents just one of many beginning Italian textbooks on the market and should not be understood as indicative of all beginning Italian textbooks.

Document Analysis of the Beginning Italian Textbook, *Avanti!*

Avanti! chapters were organized by themes. Each chapter contained four sections: Communication Strategies, Vocabulary, Grammar, and Culture. Table 7.3 reproduces the theme and vocabulary listed in the table of contents for each chapter.

Table 7.3

Chapter Themes and Vocabulary for Avanti!

Chapter	Theme	Vocabulary
1	<i>Per cominciare</i>	Alphabet and pronunciation, months and seasons, Numbers
2	<i>Com'è?</i>	Describing people, places, things
3	<i>Cosa ti piace fare?</i>	Talking about your daily activities
4	<i>Che bella famiglia?</i>	Talking about your family
5	<i>A tavola!</i>	Restaurant terms and items on an Italian menu
6	<i>I vestiti e la moda</i>	Describing your clothes
7	<i>Cosa hai fatto questo weekend?</i>	Talking about your weekend activities
8	<i>Che bella festa!</i>	Talking about Italian and American holiday Celebrations
9	<i>La scuola e i giovani</i>	Talking about education and professions
10	<i>La vita e il benessere</i>	Activities, hobbies and well-being
11	<i>Casa dolce casa</i>	Describing Italian houses and furniture
12	<i>In città</i>	Talking about Italian cities and towns
13	<i>Andiamo in ferie!</i>	Talking about vacations
14	<i>Chi sono gli italiani?</i>	Talking about Italian society today
15	<i>Quali lingue parli?</i>	The languages of Italy
16	<i>Sono famosi</i>	Talking about historical people and events

Note. Reproduced from Aski & Musumeci (2010, pp. vi-xvi)

Looking at the chapter themes for the first half of the textbook, participants enrolled in Italian 101 were required to describe themselves, their families, their activities, eating out, weekend plans, clothing, and holiday traditions. These topics all center around the students' lives. In the second half of the textbook (covered in second semester Italian, i.e., 102), the focus shifts slightly to Italian cities and towns, languages spoken in Italy, Italian society and historical figures, however several chapters are still focused on the student. They are chapters 9, 10, and 13 which present professions, hobbies, and vacations, respectively. In the sections that follow, I will critically evaluate the socioeconomic messages of this textbook.

Introductory chapters. On the third page of the textbook formal and informal greetings are presented. Students are taught to use professional titles when greeting professors, lawyers, and doctors. This is both culturally appropriate and indicative of the emphasis placed on social status in Italian culture.

On page sixteen, students are familiarized with café culture including the difference between *il bar*, *un pub*, *un discopub* and *un American bar*. A price list of items offered at a typical bar is included so students may complete an activity about ordering (Aski & Musumeci, 2010, p. 18). Again, this is culturally appropriate. Since *il bar* is ubiquitous in Italian cities, it is very useful to know about what is served and how to order. However, it is also the first explicit instruction about Italian culture and conveys the implicit message that if you want to participate in this culture, you must learn how to spend money eating out.

The first drawings of adults feature two activities: sightseeing and shopping. In the first picture, a man is standing in front of the Coliseum wearing a backpack, holding up a camera, and exclaiming: "I like Italy!" (p. 20). In the second picture, a woman is shopping, seated with many pairs of shoes around her and the dialogue bubble proclaims: "I like shoes!" (p. 20). Figure 4

reproduces how sightseeing and shopping are used to illustrate the verb *piacere* (to like, to be pleasing to). Within the first twenty pages, *Avanti!* implies that people who study Italian will travel, shop, and eat out.

Figure 4.



Note. McGraw Hill Education

Self-description. Chapters 2 and 3 teach adjectives, basic school-related vocabulary and leisure activities. Eight basic adjective pairs are illustrated: happy/sad, strong/weak, active/lazy, fast/slow, young/old, tall/short, fat/thin, and rich/poor (Aski & Musumeci, 2010, pp. 36-37). Rather than use a fat person to illustrate *grasso* (fat), the authors choose to use a pig. However, they were not as sensitive when depicting *povero* (poor). The word is illustrated using a man wearing ragged clothing and pulling out his pockets, presumably to show he has no money (p. 37). In contrast, *ricco* (rich) is illustrated by a smartly dressed man sipping champagne as he leans against his red sports car with a yacht docked behind him (p.37).

Possessions. On page forty-three, an activity asks students to select three school supplies from two tables and add up the total cost. These school supplies include notebooks, pens,

calculators, backpacks, computers, stereos and bikes. Each table has the same items with different prices attached to them. For example, one table has a computer with a price tag of 1,252€ while the other is priced at 1,349€. Students are asked to indicate to their partners the three items they would like. Next, they are to total up the expenditure and compare how much each person spent.

Though many people do see stereos, bikes, and computers as essential school equipment, they are frequently frustratingly out of reach for students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. As a pilot study participant, Kay shared, “I did not have a computer and ...before I came here, that was a huge issue, like, everyone at college is going to have a laptop and I don’t have one...so I made it a point to live in a dorm that had a computer lab in the bottom...” Presenting computers, stereos, and bikes as “school supplies” belies a privileged point of view.

On page 52, students are asked to indicate which items they possess: a car, a bike, a serious boyfriend/girlfriend, a favorite TV program or radio program (Aski & Musumeci, 2010). Asking a student whether he owns a car will highlight his socioeconomic standing.

Activities/weekend plans. On page 68, a pair of twins are presented. Salvatore is a student who has a lot of friends, a girlfriend, and likes sports. His brother, Riccardo, is not a student, but a waiter at a pizzeria. He likes books and music. By using twins, the authors set up a false dichotomy between going to school and working. Salvatore is depicted in the company of his girlfriend, chatting on the phone and exercising. Riccardo is a working class person. In contrast to Salvatore, he is depicted taking part in activities alone like going to the movies or listening to music and unhappily cleaning at the pizzeria (pp. 68-69). The textbook’s implicit message is that students are happy with active social and romantic lives while workers are unhappy and lonely.

woodworking, hunting, playing football, baseball, bowling, playing pool, knitting, and hiking are common sports and pastimes that require fewer resources.

Eating out/manners. A full nine pages are dedicated to eating out and learning how to order at restaurants (Aski & Musumeci, 2010, pp.125-133). One of the culminating activities of this chapter includes a lecture on Italian table manners. The instructor's edition suggests teachers elicit information about what students were taught regarding table manners. There is a drawing of eight people seated around a dinner table where each person is committing a *faux pas* (p. 148). It is titled: "What rude people!" Students are instructed to explain why each person in Figure 6 is being rude to their classmates.

Figure 6.



Note. McGraw Hill Education

Setting aside the fact that eating out is an activity reserved for those with disposable income, the explicit instruction about how to behave at the dinner table is the most overtly classist content in the book. Table manners differ between the US and Italy. For example, my grandmother taught me to keep one hand in my lap as I ate, but Italy it is important to keep both hands visible. In this activity, dressing up, and sitting down at the table to eat with good manners is presented as synonymous with Italian culture. In fact, these are practices specific to one's social class both in the US and in Italy.

Fashion/clothes shopping. Several pages are dedicated to clothing, fashion and personal style. The instructor's textbook includes the suggestion that students secretly select a classmate and describe what they are wearing (p. 158). As described in previous chapters, clothing is one of the primary ways students draw conclusions about social class. In chapter 6, I quoted Sam who was particularly conscious about what she wore in language class because she knew extra attention could be paid to what she happened to be wearing in classroom activities. In this way, calling attention to clothing also calls attention to fellow students' social status.

Professions. Chapter 9 includes a list of jobs that tend toward the professional: artist, architect, dentist, social worker, scientist, waiter, pharmacist, veterinarian, psychologist, police man, photographer, teacher, journalist, lawyer, sales clerk, engineer, construction worker, nurse, director, elementary school teacher, professor, doctor, stylist, hair dresser, office employee (Aski & Musumeci, 2010, pp. 242-3). Of the 25 occupations listed, 17 require a degree and 12 require an advanced degree.

Ideal home. This textbook puts a nice twist on the standard "design your dream home" exercise by imposing "financial" constraints. Students are instructed to design a custom home by choosing from a list of rooms and luxuries. Each choice has been assigned a value and partners are only allowed to "spend" 25 points (p. 314). In this way, they must reach consensus on how to spend their points. The most "expensive" item is a swimming pool for seven points. Students may choose from a small kitchen (2 points) or a large kitchen (4 points). A dishwasher is valued at 4 points. Bathroom accommodations are offered as follows: toilet with sink (2 points), with a shower (3 points) and with a whirlpool (4 points). In this way, students are forced to wrestle with an economic reality whether or not it reflects the constraints of their actual lives.

Hometown. Chapter 12 asks students to compare the merits and drawbacks of the city and the country. One exercise in particular concentrates on students' hometowns. It asks students to describe why their hometown was interesting from the point of view of a child (p. 321). Another exercise asks students to compare the quality of life in the city versus the country (p. 326). As discussed above, students' hometowns frequently indicate their socioeconomic standing to others.

Vacationing. An entire chapter is dedicated to vacations: imagined (with your best friend or classmates) and future summer vacation plans. The first activity asks students to make selections from a variety of destinations, travel seasons (high/low), accommodations, excursions, and total the cost of their selections. Students then compare their choices (Aski & Musumeci, 2010, p. 349-350). While there are no budget restrictions like the ideal home exercise above, by comparing travel plans students have to acknowledge that some choices are more expensive than others. This chapter also teaches the conditional, so at a certain point, discussion about vacationing shifts from the near future (p. 353) to an aspirational tense (p. 354-358). In the final chapter of the book, a review exercise requests that students invent and describe a vacation they took with their classmates using the past tense (p. 437).

Societal problems. Chapter 14 addresses Italian society and its struggles, like immigration, emigration, violence, poverty, drugs, divorce, hunger, racism, strikes, and taxes. The north and the south of Italy are compared in terms of the relative rates of unemployment. Southern Italy is named as more agriculturally based and therefore poor; whereas northern Italy is the seat of industry and therefore prosperous (p. 377). Drug use, delinquency, and the inability of youth to find work are all addressed. In this same chapter, an exercise invites the class to rent a villa together in Tuscany and make a list of house rules (p. 396). Similarly, the chapter

addressing professions culminates in an exercise wherein students are asked to describe an imaginary society or earthly paradise. The prompts encourage students to comment on the position of women, men, students, elders, children, rich, and poor (p.265). Such an exercise has the potential to be extremely uncomfortable for someone with low-income background.

Imaginary worlds and truth. Most exercises contained in this book use pretend situations to ground the language practice and create common ground with classmates. However, the final chapter includes a section entitled “My truth” which asks students to complete sentences in a way that is true for them (Aski & Musumeci, 2010, p. 436). They include: “I was born in...” and “The last time I went on vacation, I enjoyed...” and “I was raised in a house...” All of these questions have socioeconomic implications. First, as previously explored, hometowns indicate socioeconomic standing to classmates. Second, the book assumes students were raised in houses and that they have been on vacations.

Summary. Subtle, implicit messages about social class are communicated in many exercises provided by the textbook. Activities call attention to students’ socioeconomic status by highlighting differences in classmates’ clothing and hometown. Frequently a (upper) middle class world view (i.e., manners, “basic” school supplies, professional aspirations, travel assumptions) and higher socioeconomic status activities (i.e., vacations, eating out, shopping) are conflated with Italian culture. Yet, stratification and societal problems in Italy are also acknowledged and some activities do impose “economic” constraints. It should be noted that while *Avanti* is used in beginning Italian classes at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, its contents are not necessarily typical of other beginning Italian language textbooks.

In the section that follows, I will examine how well participants feel their social class identity and socioeconomic status are represented in the materials and activities as well as how

much they feel their classmates and native speakers of Italian are represented. I will also examine how well participants feel their social class identity and socioeconomic status *should be* represented in the materials and activities as well as that of their classmates and native speakers of Italian.

Representation of Social Class Identity and Socioeconomic Status

In the online survey, several questions elicited how much the social class identity and socioeconomic status of participants, classmates, and native speakers were represented and *should be* represented in the materials and activities of the language courses. By selecting a percentage ranging in ten percent increments from ‘none of the materials’ (0%) to ‘all of the materials’ (100%), participants enrolled in beginning Italian courses indicated both the actual representation of social class identity and socioeconomic status and what it *should be* (see Appendix F, Q4.7-4.8, 4.10-4.11, 4.13-4.14).

In short, the results from survey questions show that participants indicated that their social class identity and socioeconomic status as well as that of classmates and native speakers were represented in the textbook and instructional materials in wildly different amounts. For example, some indicated their social class identity and socioeconomic status were represented in all the instructional materials of beginning Italian, while others indicated their social class identity and socioeconomic status were represented in none of the materials. (Frequency results from these six survey questions may be reviewed in Tables 7.4-7.9 found in Appendix H.)

I expected that social class background would explain the discrepancies between participants’ reported representation of social class identity and socioeconomic status in the materials and activities in beginning Italian courses. However, the statistical tests I performed

using the seven social class background groups I identified did not show any significant difference in the way participants in these groups answered online survey questions relating the actual representation of social class identity and socioeconomic status for participants, classmates, and native speakers or what respondents indicated it *should be*.

Relationship between first-generation status and reported representation. In order to account for the discrepancies in responses to these survey questions, I compared the responses of first-generation and participants without first generation status. The ratio of participants with first-generation status enrolled in beginning Italian ($n = 68$) reflects the ratio for all participants ($N = 101$). That is, first-generation participants make up between 25-30% of each group (see Table 7.10). In other words, first-generation participants are not overly represented in the beginning Italian subgroup as compared to all participants.

Table 7.10

Ratio of First-generation Participants in Full Group and Italian Group

Participants	Full group		Italian students	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Not first gen	71	70%	51	75%
First gen	30	30%	17	25%
Total	101	100%	68	100%

Significant difference in responses by first-generation groups. The responses to these survey questions differed by first-generation status in one respect. The amount participants reported native speakers' socioeconomic status was actually represented in the materials and activities of beginning Italian differed by first-generation status (see Table 7.11). There were no significant differences in participants' indication of ideal representation in materials and activities of beginning Italian (see Table 7.12).

Table 7.11

Chi-square Test for Actual Representation of First-generation and Not First-generation.

Survey question	Actual representation in materials and activities	Chi-square	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
4.7	Participant social class	7.47	9	.59
4.7	Participant socioeconomic status	11.24	10	.38
4.10	Classmate social class	11.08	8	.20
4.10	Classmate socioeconomic status	12.02	10	.28
4.13	Native speaker social class	14.06	11	.23
4.13	Native speaker socioeconomic status	21.17	11	.032*

Note. First gen ($n = 17$); Not first gen ($n = 51$); $p^* < .05$

Table 7.12

Chi-square Test for Ideal Representation of First-generation and Not First-generation.

Survey				
question	Ideal representation in materials and activities	Chi-square	df	p
4.8	Participant social class	12.82	9	.17
4.8	Participant socioeconomic status	16.29	11	.13
4.11	Classmate social class	10.84	10	.37
4.11	Classmate socioeconomic status	10.73	11	.47
4.14	Native speaker social class	9.41	10	.49
4.14	Native speaker socioeconomic status	14.32	11	.22

Note. First gen ($n = 17$); Not first gen ($n = 51$); $p^* < .05$

Summary. Statistical analysis was performed to determine whether participant responses about how much the social class identity and socioeconomic status of participants, classmates, and native speakers were actually and ideally represented in materials and activities of beginning Italian. Results showed that the amount participants reported the socioeconomic status of native speakers was represented by the materials and activities in beginning Italian differed by first-

generation status: $\chi^2(11, N = 68) = 21.17, p = .023$. In the final section of this chapter, I will present interview data that gives insight into the relationship between social class background of first generation and working class participants and the amount they feel their social class identity and socioeconomic status is and should be represented in the textbook and activities.

Insights from First-Generation and Working Class Participants

In this section, I will draw from the data of the nine participants enrolled in beginning Italian courses: Cameron, Carrie Ann, Harold, Katniss, Melissa, Michelle, Santino, Sofia, Sophie. Below I will share these participants' reactions to the textbook and activities in order to better contextualize textbook analysis and the survey results relating representation of social class identity and socioeconomic status in the textbook presented above.

As I reported in chapter 6, Carrie Ann observed, "I feel like Italian culture is much more like sophisticated. It appears as like a higher class and so you want to like fit in to the higher class." Indeed, within the first twenty pages of *Avanti!* uses traveling, shopping, and eating out to contextualize learning Italian.

Conflicting values. One of the main underlying assumptions of the textbook is that students studying Italian have travelled or aspire to travel. This is conveyed by the numerous activities that ask students to imagine and plan trips as well as the entire chapter dedicated to vacations. According to Santino, it was difficult to relate to the situations in *Avanti!* because, "I've never been to Italy and most of it was about being in Italy." Such focus on travel can conflict with the experiences, values, and aspirations of first-generation and working class students.

As Harold explains, in his family, “we don’t really have vacations so much as we have breaks.” His family has a “park-model trailer in Door County...where the not-wealthy people go to vacation, because as soon as you get further north, you get higher class, basically.” He says, “Every once in a while we go there.” Given that his family owns a place specifically intended for “breaks,” as he says, I asked him whether he mentioned his family’s trailer up north when the class discussed vacations:

HAROLD: I always just made up a vacation, like, oh, we went to Italy, or we went to France, and just—I just, for me, vacation was always kind of something blah. I don’t know why but even the idea of saving up money to go somewhere, as much as I want to go somewhere, it always feels like you’re paying for the experience, and for me,...everything’s an investment, like, can I get money back on the investment? It’s so weird. Like, why go here when you could buy a bike that could get you places?

...I don’t want to sound materialistic, but I like to have something that I can hold. Like why go out to eat when you have plenty of food in and you can use that money to buy a book?

...I’m trying to get over that because I really want to go somewhere and I’m going to have to, because it’s not cheap. But—that for me, we were never a huge vacation family. We did go to Disney World when I was in fifth grade. That was cool at that time, but...we’re not a vacationing family.

Harold's struggle with the idea of investing in a travel experience contrasts with the foreign language classroom learning environment where vacationing as well as dining out and shopping are all presented as things of value, experiences students are assumed to know, care about and aspire to. In order to participate in the narrative of the classroom, Harold chooses to

make up a vacation rather than describe his experience on “breaks” with his family at their park-model trailer in Door County.

Lack of representation. In addition to vacationing, other activities presented as normal or usual by the textbook seemed foreign or odd to the working class/first generation students I interviewed. For Michelle, the book’s suggestion of skiing as a weekend activity was odd:

INTERVIEWER: What about some of the activities that are described in different chapters, is there anything that stands out as being really odd to you or unfamiliar?

MICHELLE: I think in one of the first chapters it said I go skiing. I thought that was funny.

INTERVIEWER: Why?

MICHELLE: Most people don’t just go skiing on the weekends. It’s kind of like a every-once-in-awhile kind of thing instead of an every-weekend thing.

INTERVIEWER: Have you ever been skiing?

MICHELLE: Yeah. I’ve been skiing once, so . . . It’s like, yes, I have been skiing but I don’t go skiing all the time—

Michelle is familiar with the activity, but the idea of going skiing every weekend is beyond her horizon of possibility. While the book presented specialized activities like skiing, golfing and horseback riding, it neglects other specialized activities that might be a part of the life experience of just as few students. Below, Michelle explains whether the book contained vocabulary that was relevant to her life:

INTERVIEWER: Could you find the vocabulary to describe your own life in your book?

MICHELLE: In the book, yeah. Uh, I guess some of it, not really, but I, if I, if it was like really simple I could. Like I wake up in the morning and I wash my face—I think that’s in there.

INTERVIEWER: But when you said like “some of it, not really,” what were you thinking of then?

MICHELLE: Well, I mean, like, I don’t know how to say next weekend I’m going to drill or something like that.

‘Drill’ refers to the military training Michelle must complete regularly as a member of ROTC. For Michelle, it is much more realistic to drill every weekend than go skiing.

Other participants also reported the book’s vocabulary was inadequate to describe their lives and that of their families.

INTERVIEWER: Could you describe, did you find the vocab to describe your parents’ hobbies?

MELISSA: Not, not the ones that I would like to.

INTERVIEWER: Like what? Can you tell me?

MELISSA: Um, I don’t think I could have found like, I know fishing isn’t in there, which would be something my dad would like to do. And I know crocheting isn’t in there, so, it’s not the basic ones. Like you could find golfing or going for a walk or watching TV.

As Melissa explains, golfing is listed among the “basic” activities like watching TV and walking while the two activities she “would have liked to” use to describe her parents were not included.

Carrie Ann also expressed that she would have liked to know words that related to her agricultural work:

INTERVIEWER: Could you find the words to describe yourself, like your interests and your hobbies?

CARRIE ANN: I mean, there, every once in a while there's like a verb that you don't know just because like you haven't gotten there yet, but, I mean, you can always look it up. Um, uh, I think I guess because I have such a big agricultural background, like there wasn't a lot of that in here. But, um, it's not like, I don't know, like there's many other ways to describe me than that, so I guess—I didn't really—

INTERVIEWER: So you just picked other words.

CARRIE ANN: Yeah.

INTERVIEWER: But what were some of the words that you might want to have known?

CARRIE ANN: Um, it's just like, um, like a farm, like I would just look that up. Um, some of the animal names, um, some, some of the more common, I guess, food names weren't really in here. Um—

INTERVIEWER: Like what? What are you thinking of?

CARRIE ANN: Um, like carrot, or no, carrots was in there. Like cabbage or like, I don't even know if apple was in here. Um, and kind of just like, I guess common for this area.

When students aren't able to find the precise vocabulary to describe their lives, they must employ one of the participation strategies described above. In Carrie Ann's case, she cherry-picked from her life experience and described herself in ways that didn't have to do with agriculture. Asking for specific vocabulary words may highlight difference or life experience unlike that represented in the textbook and expected in class.

Highlighting Socioeconomic Difference.

Asking for missing vocabulary. As the data show above, particular details like parents' work can indicate communicate social class background and socioeconomic status. When particular words are not presented in the book, students may ask for the vocabulary which further draws attention to it:

INTERVIEWER: Um, what about the words to describe your family members' jobs?

CARRIE ANN: I had to ask for my dad because he's a farmer, but, um, I guess . . . I don't know if my mom's job would be in it. Um, but I think it would, I just used like businessperson.

When the vocabulary needed is missing, students may ask for it or employ strategies like avoiding, modifying, or inventing to participate in class in a way that does not call attention to social class background or socioeconomic status. For example, Harold couldn't find the exact vocabulary to describe his parents' work, but chose not to ask for it:

INTERVIEWER: So could you find the vocabulary to describe your family members' jobs?

HAROLD: No.

INTERVIEWER: What'd you do when you had to talk about that?

HAROLD: I . . . [sighs]. What did I do? I know, like my mom's a teacher's aide, so I just said teacher for that. Uh, for my dad, I don't remember . . . I tended to either fudge the details or work around that, like say, I don't know how to say what my dad does. Well, I'm like, I know how to say what my uncle does, so I'll just say that my dad does what my uncle does—sort of thing.

Asking for a word in order to participate, can call additional attention to social class background and socioeconomic status. For those whose parents' positions were on the book's vocabulary list, there are no obstacles to participation.

Contrasting experiences. Michelle indicates that she noted when her classmates typical weekend activities deviated from her own:

INTERVIEWER: So for weekend activities, what kind of things did you share with the class?

MICHELLE: I usually said I studied. Because that's typically how I spend the weekend. And then I probably say like sleep or eat or something, because I can remember those words. They were easier.

INTERVIEWER: So those things were true for you. If you could remember other words, what other kinds of things might you have shared?

MICHELLE: Um, I can remember how to say read. And paint.

INTERVIEWER: Do you paint?

MICHELLE: Uh, well, I draw, so. It was the closest thing to it.

INTERVIEWER: Do you remember your classmates sharing anything about their weekends? You said that they traveled a lot. Anything else?

MICHELLE: They liked to say they went like to so-and-so's house or sometimes they'd go to restaurants. Um, otherwise they typically said study or sleep or eat.

INTERVIEWER: Mm-hum, like you. Did you ever go to restaurants and things like that?

RESPONDENT: No, no.

Michelle notes that her classmates are able to contribute to the textbook narrative about eating out while she is not. Similarly, Cameron describes how one student's travel experiences really stood out in class:

CAMERON: I feel like most middle-class people don't have like the extra money to like go travel, like a big trip or, you know what I mean, like most people can't afford that— So, the stuff about traveling, there was one kid in my class who was clearly like really wealthy, so—I was like, oh, my gosh, this kid is like in the upper-upper class, but the rest of us were all pretty much in the middle class. We were all like, oh, my goodness.

INTERVIEWER: So he was describing like big trips.

CAMERON: Right, like massive, like two-month, like I went here, here, here and here...

While Cameron couldn't identify with taking such big trips, hearing about classmates travel experiences had a different effect on Sophie who had traveled a bit and was a little older than her classmates: "I need to go travel again and, and go to Italy and maybe in some way I felt down about the fact that some of my classmates had been and I hadn't." Each of these participants noted the differences between their life experiences and their classmates and recognized the socioeconomic implications.

Pride in social class background. One participant shared that although she recognized in-class activities tended to highlight social class differences, she felt alright about sharing:

SOFIA: I felt like nobody really talked about it or acknowledged what social class you come from. But I think that there was like some activities probably where we had to describe what our parents did for jobs. And I thought of like, oh, describe your house, or even describe like your, your dream house or like your future, and I felt like that kind of

had, would obviously stem from, it would change depending on where your social class was, so. In a couple of those activities I felt like, oh, okay, maybe somebody's recognizing my social class, or, oh, okay, their parents do this, they must be from that social class.

INTERVIEWER: Can you remember sharing your parents' jobs and stuff?

SOFIA: Yes. Yeah, we did that. Mm-hum.

INTERVIEWER: And how did that feel?

SOFIA: I didn't mind it at all. I don't, no, I, well, I'm like from just an average like working-class family, but it never bothers me to talk about it or anything like that. I don't know if anybody else is bothered by it, like embarrassed or nervous to talk about their situations, but at least I wasn't, and the people that I was talking to didn't seem to be nervous.

INTERVIEWER: Could you find the names of our parents' jobs in the book, like vocabulary-wise?

SOFIA: Yes, because my dad's an engineer—so, that one was pretty easy. And my mom's a secretary, so that was, oh, actually, I probably just picked those out because they were like the most, the secretary just seemed to like describe what my mom did the most, so I probably picked that word because I saw it. But I know some students were asking, um, I don't remember any in particular, but, oh, how do you say this, because it wasn't like a common word. But I just remember a few students asking, like their parents were something specific and they had to ask.

Sofia confirms that in her beginning Italian classes (101, 102), she was asked to share details that she knew would highlight her background that of her classmates. While she was comfortable

sharing and had no issue finding the vocabulary to describe her parents' jobs, for example, she also recognized that it might feel uncomfortable for others and that some of her classmates' needed to ask for specific vocabulary.

Chapter Summary

Analysis of survey questions addressing the textbook included those enrolled in beginning Italian courses ($n = 68$) who were all exposed to *Avanti!*, the textbook central to their courses. Document analysis of *Avanti!* revealed a middle class world view of professional aspirations, assumptions about travel experiences, eating out, and table manners. Activities frequently highlighted socioeconomic difference by calling on students to share information about their parents' jobs, travel experiences, and hometowns. Vacationing, eating out, and shopping were all used to contextualize learning so that Italian culture becomes conflated with these classed activities.

There is no confirmed relationship between participants' social class background and the amount they report their, their classmates' or native speakers' social class identity and socioeconomic status is represented or should be represented in beginning Italian materials and activities. Further analysis of these questions by first-generation status showed that there was one statistically significant relationship between first generation status and the amount participants reported the socioeconomic status of native speakers was represented by the materials and activities in beginning Italian.

The prominent focus on vacationing/travel in *Avanti!* results in a value conflict for some working class/first-generation students. Lack of representation in the book pushes students to employ participation strategies in order to participate in the classroom narrative about parents'

jobs and activities. Asking for missing vocabulary highlights social class background for students whose parents' jobs are not listed. Though the effect of the textbook's middle class orientation is not always negative, participants recognize the way sharing information prompted by the book's activities reveals something about their social class background/socioeconomic status.

Chapter 8: Discussion of Implications, Limitations, and Future Research

Project Summary

This is the first study in the field of SLA to examine learner social class identity and foreign language learning in the *classroom* within a US context. I sought to understand whether and how the a middle class world view I perceived in the foreign language curriculum coupled with approaches to language teaching that place emphasis on speaking about one's self (i.e., Communicative Language Teaching) impacted learners from different social class backgrounds. Given the social class-based divisions between *Coasties* and *Sconnies*, the University of Wisconsin-Madison campus offered a rich context in which to test my observations about the impact of class-bias in the foreign language classroom.

The present study grew out of preliminary interviews with the Working Class Student Union (WCSU) whose stated mission is to advocate for first-generation college students and working class students (2014). Participants' social class was operationalized by two questions eliciting social class background and first-generation status in the online survey which provided the basis of the seven groups used to analyze the quantitative data (see Appendix F, Q6.15 & 6.25). Data were also analyzed by comparing two groups of participants with and without first generation status. Participants who were the first in their families to attend college and/or indicated being raised in a working class family were invited for follow-up interviews which were transcribed and coded in two phases.

My first research question asked how socioeconomic difference was recognized and highlighted in the foreign language classroom. Next, I asked how this emphasis on socioeconomic difference affected participants' emotions and their dispositions to discussing 12 topics in the target language. Finally, I examined one textbook to see whether it communicated

classist messages and asked participants to evaluate how representative of social class identity and socioeconomic status they felt it to be. Below I will revisit each research question and assess what I was able to answer with these data and what remains unclear. I will also theorize the salient points and indicate which lines of inquiry would be fruitful for future research.

RQ1: How is Socioeconomic Difference Recognized and Highlighted in the Foreign Language Learning Environment?

In chapter 5, I explored how *socioeconomic difference* was communicated on campus at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and in the foreign language classroom. To interrogate socioeconomic difference, I operationalized three terms: *social status*, *social class*, and *socioeconomic status*.

Determining campus social status. Initial questions about *social status* on campus were open and undefined, but I expected participants to use stratification terminology of the wider world to define it (i.e., lower, working, middle, upper class). Instead, I found that only 24% of participants used social class and socioeconomic-related descriptors to describe social status on-campus. Indeed, 30% of participants did not feel social status was even a “thing” on campus, citing it as a “non-issue,” a “diverse” or “welcoming” campus. A similar proportion (29%) understood campus social status in terms of student status (i.e., grad/undergrad, professor/student), activities, socializing, and major. Thus, this open-ended question about social status on campus revealed the majority of participants saw the UW-campus community as a

closed system where social stratification related to internal campus-related measures and social status labels from the outside world were not applicable.

Recognizing social class in the classroom. Yet, when asked to choose the *social class* of their foreign language classmates, the majority of participants (79%) believed them to be middle class (see Table 5.3). While a portion of participants (20%) wrote that they came to this conclusion based on an assumption, the remainder named specific indicators of socioeconomic difference that indicated one's social class identity: self-presentation/demeanor/interaction, clothing/possessions, student status, hometown, family details, travel experience, and financial assistance/work status.

Noticing socioeconomic status. Based on my own experience as a language teacher and my review of the literature, I worked from the assumption that the indicators of socioeconomic difference are highlighted by the foreign language curriculum through activities and prompts. Therefore, I wished to find out whether there was a relationship between demographic variables that indicate socioeconomic difference (i.e., parental educational attainment, family income, and the number of hours worked on and off campus) and how much participants from particular social class backgrounds felt their *socioeconomic status* was noticed in class by classmates and instructors. To understand this relationship, I broke the participants up into seven groups based on their first-generation status and the social class identity of the family in which they were raised. I found that the amount of parental educational attainment, reported family income, and number of hours worked on and off campus *did* have an effect on how much participants reported their socioeconomic status was noticed by classmates and instructors,

though the strength and direction of these correlations varied in each of the seven social class groups.

Summary. These data suggest that parental educational attainment, family income, and work commitments are highlighted by the foreign language classroom in a way that draws attention to participants' socioeconomic difference. Follow-up interviews with first-generation and working class participants corroborate that socioeconomic difference is signaled by hometown or regional provenance, students' work status or particular positions held by their parents, leisure activities like travel experience, relative age, and relative amount of financial assistance. Considering these data sources together, we see how, for example, parental education relates to the kind of job a student shares while participating in a class activity, and therefore how much the participant reports his socioeconomic status is noticed.

The data presented in Chapter 5 adequately addresses the way socioeconomic difference is recognized and highlighted in the foreign language learning environment. Data show how social status is understood on the UW-Madison campus and indicators of social status on campus. We also know that within the foreign language classroom participants draw conclusions about one another's social class identity based on particular signifiers (i.e., self-presentation/demeanor/interaction, clothing/possessions, student status, hometown, family details, travel experience, and financial assistance/work status).

Data also show a correlation between the amount participants from particular social class groups report others notice their socioeconomic status and socioeconomic difference variables. This suggests that parental educational attainment, family income, and the number of hours worked on and off-campus are directly or indirectly made apparent by classroom activities.

Interviews with first-generation and working class participants confirm that socioeconomic difference is highlighted by classroom activities which enact a semiotic process of identification in which one determines how one is similar to or different from a fellow classmate within a particular learning context (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004).

RQ2: What are Participants from Particular Backgrounds' Feelings, Dispositions to Discussion Topics, and Participation Strategies in the Foreign Language Learning Environment?

To determine the impact of highlighting socioeconomic difference in the foreign language classroom, I measured how comfortable, valued, part of the group, adequate, and heard participants reported feeling in the classroom according to their social class background. I also gauged participants' dispositions to 12 discussion topics that can highlight socioeconomic difference. Finally, I identified how participants employed participation strategies to manage their identities and avoid stigma.

Feeling in the classroom. With regards to participants' feelings in the classroom, certain patterns of note emerged based on social class identity and first-generation status. For example, all first-generation participant groups reported feeling less valued and less adequate than other groups. All MC and UC participants' mean responses were similarly high with regards to their desire to feel more heard.

Responses by LC participants and UC participants (excluding the one UC first – generation participant), revealed opposing classroom experiences. While all participant groups reported a greater desire to feel more comfortable, valued, part of the group, adequate, and heard, LC participants reported the greatest desire to feel more comfortable, part of the group, and more adequate. In fact, LC participants were the only group to perceive classmates were more

comfortable than they were. They also perceived their classmates felt more part of the group to the largest degree of all seven groups. In contrast, UC participants perceived their classmates were less apart of the group to the largest degree. UC participants also perceived they were more comfortable, valued, and adequate than their classmates to the largest degree of all seven groups.

While the classroom experience of LC participants clearly contrasts with the experience of UC participants, the reported feelings of WC participant groups is conflicted. WC participants with at least one parent who had graduated from college indicated their voices were most heard of all seven groups and first-generation WC participants reported feeling more heard than their classmates to the largest degree of all seven groups. But, first-generation WC participants also reported the greatest desire to feel more valued.

Lack of classroom context. These data point to divergent experiences of LC and UC participants and a similar experience of being heard for WC participants. However, measuring the feelings of all participants in aggregate does not account for their classroom context and the socially constructed, context-dependent nature of identity (Norton, 2000). Unfortunately, due to low participation rates, I was unable to perform this analysis within each section of French, Italian, and Spanish. Had I been able to, we would have been able to see the distribution of social class backgrounds among participants in each classroom and gauge their reported feelings within the context of the social structure in each classroom.

Dispositions to discussion topics. Given the reported feelings of LC, WC, MC, and UC participants with and without first-generation status, I wondered what these groups' dispositions to discussing topics that implicate socioeconomic difference in class activities. First, I asked how frequently these 12 topics were discussed in class and then I asked participants to indicate their disposition to discussing them as any of the following: comfortable, selective, lack the

vocabulary, avoidant. I expected there would be statistically significant proportional differences between social class/first-generation groups with regard to dispositions about discussing topics that highlight socioeconomic difference, especially those related to family.

Relationship between discussion frequency and comfort level. The most basic conclusion I draw from these data is that the topics more frequently discussed in class (i.e., pastimes/hobbies, vacation experiences, and ideal vacation), participants also felt most comfortable discussing and the topics least frequently discussed (i.e., parents' living arrangement, parents' pastimes and hobbies, and parents' jobs), participants reported feeling least comfortable and would avoid discussing. This is logical. The more experience one has discussing a topic in a foreign language, the more comfortable one feels doing so.

Participants avoid topics they lack the vocabulary to discuss. Additionally, participants reported they would avoid discussing topics they did not have the vocabulary to express what is "true for them" (i.e., all topics related to parents and family tree, see Table 6.7). I found a statistically significant difference in the way the two first-generation status groups indicated that they "wouldn't know the vocabulary to express what is true for them" when discussing their family tree. This suggests that one group's family tree is more complicated than the other and includes members whose titles have not been taught, such as step-father or half-sister. I did not collect demographic data on number of family members and relationships to the participant. Had I collected this data, I might have compared the family make-up of first-generation status groups with the family tree presented in each language's respective textbook to see if there were vocabulary gaps which would make describing the family members of one group more challenging. However, I did not collect this data, so the result is somewhat ambiguous.

Selectivity. Looking at all participants, I note that they indicated being selective about some frequently discussed topics, including living arrangement, aspirations for the future, hometown, and family tree. They also indicated being selective about less frequently discussed topics, including ideal home and topics related to their parents (ages, jobs, pastimes/hobbies, living arrangement). To understand this data, I viewed it in tandem with the participation strategies I identified in the interview data with first-generation and working class participants (discussed below).

Participation strategies. I identified strategies for participation in the interview data with first-generation and WC participants. They include withholding, modifying, and inventing information to manage one's identity and avoid stigma (Goffman, 1963) by controlling information that might "out" their socioeconomic status. Yet, as I began discussing above, participants from other backgrounds indicated they would selective about discussing some frequently discussed topics (see Tables 6.8-6.11). In my analysis of the data I've come to understand that participants from any background might choose to manage their identities by employing participation strategies depending on a particular classroom context. For example, Harold's classroom environment included just one out-of-state student and one international student. While I do not know their first generation status or social class background, had I interviewed these students, I might have found that they also managed their identities in order to avoid stigma related to topics that highlight socioeconomic difference and not to "stick out" among their instate classmates. Future research might include interviews with participants of all social class backgrounds to understand what sort of stigma each group seeks to avoid by being selective about what they share.

RQ3: How Do Participants from Particular Backgrounds Enrolled in Beginning Italian Courses Perceive Representation in the Textbook?

In chapter 7, I looked at the textbook used by a subset of participants enrolled in beginning Italian courses that utilized the textbook *Avanti!* (2012), which I found was central to the course. I chose this group because it was the largest subset that used the same textbook ($n = 68$). In my literature review of foreign language textbooks (see Chapter 3), I reviewed studies that showed how textbooks obfuscate socioeconomic differences and/or lack socioeconomic stratification. So, in my analysis of *Avanti!*, I looked for subtle and implicit messages socioeconomic differences. Indeed, my document analysis pinpointed middle class professional aspirations, assumptions about travel experiences, and instructions on table manners. Italian culture was contextualized by vacationing, eating out, and shopping. Textbook activities utilize information about parents' jobs and hometowns—precisely the indicators of socioeconomic difference discussed above that participants indicated they would be uncomfortable, selective, or avoid discussing in class.

The amount participants reported the socioeconomic statuses of native speakers was represented by the materials and activities in beginning Italian differed by first-generation status. This suggests a lack of socioeconomic stratification in this textbook was noted by one group of participants as well, though which group noted it is unclear.

Study Implications

Pedagogical implications. This study demonstrates the need for heightened awareness on the part of language instructors at all levels about the diversity of social class identities and their fluid nature in the classroom context. Teacher trainers can attune future instructors to the

ways the foreign language curriculum and certain pedagogical approaches elicit personal information from students that may inadvertently highlight socioeconomic differences.

When and if socioeconomic difference is emphasized by an activity, instructors must understand that it may constrain students' participation. Students may choose not to participate or may participate in a way that does not utilize vocabulary relevant or useful to them. Lack of participation can adversely affect student grades as instructors who lack sensitivity to these issues may understand this as lack of engagement. Above all, limited participation hinders the development of fluency and a student's sense that language study has relevance to the student's life.

Rather than instructing students to pretend if they do not have experience with a topic, activities for language practice should take the focus off the student as much as possible and place it on a subject, issue, or project. For example, to practice travel-related vocabulary, an activity might include creating a target-language guide of all the free things to do in the place where students are studying (i.e., Madison, WI). Such an activity may incorporate target language culture by making comparisons between cultures and explaining similarities and differences. Rather than privilege those students who have travel experience, in this way all students have equally accessible points of reference to use the target language meaningfully.

Implications for curriculum design. This study also calls for increased diversity of socioeconomic status represented in the curriculum in order to avoid the conflation of middle class cultural norms and the target language culture. With the addition of online supplementary materials, textbook authors might easily offer expanded vocabulary lists specific to their largest markets and regions. For example, in Wisconsin, it would be useful to include vocabulary relating to agriculture. Such vocabulary can easily be connected to Italian, French, or Spanish

agricultural products and regional marks of authentic products (i.e., D.O.C.). A wider variety of occupations, hobbies, and life experiences will assist students to connect to the target language and imagine it as relevant to their lives.

Textbook authors should move away from activities that involve consumer exchanges and other activities that require large sums of money. In my analysis, *Avanti!* did do a good job of placing economic constraints on activities that involve designing ideal homes and vacations. But, textbooks should aim to strike a balance between aspirational activities that extend students' horizons of possibility and those that render the target culture unimaginable to students of particular social class backgrounds.

Implications for students and those who serve them. This study illustrates the use of conscious and unconscious participation strategies in the classroom. Students from working class backgrounds and those who are the first in their families to attend college would benefit from explicit teaching of identity management strategies to build up a cadre of resources to draw upon in different contexts. With the support of peers, students would benefit from identifying why and in which circumstances they feel more or less comfortable, valued, part of the group, adequate, and heard. Naming these classroom situations and commiserating with others who have also experienced similar feelings can help mitigate their emotional power over the student. As a group or as individuals, students may choose to accept, contest, or refute the circumstances of these classroom situations. Educational environments may continue to make non-middle class students feel culturally isolated, but those who feel supported by peers in organizations like the Working Class Student Union will have an easier time depersonalizing discrimination, recognizing class-bias, and cultivating pride in their background and roots.

Implications for the public and private university setting. Public institutions are frequently thought to be the most accessible to students from humble means due to lower tuition and diversity of the student body. Private institutions, on the other hand, thought to be more out-of-reach due to higher tuition and a typically less diverse student body. Although the research was conducted at a public institution, its findings are relevant for all types of higher education settings. This study indicates that all instructors at all institutions should take care to include the lived experiences of first- generation/working class students in their activities while simultaneously cultivating a sensitivity to the way activities that require students to share personal information may unwittingly “out” them when participating.

Limitations and Future Research

Limitations due to participation. Although over 900 students were enrolled in French, Italian, and Spanish in Spring 2012, only 101 participated. Relatively low participation made it impossible to perform some of the statistical analysis I had hoped to do. For instance, it was impossible to analyze participants by classroom, language level, or language. The most specific group I was able to create was that of beginning Italian, which included participants enrolled in 101, 102, and 201. These courses all used the same textbook. I spent significant time attempting to produce General Linear Models with the power to predict the classroom experience of participants with particular socioeconomic backgrounds. To feel confident about the accuracy of such models, I decided I would need to have enrolled more participants.

Future studies. Future studies might focus on one instruction level (i.e., 101) and build in an incentive for participation. For instance, surveying students enrolled in any 101 foreign language course would increase the possibility of larger numbers of participants with uniform

experience in each language surveyed. For example, data from French 101, Italian 101, or Spanish 101 could then be analyzed together as “entry level language students” or separately by language. If whole classes were incentivized to participate, analysis could be performed on individual sections. It was my original intention to have enough data to do this, but I had to work with the data I was able to collect.

Survey design limitations. The principal issue with the survey was its length. Twenty-six of the 127 people who began it, did not finish. I asked a wide variety of questions, looking at the foreign language classroom from a variety of angles and gathered a lot of demographic information about participants in order to insure there was something of interest to write about. Some questions were too poorly worded to yield results worth analyzing. For example, I asked participants to name their own social class as either lower, working, middle, or upper. The issue was that some participants who answered lower or working also answered that they were raised in middle and upper class families. The question was not a reliable measure of participants’ social class background. However, I was able to use the answers from the more precisely worded question relating to the social class of the family in which participants were raised as the basis of my analysis (Q6.15, Appendix F).

Future studies. A future study might utilize a very short survey with very few background questions and a maximum of five questions relating to feelings, dispositions to class discussions, and representation of socioeconomic difference in the textbook and class materials. A shorter survey would also allow for quick, in person administration in the first 5-10 minutes of class. This would greatly increase participation rates and make it possible to use more powerful statistical methods to analyze data by more specific language group levels.

Limitations of follow-up interviews. I was acutely aware that my socioeconomic difference relative to the participant was being gauged and assessed the same way participants describe assessing others in Chapter 5. Based on this assessment, participants may have felt more or less comfortable sharing certain bits of information with me. Yet, no matter what I wore or how I spoke, a basic social status differential always existed: I was the graduate student researcher providing a \$20 thank you gift for an hour of their time and the participants were undergraduates (for the most part) who were likely struggling financially.

Future studies. In future research, I might utilize a kind of confessional hotline for participants. This will decrease the influence of face-to-face interaction. It would also allow for more immediate reflection on classroom experiences. For example, a participant might make the phone call while walking from foreign language class to their next destination.

Limitations due to location. There are both strengths and weaknesses to situating this research in one location. The Scennie/Coastie stereotypes used to refer to geographical differences and their socioeconomic implications among the student body is unique to the University of Wisconsin-Madison. The specificity of this study's vocabulary strengthens our understanding of the context in which this research occurred. Yet, it is also a weakness in that certain details cannot be generalized to other educational environments. However, other social class divisions of this nature certainly exist by other names on different campuses.

Expanded Research Design. Given that social class is contextual, collecting data from beginning language classes at various types of institutions (i.e., private liberal arts college, urban community college) would yield interesting results. Observation of one section over time would allow the researcher to understand how specific bits of information revealed in classroom

activities affect participation. Periodic interviews with individuals of different backgrounds over time would also allow the researcher immediate insight into what has been observed.

Future research might focus in on the classroom context of two foreign language sections. It would be interesting to enroll one classroom helmed by an instructor with a social class background distinct from the majority of its students and one led by an instructor who shares the background of the majority of the enrolled students at the same institution.

Concluding Thoughts

When I began pre-pilot interviews with members of the Working Class Student Union in the summer of 2010, it was the only student group of its kind in the country. Now numerous universities, both public and private, host student groups that support and advocate for the needs of first-generation college students. In fact, Class Action (classaction.org), a non-profit that advocates to end the practice of classism, has organized an annual conference called First Gen College Student Summit since 2012. This year, my alma mater, Wellesley College, hosted it. Additionally, “Class Confessions” Facebook pages provide forums for students from all socioeconomic backgrounds at elite universities around the country to share their experiences anonymously (i.e., Stanford Class Confessions).

While safe spaces for first-generation students and forums for raising awareness about socioeconomic difference are increasing, the segregated and anonymous nature of these spaces still points to the stigma of first-generation status and lower/working class status. Thus, participating in foreign language classroom activities that highlight socioeconomic difference, can mean “coming out” to classmates about one’s social class background. With increased appreciation and understanding of the variety of life experience across social class lines, institutions of higher education—and society generally—might become more aware of the ways

certain expertise, customs, habits, and experiences are privileged over others and learn to celebrate social class diversity.

References

- Allen, J. (2010, October 5). Panelists explore coastie origins. *The Badger Herald*. Retrieved from <http://badgerherald.com/news/2010/10/05>
- Apple, M. W. (1986). *Teachers and texts: A political economy of class and gender relations in education*. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Apple, M. W., & Christian-Smith, L. K. (1991). *The politics of the textbook*. New York: Routledge.
- Aries, E., & Seider, M. (2005). The interactive relationship between class identity and the college experience: The case of lower income students. *Qualitative Sociology*, 28(4), 419-443.
- Aries, E. (2008). *Race and class matters at an elite college*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Arikan, A. (2005). Age, gender and social class in ELT coursebooks: A critical study. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 28, 29-38.
- Aski, J. M. & Musumeci, D. (2010). *Avanti!* New York: McGraw Hill.
- Astarita, A. C. (2008a, November). *Fa cara de Català: Catalan identity construction in a US context*. Paper presented at the Graduate Symposium in Applied Linguistics, The University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, Wisconsin.
- Astarita, A. C. (2008b, April). *I'm smart, but I'm slow: Attention deficit disorder and the foreign language classroom*. Paper presented in French/Italian 821: Making the foreign language classroom more accessible at The University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, Wisconsin.
- Astarita, A. C. (2009, October). Befriending the natives in their non-native languages: Using multilingual competence to access the native English speaking community. In M. Back (Chair), *Gaining Access/Granting Access: participation and non-participation in target language communities*. Colloquium conducted at the meeting of the Second Language Research Forum (SLRF), Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.
- Astarita, A. C. (2014, March). The role of social class in the foreign language classroom. In Y. Kanno (Chair), *Social Class in Language Learning and Teaching*. Colloquium conducted at the meeting of the American Association of Applied Linguistics, Portland, Oregon.
- Benseler, D. P. & Schulz, R. A. (1980). Methodological Trends in Foreign Language Instruction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 64 (1), 88-96.

- Block, D. (2007a). The rise of identity in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(Supplement), 863-876.
- Block, D. (2007b). Socialising second language acquisition. In Z. Hua, P. Seedhouse, L. Wei & V. Cook (Eds.), *Language learning and teaching as social inter-action* (pp. 89-102). Basingstoke, UK & New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Block, D. (2012a). 'Class and second language acquisition research,' *Language Teaching Research*, 16 (2): 162-70.
- Block, D. (2012b). Economising globalisation and identity in applied linguistics in neoliberal times. In D. Block, J. Gray, and M. Holborow (Eds.), *Neoliberalism and Applied Linguistics* (pp.56-85). London: Routledge.
- Block, D. (2014). *Social class in applied linguistics*. New York: Routledge.
- Bloom, L. Z. (1996). Freshman Composition as a Middle-Class Enterprise. *College English*, 58, 6, 654-75.
- Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System. (2010). *University of Wisconsin system application for undergraduate admission*. Retrieved from <https://apply.wisconsin.edu>
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). The economics of linguistic exchanges. *Social Science Information*, 6, 645-668.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: a social critique of the judgment of taste*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J. C. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. London: Sage.
- Brown, J. D. (2001). *Using surveys in language programs*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2004). Language and identity. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 369-392). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Butler, Y. G. (2013). Parental factors and early English education as a foreign language: a case study in Mainland China. *Research Papers In Education*, 29 (4), pp.410-437
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Canagarajah, A. S. (1993). Critical Ethnography of a Sri Lankan Classroom: Ambiguities in Student Opposition to Reproduction through ESOL. *Tesol Quarterly*, 27, 4, 601-626.
- Capretz, P. J., Abetti, A., Germain, M.A., Wylie, L. ([1987] 1994). *French in action: A beginning course in language and culture: the Capretz method*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Carroll, R. (1988). *Cultural misunderstandings: The French-American experience* (C. Volk, Trans.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cassidy, O. (2015, April). Hmong life in Madison. *Madison Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.channel3000.com/madison-magazine>
- Christopher, R. (2008). "Middle-class drag." In K. Oldfield & R. G. Johnson (Eds.) *Resilience: Queer professors from the working class*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Chastain, K. (1976). *Developing second language skills: theory to practice*. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Co.
- Connell, R. W., Ashenden, D. J., Kessler, S., & Dowsett, G. W. (1982). *Making the difference: Schools, families and social division*. Sydney: George Allen & Unwin.
- Cook, V. (2003). Materials for Adult Beginners from an L2 Perspective. In Tomlinson, B. (Ed.) *Developing materials for language teaching* (pp. 275-290). London: Continuum.
- Courtilion, J. & de Salins, G.D. (1995). *Libre Echange*. Paris: Hatier/Didier.
- Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (2014). Social Class, Identity, and Migrant Students. *Journal Of Language, Identity & Education*, 13(2), 111-117. doi:10.1080/15348458.2014.901823
- Davies, B. & Harré, R. (1990). 'Positioning: The Discursive Production of Selves.' *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior*, 20 (1), 43-63.
- Davison, D., Gor, K., & Lekic, M. (1996). *Russian Stage I: Live from Moscow. Volume 1*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- De Castell, S. (1990). Teaching the textbook: Teacher/Text authority and the problem of interpretation. *Linguistics and Education*, 2, 1, 75-90.
- Dews, C. L. B., & Law, C. L. (1995). *This fine place so far from home: Voices of academics from the working class*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

- Durham, C. A. (1995). At the Crossroads of Gender and Culture: Where Feminism and Sexism Intersect. *Modern Language Journal*, 79, 2, 153-65.
- Erni, J. N. (2008). Out-performing identities. In A. M. Y. Lin (Ed.), *Problematizing identity: Everyday struggles in language, culture, and education* (p. 193-198). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Fiechtner, B. & Vosseller, T. (n.d.). *Our Story*. Retrieved from <http://sconnie.com/pages/our-story>
- Fish, S. E. (1980). *Is there a text in this class? The authority of interpretive communities*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81, 286-300.
- Florent, J., & Walter, C. (July 01, 1988). A Better Role for Women in TEFL. *ELT Journal*, 43, 3, 180-84.
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). New York: Continuum. (Original work published 1968).
- Gahagan, J. & Cridlig, J.-M. (1996) *Panorama*. Paris: European Schoolbooks.
- Gao, F. (2010). Negotiation of Chinese learners' social class identities in the English language learning journeys in Britain *Journal of Cambridge Studies*, 5 (2-3), 64-77.
- Gao, F. (2014). Social-Class Identity and English Learning: Studies of Chinese Learners. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 13(2), 92-98.
- Giroux, H. A. (1981). *Ideology, culture & the process of schooling*. Philadelphia; London: Temple University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma; notes on the management of spoiled identity*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Goldthorpe, J. H., & Jackson, M. (2008). Problems of an education-based meritocracy. In A. Lareau, & D. Conley (Eds.), *Social class: How does it work?* (pp. 93-117). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Guarnaccio, C. & Guarnaccio, E. (1997). *Ci siamo*. Port Melbourne, Victoria: CIS Heinemann.
- Guerra, J. (Producer). (2015 January 29). *State of opportunity* [Audio broadcast]. Retrieved from <http://stateofopportunity.michiganradio.org/post/coming-out-poor-elite-university>
- Hadley, A. O. (2001). *Teaching language in context*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Herzing University. (n.d.). *Herzing University Admissions*. Retrieved November 5, 2011 from <http://www.herzing.edu/admissions>.
- hooks, b. (2000). *Where we stand: Class matters*. New York: Routledge.
- Hout, M. (2008). How class works: Objective and subjective aspects of class since the 1970s. In A. Lareau, & D. Conley (Eds.), *Social class: How does it work?* (pp. 25-64). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Johnson, A. (2009, December 15). 'Coastie' song, video spark debate at UW. *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*. Retrieved from <http://www.jsonline.com/features/religion/79373062.html>
- Kaplan, A. (1993). *French lessons, a memoir*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kinginger, C. (2004). Alice doesn't live here anymore: Foreign language learning and identity reconstruction. *Bilingualism Education and Bilingualism*, (45), 219-242.
- Kubota, R. (2003). New approaches to gender, class, and race in second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(1), 31-47.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Sunderman, G. (2001). The struggle for a place in the sun: Rationalizing foreign language study in the twentieth century. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(1), 5-25.
- Lareau, A. (2008). Introduction: Taking stock of class. In A. Lareau, & D. Conley (Eds.), *Social class: How does it work?* (pp. 3-24). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Law, C. L. (1995). Introduction. In Dews, C. L. B., & Law, C. L. (Eds.) *This fine place so far from home: Voices of academics from the working class*. (pp. 1-10). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- LeCourt, D. (2004). *Identity matters: Schooling the student body in academic discourse*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- LeCourt, D. (2006). Performing working-class identity in composition: Toward a pedagogy of textual practice. *College English*, 69, 1, 30-51.
- LeCourt, D., & Napoleone, A. R. (2011). Teachers with(out) class: Transgressing academic social space through working-class performances. *Pedagogy*, 11, 1, 81-108.
- Leahy, A. (2006). The die arbeit code. *The Linguist: Journal of the Institute of Linguists*, 45, 4, 120.

- Lehrermeier, A. R. (2008). Class, sexuality and academia. In Oldfield, K., & Johnson, R. G. (Eds). *Resilience: Queer professors from the working class*. (pp. 7-23). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Lin, A. (2008). *Problematizing identity: Everyday struggles in language, culture, and education*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Linkon, S. L. (1999). *Teaching working class*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Liskin-Gasparro, J. (1982). *ETS oral proficiency testing manual*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Liu, H. G. (2012) *Parental investment and junior high school students' English learning motivation: A Social class perspective*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Peking University.
- López-Gopar, M. E., & Sughrua, W. (2014). Social Class in English Language Education in Oaxaca, Mexico. *Journal Of Language, Identity & Education*, 13(2), 104-110. doi:10.1080/15348458.2014.901822
- Lubensky, Ervin & Jarvis (1996). *Nachalo: When in Russia*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Luke, A. (1988). *Literacy, textbooks, and ideology: Postwar literacy instruction and the mythology of Dick and Jane*. London: Falmer Press.
- Madison Area Technical College. (n.d.). *Liberal arts transfer courses – Madison Area Technical College (MATC)*. Retrieved 3 November 2011 from <http://madisoncollege.edu/>
- McKay, S. L., & Wong, S. C. (1996). Multiple discourses, multiple identities: Investment and agency in second-language learning among Chinese adolescent immigrant students. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(3), 577.
- McIntosh, P. (1988). *A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies*. Working Paper 189, Center for Research on Women, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass., 1988.
- Meyer, L. K. (1975). Social class and foreign language learning: Implications for curriculum. *Lektos: Interdisciplinary working papers in language sciences*, vol. 1, no. 2., Report: ED122616. 14p.
- Multicultural Students Center University of Wisconsin-Madison (n.d.). *Survey*. Retrieved March 22, 2010 from <http://msc.wisc.edu/msc/>

- Muzzatti, S. L., & Samarco, C. V. (2006). *Reflections from the wrong side of the tracks: Class, identity, and the working class experience in academe*. Lanham, Md: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Naunton, J. (1993). *Think ahead to first certificate*. Essex: Longman.
- Norton (Peirce), B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 1, 9-31.
- Norton, B. (1997). Language, identity, and the ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 3, 409-429.
- Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Harlow, England; New York: Longman.
- Norton, B. & McKinney, C. (2011). "An identity approach to second language acquisition." In Atkinson, D. (Ed.) *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition*. (pp. 73-94). New York: Routledge.
- Nunan, D. (1995). *Atlas 1*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Office of Academic Planning and Institutional Research (2014). *2014 Diversity Forum*. Retrieved June 5, 2015 from <https://apir.wisc.edu/diversity-forum.htm>
- Office of Admissions and Recruitment at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. (2011). *Freshman applicants: requirements and expectations*. Retrieved October 22, 2011 from <http://www.admissions.wisc.edu/freshman/requirements.php>
- Office of the Provost & Office of Budget, Planning and Analysis. (2012). *2011-2012 Data Digest*. University of Wisconsin-Madison Academic Planning and Analysis. Retrieved from <http://apir.wisc.edu>
- Oldfield, K., & Johnson, R. G. (2008a). *Resilience: Queer professors from the working class*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Oldfield, K., & Johnson, R. G. (2008b). Introduction. In Oldfield, K., & Johnson, R. G. (Eds.) *Resilience: Queer professors from the working class*. (pp. 1-6). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Ortega, L. (2009). *Understanding second language acquisition*. London: Hodder Education.
- Pari, C. (1999). "Just American"? In Linkon, S. L. (Ed.) *Teaching working class*. (pp. 123-141). Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

- Pavlenko, A., & Blackledge, A. (2004). Introduction: New theoretical approaches to the study of negotiating identity in multilingual contexts. In A. Pavlenko, & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts* (pp. 1-33). Clevedon; Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.
- Pew Research Center. (2008, April 9). Inside the middle class: Bad times hit the good life. [Web log post]. Retrieved from <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2008/04/09/>
- Philips, S. U. (2004). Language and social inequality. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 474-495). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Poulou, S. (1997). Sexism in the discourse roles of textbook dialogues. *Language Learning Journal*, 15(1), 68-73.
- Reagan, T. G., & Osborn, T. A. (2002). *The foreign language educator in society*. Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Richards, J. (1998). *Changes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J.C. & Rodgers, T. (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching: A description and analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rifkin, B. (1998). Gender Representation in Foreign Language Textbooks: A Case Study of Textbooks in Russian. *Modern Language Journal*, 82, 2, 217-36.
- Rifkin, B. (2003). Guidelines for foreign language lesson planning. *Foreign Language Annals*, 36(2), 167-179.
- Ritchie, A. (2005). Whose code are you teaching? A popular Australian coursebook unravelled. *Babel*, 39(3), 4-7,38.
- Rivers, W. (1975). *A practical guide to the teaching of French*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rose, M. (1995). *Possible lives: The promise of public education in America*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Rose, M. (2005 [1989]). *Lives on the boundary: A moving account of the struggles and achievements of America's educationally unprepared*. New York: Penguin Books [The Free Press].
- Rosenblatt, L. M. (1978). *The reader, the text, the poem: Transactional theory of the literary work*. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Ryan, J. & Sackey, C. (1984). *Strangers in paradise: Academics from the working class*. Boston: South End.

- Saldana, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Savage, M., Devine, F., Cunningham, N., Taylor, M., Li, Y., Hjellbrekke, J. & Miles, A. (2013). A new model of social class? Findings from the BBC's Great British Class Survey experiment. *Sociology*, 47(2), 219-250.
- Savignon, S.J. (1983). *Communicative competence theory and classroom practice texts and contexts in second language learning*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Schwalbe, M. (1995). The work of professing (A letter to Home). In Dews, C. L. B., & Law, C. L. (pp. 309-331). *This fine place so far from home: Voices of academics from the working class*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Shardakova, M., & Pavlenko, A. (2004). Identity options in russian textbooks. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 3(1), 25-46.
- Shepard, A., McMillan, J., & Tate, G. (1998). *Coming to class: Pedagogy and the social class of teachers*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.
- Sherman, J. E. (2010). Multiple levels of cultural bias in TESOL course books. *Relc Journal*, 41, 3, 267-281.
- Shin, H. (2014). Social Class, Habitus, and Language Learning: The Case of Korean Early Study-Abroad Students. *Journal Of Language, Identity & Education*, 13(2), 99-103. doi:10.1080/15348458.2014.901821
- Siegal, M., & Okamoto, S. (1996). Imagined worlds: Language, gender, and socio-cultural "norms" in Japanese language textbooks. In N. Warner, J. Ahlers, L. Bilmes, M. Oliver, S. Wertheim & M. Chen (Eds.), *Gender and belief systems: Proceedings of the fourth Berkeley women and language conference, April 19, 20, and 21, 1996* (pp. 667-678). Berkeley, Calif.: Berkeley Women and Language Group, University of California.
- Sleeter, C.E. & Grant, C.A. (1991). Race, class, gender, and disability in current textbooks. In M. W. Apple & L. K. Christian-Smith (Eds.) *The politics of the textbook*. (pp. 78-110). New York: Routledge.
- Soars, L. & Soars, J. (2003). *The new headway: Intermediate student's book*. Oxford: OUP.
- Story, N. (2008) Flying the coop. In Oldfield, K., & Johnson, R. G. (Eds.) *Resilience: Queer professors from the working class*. (pp. 83-100). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Sudlow, C. (1999). *Alloys-y*. South Melbourne: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Swaffter, J., Arens, K., & Byrnes, H. (1991). *Reading for meaning: An integrated approach to language learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Talburt, S., & Stewart, M. A. (1999). What's the subject of study abroad?: Race, gender, and "living culture". *Modern Language Journal*, 83(2), 163-175.
- TayTay, AOL, Booty B (Songwriters & Performers) and Kwalae, Q. (Video producer). (n.d.). *What's a sconnie (sconnie song)*. [Web Video]. Retrieved October 22, 2011 from <https://www.youtube.com/user/ZooniversityMusic>
- Thornbury, S. (1999). Window-dressing vs cross-dressing in the EFL sub-culture. *Folio* 5(2), 15-17.
- Tokarczyk, M. M., & Fay, E. A. (1993). *Working-class women in the academy: Laborers in the knowledge factory*. Amherst, Mass: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Toohey, K. (2000). *Learning English at school: identity, social relations and classroom practice*. Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.
- Truong, A. (2009, October 13). 'Coastie song' drops on UW with beats, controversy. *The Badger Herald*. Retrieved October 22, 2011 from <http://badgerherald.com/blogs/arts/2009/10/13>
- University of Wisconsin-Madison Language Institute (2015). *Language requirements for a bachelor's degree*. Retrieved May 22, 2015 from <http://languages.wisc.edu/advising/requirements>
- University of Wisconsin-Madison Language Institute (2011). *Fall 2011 orientation for new language instructors*. Retrieved October 23, 2011 from http://www.languageinstitute.wisc.edu/content/language_tas/workshop.htm
- Vandrick, S. (1997). The role of hidden identities in the postsecondary ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(1), pp. 153-157.
- Van Lier, Leo (1988). *The classroom and the language learner: Ethnography and second language classroom research*. New York: Longman.
- Vellaccio, L. and Elston, M. (1998). *Teach yourself Italian*. London: Hodder Headline.
- Weaver, L. (1993). A Mennonite 'Hard Worker' moves from the working class and the religious/ethnic community to academia: A conflict between two definitions of work. In Tokarczyk, M. M., & Fay, E. A. (Eds.). *Working-class women in the academy: Laborers in the knowledge factory*. Amherst, Mass: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Wisconsin Council on Children and Families (2014). *Race for results: Wisconsin's need to reduce racial disparities*. Retrieved June 4, 2015 from www.wccf.org

- Wisconsin Council on Children and Families (2013). *Race to Equity: A baseline report on the state of racial disparities in Dane county.*. Retrieved June 4, 2015 from <http://racetoequity.net>
- Working Class Student Union (2012). *Working Class Student Union*. Retrieved February 28, 2012 from <https://www.facebook.com/pages/Working-Class-Student-Union>
- Working Class Student Union (2014). *Working Class Student Union*. Retrieved December 28, 2014 from <http://wcsu-rso.org/aboutus/aboutus.html>
- Young, R. F. and Astarita, A. C. (2013), Practice Theory in Language Learning. *Language Learning*, 63: 171–189.
- Young, Michael. (1958). *The rise of the meritocracy*. Hammondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- Zandy, J. (2001). *What we hold in common: An introduction to working-class studies*. New York: Feminist Press at the City University of New York.
- Zooniversity (Songwriters & Performers). (n.d.). *What's a coastie? (Coastie song)*. [Web Video]. Retrieved October 22, 2011 from <https://www.youtube.com/user/ZooniversityMusic>

Appendices

Appendix A. Coastie Song Lyrics

What's a coastie?	Take off the glasses,
Black tights all day	Lemme see your face
That's a coastie	It's a hot summer day
Starbucks big shades!	Still rockin' North Face.
She a coastie	Gotta Starbucks cup, yeah you my star
Always blowin' daddy's money	Bucky
You a coastie	I know you live there but I could really get
My east coast Jewish honey	you lucky
	So I said honey, be my lady
What's a coastie?	She said, "kk...I'ma meet you at the KK"
White tee v-neck	
That's a coastie	Walk up out my spot,
She always think that she the best	Look around and say, "yesss"
She a coastie	Coastie got me sedated like a pill of Xanax
North face with the Uggs	Always walkin' Langdon with a strut
You a coastie	lookin' haawwt
But I'ma still show some love	Talkin' on her celly like, "girl, ohh
	gawwwd!"
My Jewish American princess baby	Coach bag, Gucci shades that they daddy
Walks wit a swag and talks so crazy	bought
East coast accent,	Muggin' wearin v-neck tees with they
East coast fashion	iPaawwd
Black spandex wit an ass like Bascom!	Always up in Van Vleck, "I have a
Smokin' on a cig as she passin',	question"
Blackberry messagin',	Baby sit back, let me explain this lesson
Multitaskin'	

Appendix B. Sconnie Song Lyrics

What's a sconnie?
 Livin' on Breese St.
 That's a sconnie
 Eatin' at McDs
 He's a sconnie
 Always riddin' daddy's tracker
 You a sconnie
 Can't this shit go any faster?

 What's a sconnie?
 Badger gear game day
 That's a sconnie!
 Love my cheese anyway
 He's a sconnie!
 Always cheerin' for the Packers
 You a sconnie!
 Eat my cheddar cheese and crackers!

 Wisconsin native cheesehead baby
 Stayin' in-state and partyin' crazy
 Midwest accent, farm boy fashion
 Jeans and a t-shirt walkin' up
 Bascom
 Take off that orange hat, it ain't
 fashion

Huntin' season's over two months
 passin'
 Come a little closer, let me see your
 face
 With the new lights on Langdon, it
 ain't a scary place
 Milwaukee Brewers, brats on
 skewers
 Wake up PBR and put down Coors
 I said, baby you thirsty?
 Need some water from the bubbler?
 I can meet you at the bubbler!
 (chorus)
 Only drinkin' beer that's from
 Milwaukee
 Super human B.A.C.
 It's Saturday night, no where to go
 Sconnie's be at a house party, don't
 ya know?
 Boy ya like milk and that's good for
 my bones
 Just thank God we ain't no lactose
 Always up in Woody, like where is
 the party?
 Boy, come back to Langdon and we
 can get it started!

Appendix C. Sconnie Nation and Bucky's Locker Room, the Official Wisconsin Apparel Store



Image 1 retrieved 31 January 2012 from <http://www.sconnie.com/products/view/273/36>

Image 2 retrieved 31 January 2012 from

<http://www.buckyslockerroom.com/ProductDetails.asp?ProductCode=4400372>

Appendix D. CoastieUSA



Image retrieved 12 August 2012 from <http://www.coastieUSA.com>

Appendix E. Rifkin (2003). Sample Lesson Plan.

Table 2

SAMPLE LESSON PLAN

(0) **Homework for the lesson:** A short reading about homes and apartments featuring targeted constructions important for this topic (location; possession; verbs of standing, hanging, lying), most of which the students have encountered before this course, and an explanation of the use of these constructions.

(1) **Reading activity:** Students read a short essay from an illustrated magazine about new trends in home design for the wealthy “new Russians”; students are required to answer questions about content, decode new words related to the topic “home,” and notice constructions expressing possession and location. In the follow-up phase of this module, students discuss cultural differences in what constitutes a desirable home for new Russians and what they consider a desirable home for themselves.

(2) **Listening/viewing activity:** Students watch a short segment from a Russian television program in which a star describes her new home; students are required to answer questions about content, decode new words related to the topic “home,” and notice constructions expressing possession and location. In the follow-up phase, students discuss whether the cultural differences they perceived in the reading activity were confirmed or refuted in the listening/viewing activity.

(3) **Speaking activity:** Students are reminded of expressions for location (“to the right of,” “to the left of,” etc.) and possession with inanimate subjects (e.g., “the living room has a fireplace”) and are drilled in the use of these constructions. They then are assigned to work in pairs. Each partner of the pair is given a home design or plan and describes it (unseen) to his or her partner. The partners then draw the designs based on the verbal descriptions and, ultimately, compare the drawings with the printed plans. Lastly, the partners discuss what aspects of the home plans they personally like and dislike and why, and what aspects of the home plans the Russians featured in the reading and viewing activities might like or dislike and why.

(4) **Prewriting activity:** Students work in pairs to prepare to write a composition (for homework) on the topic: “My Ideal Home” from their own personal perspective or from the perspective of a famous personality (real or fictitious). In the prewriting activity, they draw up a list of vocabulary items they will need and together write topic sentences for each of the paragraphs of the composition.

(5) **Preparation for next days' classes:** The topic for next two days will be comparison of homelessness in the United States and Russia and the issue of affordable housing in both cultures. Targeted structures will include comparatives and quantitative expressions.

Appendix F. Questions from the Online Survey.

Q1.1 Which language course are you currently enrolled in?

- French
- Italian
- Spanish

Q1.2 What is the course number?

- 101
- 102
- 201
- 203
- 204
- 207
- Other. please specify: _____

Q2.1 Please read each contrasting word pair and indicate how you feel in language class on the scale that runs between them:

entirely comfortable

entirely uncomfortable

totally adequate

totally inadequate

highly valued

not valued at all

completely heard

completely unheard

very much a part of the group

not a part of the group at all

Q2.2 Please read each contrasting word pair and indicate how you would like to feel in language class on the scale that runs between them:

entirely comfortable

entirely uncomfortable

totally adequate

totally inadequate

highly valued

not valued at all

completely heard

completely unheard

very much a part of the group

not a part of the group at all

Q2.3 Please read each contrasting word pair and indicate how you think your classmates feel in language class on the scale that runs between them:

entirely comfortable

entirely uncomfortable

totally adequate

totally inadequate

highly valued

not valued at all

completely heard

completely unheard

very much a part of the group

not a part of the group at all

Q3.1 Have you ever been asked to talk about the following topics in language class?

	Never	A few times	Sometimes	Somewhat frequently	Frequently	Very freq.
My pastimes/hobbies						
My living arrangement						
My vacation experiences						
My aspirations for the future						
My hometown						
My ideal home						
My ideal vacation						
My family tree						
My parents' ages						
My parents' jobs						
My parents' pastimes/hobbies						
My parents' living arrangement						

Q 3.2 Please check the boxes that describe how you feel about discussing the following topics in this language class.

	I would feel comfortable being asked about this topic.	I would be selective about what I share on this topic.	I wouldn't know the vocabulary to express what is true for me about this topic.	I would avoid speaking about this topic.
My pastimes/hobbies				
My living arrangement				
My vacation experiences				
My aspirations for the future				
My hometown				
My ideal home				
My ideal vacation				
My family tree				
My parents' ages				
My parents' jobs				
My parents' pastimes/hobbies				
My parents' living arrangement				

Q4.1 How frequently were the following materials used for this class both in and out of the classroom?

	very frequently	frequently	somewhat frequently	somewhat infrequently	infrequently	very infrequently	Not applicable.
Textbook							
Workbook							
On-line Workbook							
Audio Lab book							
Video/DVD							
Supplementary exercise book							
Instructor-created handouts							
Course packet							

Q6.2 How would you describe social status on the UW-Madison campus?

Q6.3 What's your social status on the UW-Madison campus?

Q6.15 If you were asked to use one of four names for your family's social class, which would you say your family belongs in? [Note that the word 'family' refers to the one in which you were raised.]

- Lower Class
- Working Class
- Middle Class
- Upper Class

Q6.18 If you were asked to use one of four names for your language classmates' social class, which would you say the majority belongs in?

- Lower Class
- Working Class
- Middle Class
- Upper Class

Q6.19 How do you know your language classmates' social class?

Q6.25 Has either of your parents or guardians earned a four-year college/university degree?

- Yes
- No

Q6.26 What is the highest level of education your father or guardian has completed?

- Less than High School
- High School / GED
- Some College
- 2-year College Degree
- 4-year College Degree
- Master's Degree
- Doctoral Degree
- Professional Degree (JD, MD)

Q6.27 What is the highest level of education your mother or guardian has completed?

- Less than High School
- High School / GED
- Some College
- 2-year College Degree
- 4-year College Degree
- Master's Degree
- Doctoral Degree
- Professional Degree (JD, MD)

Q6.28 What was your parents' or guardians' approximate combined annual household income last year?

- Less than 30,000
- 30,000 – 39,999
- 40,000 – 49,999
- 50,000 – 59,999
- 60,000 – 69,999
- 70,000 – 79,999
- 80,000 – 89,999
- 90,000 – 99,999
- 100,000 or more
- I don't know.
- Not applicable.

Q6.37 Do you work during the academic year while attending UW-Madison?

How many hours did you work per week?

Type the number of hours below:

On-campus

Off-campus

Q6.41 Thank you for your participation! You will be entered in the \$50 gift certificate drawing. Please enter your e-mail address below.

Q6.42 A follow-up interview will take about an hour and you will be given \$20 as a thank you for your time. Are you willing to be interviewed about your language learning experiences? If so, please indicate your availability below:

- Before the end of the semester (May 11-27)
- Over the summer (June 5-August 10)
- Fall semester 2012

Appendix G. Semi-structured Interview Protocol

1. Are you taking a foreign language now?
 - a. If so, keep that foreign language class in mind as I ask you questions.
 - b. If not, think of one foreign language class from your past and keep that in mind as you answer these questions.
2. Please tell me the name of the class, level, approximately how many people were in the class and whether it was taught by a professor, FA or TA.
3. Picture the teacher, classmates, classroom and textbook.
4. What do you think your teacher notices/noticed about you the most? Why?
5. What do you think your classmates notice/noticed about you the most? Why?
6. If your teacher had to differentiate you from another student while speaking to someone else, what descriptors would your teacher use?
7. If a classmate had to differentiate you from another student while speaking to someone else, what descriptors would your classmate use?
8. How would you describe yourself in this class?
9. How are/were you different from other students in your class?
10. What do you think of when people use the term 'social class'?
11. What does the term 'social class' mean? How would you define it?
12. Are/Were there people of your social class in your foreign language class?
 - a. How do you know?
 - b. What activities or topics of conversation 'tipped' you off?
13. Are/Were you in the same social class as your teacher?
 - a. How do you know?

- b. What activities or topics of conversation ‘tipped’ you off?
14. What is your ‘social class’?
 15. What is your family’s ‘social class’?
 16. Is it the same as your family’s? Why or why not?
 17. In your foreign language class, do you think others’ know/knew what your social class is/was? Why?
 18. Which activities or topics of conversation revealed your social class /others’ social class?
 19. Have you ever felt you needed to ‘pass’ as a different social class?
 20. Do/Did you ever hide your social class? How? Did others?
 21. Do/Did you ever make things up so as not to call attention to yourself? During which activities or topics of conversation? Why? Did others?
 22. Do/Did you ever avoid talking? When? Why? Did others?
 23. Have you ever felt /Did you ever feel uncomfortable, alienated or like an outsider in class? When, why? Do you think others do/did?
 24. Think of the people who are/were your friends in foreign language class. Are/Were they in your social class? How do you know?
 25. Does/Did your teacher ever make assumptions about you or about experiences common to the class that were not true for you? What?
 26. Why did you take [foreign language]?
 27. Are/Were your reasons different from your classmates? Does this isolate you in any way?
 28. Do you work? How many hours/week? On-campus/off-campus?
 29. Does working interfere with your foreign language class assignments/participation in extra-curricular offerings/outside group work? How?

30. What was beneficial /detrimental about taking a foreign language?
31. Does/Did taking a foreign language have any unintended effect on your life?
32. Is/Was taking a foreign language a burden to you in anyway? How?
33. What do you think of the textbook and supplementary materials? Give me five adjectives.
34. Can/Could you relate to the situations in the book and supplementary materials?
35. Can/Could you relate to the characters in the book and supplementary materials?
36. Do the textbook and supplementary materials contain characters that do things you would do? Do they look like you?
37. Can you find the words to describe yourself?
 - a. What are your interests?
 - b. What are your hobbies?
 - c. What is a typical vacation for you?
 - d. What is your area of study?
 - e. What kind of job would you like to have in the future?
 - f. Can you find the words for these things in the textbook and supplementary materials?
38. Can you find the words to describe your family?
 - a. What are your family members' jobs?
 - b. What are your family members' housing arrangements?
 - c. What are your family members' hobbies?
 - d. What are your family members' typical vacations?
 - e. What are the things you do together with your family?

- f. Do you have a “traditional” family make-up (i.e. two married biological parents, biological siblings, etc)?
 - g. Can you find the words for these things in the textbook and supplementary materials?
39. Did not knowing these vocabulary words impede your learning/make you uncomfortable/alienate you? How?
40. Are there any specific experiences/events, texts, textbook exercises, films, activities, examples, drawings, depictions, descriptions from class that stand out to you or illustrate how you related to the class materials?
41. What (if anything) feels foreign about foreign language class? (MC culture?)
42. Do you feel like you can participate/share in class discussions?
43. How were your life experiences/stories received in foreign language class? Were they accepted/legitimated/included/confirmed/refuted/marginalized?
44. Did you ever feel like you needed to say or refrain from saying certain things or behave in a certain way to be accepted by your teacher or classmates?
45. Did you ever feel like you needed to say or refrain from saying certain things or behave in a certain way to get a good grade?
46. Did you ever feel untrue to yourself, your family or your origins in foreign language class?
47. Did you ever have to compromise your values or priorities in foreign language class?
48. Has any of this affected your language learning?
49. Do you think it is possible to be multilingual and from your class background?
50. Has the way you think of yourself changed as you’ve taken a foreign language?

51. Has the way you think of your family changed as you've taken a foreign language?
52. Has learning a foreign language expanded your access to certain things? What?
53. How did your social class affect your language learning? Did it make it easier or more difficult? In what ways?
54. How did learning a foreign language affect your understanding of your social class identity?

Appendix H. Frequency Tables for Textbook Representation of Social Class and Socioeconomic Status of Participants, Classmates, and Native Speakers

Table 7.4

Participants' Report of Actual and Ideal Representation of Social Class Identity in Beginning Italian Materials and Activities

My social class identity	is represented in...	should be represented in...
none of the materials and activities	20	21
10% of the materials and activities	2	2
20% of the materials and activities	0	0
30% of the materials and activities	1	5
40% of the materials and activities	3	2
50% of the materials and activities	11	17
60% of the materials and activities	9	3
70% of the materials and activities	3	5
80% of the materials and activities	6	4
90% of the materials and activities	6	2
all of the materials and activities	7	7

Note. N = 68

Table 7.5

Participants' Report of Actual and Ideal Representation of Socioeconomic Status in Beginning Italian Materials and Activities

My socioeconomic status	is represented in...	should be represented in...
none of the materials and activities	24	22
10% of the materials and activities	1	2
20% of the materials and activities	0	0
30% of the materials and activities	2	1
40% of the materials and activities	3	4
50% of the materials and activities	7	3
60% of the materials and activities	5	13
70% of the materials and activities	4	3
80% of the materials and activities	6	6
90% of the materials and activities	8	5
all of the materials and activities	7	2

Note. N = 68

Table 7.6

Participants' Report of Actual and Ideal Representation of Classmates' Social Class Identity in Beginning Italian Materials and Activities

Classmates' social class identity	is represented in...	should be represented in...
none of the materials and activities	18	18
10% of the materials and activities	1	1
20% of the materials and activities	0	0
30% of the materials and activities	0	1
40% of the materials and activities	4	2
50% of the materials and activities	9	12
60% of the materials and activities	5	5
70% of the materials and activities	9	5
80% of the materials and activities	9	6
90% of the materials and activities	4	4
all of the materials and activities	9	12
No response	0	2

Note. N = 68.

Table 7.7

Participants' Report of Actual and Ideal Representation of Classmates' Socioeconomic Status in Beginning Italian Materials and Activities

Classmates' socioeconomic status	is represented in...	should be represented in...
none of the materials and activities	17	22
10% of the materials and activities	0	1
20% of the materials and activities	4	1
30% of the materials and activities	1	1
40% of the materials and activities	2	3
50% of the materials and activities	6	10
60% of the materials and activities	6	4
70% of the materials and activities	8	5
80% of the materials and activities	9	6
90% of the materials and activities	5	5
all of the materials and activities	9	12
No response	1	0

Note. N = 68

Table 7.8

Participants' Report of Actual and Ideal Representation of Native Speakers' Social Class Identity in Beginning Italian Materials and Activities

Native speakers' social class identity	is represented in...	should be represented in...
none of the materials and activities	4	3
10% of the materials and activities	3	1
20% of the materials and activities	3	2
30% of the materials and activities	4	0
40% of the materials and activities	8	4
50% of the materials and activities	10	11
60% of the materials and activities	6	2
70% of the materials and activities	6	6
80% of the materials and activities	11	10
90% of the materials and activities	4	7
all of the materials and activities	7	20
No response	2	2

Note. N = 68

Table 7.9

Participants' Report of Actual and Ideal Representation of Native Speakers' Socioeconomic Status in Beginning Italian Materials and Activities

Native Speakers' socioeconomic status	is represented in...	should be represented in...
none of the materials and activities	4	5
10% of the materials and activities	4	1
20% of the materials and activities	5	1
30% of the materials and activities	4	3
40% of the materials and activities	4	1
50% of the materials and activities	10	11
60% of the materials and activities	5	1
70% of the materials and activities	10	7
80% of the materials and activities	10	10
90% of the materials and activities	3	6
all of the materials and activities	7	20
No response	2	2

Note. N = 68