#### This CP was basically just a time suck we read because most offense could be delinked

#### Counterplan Text: Public colleges and universities ought not restrict constitutionally protected speech except for posts on RateMyProfessors.com and other related teacher rating websites

#### RateMyProfessors ratings reflect racism towards Asian professors and cause criticism for their accents

Subtirelu 15 [Subtirelu, Nicholas Close. "“She does have an accent but…”: Race and language ideology in students' evaluations of mathematics instructors on RateMyProfessors. com." Language in Society 44.01 (2015): 35-62. //BWSWJ]

I return now to my original research questions, attempting to provide answers to them based on the findings of this study. My first research question dealt specifically with whether mathematics instructors with Korean and Chinese last names at institutions of higher education in the United States were evaluated differently on RateMyProfessors.com than their colleagues with US last names. I found that instructors with Chinese or Korean last names were rated significantly lower in Clarity and Helpfulness. In particular, I found that the median rating of Clarity for these instructors was approximately 0.60 to 0.80 points (on a five-point scale) lower than that for instructors with US last names, suggesting a substantial disadvantage for instructors with Chinese or Korean last names. In addition, quantitative analysis of the comments in the two corpora revealed that RMP users commented on the language of their ‘Asian’ instructors frequently but were nearly entirely silent about the language of instructors with common US last names. Finally, RMP users tended to withhold extreme positive evaluation from instructors who have Chinese or Korean last names, although this was frequently lavished on instructors with US last names. This suggests that students’ evaluations of ‘Asian’ instructors teaching in the US pay greater attention to instructors’ language, a tendency that lessens the likelihood that they will offer the same extreme positive evaluations that they fre- quently bestow on many of their other instructors. The tendency for ‘Asian’ instructors to be evaluated more negatively than their colleagues with common US last names raises one particularly difficult question: are these evaluations ‘justified’, ‘fair’, ‘deserved’, or ‘legitimate’, or are they not? In other words, are students ‘biased’, or do their instructors have ‘legitimate’ language problems? While it might be on some level informative to examine in- structors’ spoken language and students’ responses to it, as some studies have done (e.g. Rubin 1992; Kang & Rubin 2009) and future research should continue to do, ultimately the issue cannot be divorced from questions of ideology. Even when there is apparent agreement among different people about the perceived quality or intelligibility of an individual’s language, that consensus cannot be removed from the political and social circumstances that have produced it (Park & Wee 2009). In other words, even if we were able to come to a consensus about whether an instructor has ‘legitimate’ problems with his or her speech (perhaps even with that instructor joining in the consensus and accepting this char- acterization of his or her language), that consensus would have to draw on some ideological framework of expectations for what or whose language will be legiti- mized. Such a framework would almost certainly serve the interests of some by constructing their language as ‘without problems’ or ‘normal’ (likely NESs) while marginalizing others by constructing their language as ‘containing problems’ or ‘being abnormal’ (likely many NNESs). In light of the understanding that ideology is central to widespread complaints about NNES instructors’ language, I have examined the different evaluations I ob- served from a language ideological perspective attempting to examine how they work in the interests of certain instructors but not in others. Hence, my second re- search question concerned how differences in evaluations of these instructors might be explained as a function of the ideology of nativeness as described by Shuck (2004, 2006). Shuck’s work on the ideology of nativeness suggests that in some contexts NESs freely construct NNESs using exaggerated stereotypical characteristics including the outright denial of the NNES’s English competence. Discourse drawing on the ideology of nativeness in this manner was attested in some RMP users’ evaluations of their ‘Asian’ instructors. In addition, in some cases, RMP users attempted to absolve themselves and other students of responsibility for ensuring successful communication with their instructors (for example, by advising others not to ask questions in class). For these users then, Shuck’s description of the performance and dissemination of the ideology of na- tiveness is quite apt. I observed, however, that attempts to draw on the ideology of nativeness and construct ‘Asian’ instructors as incomprehensible were actually far less common than objections to the presuppositions of the ideology of nativeness. Specifically, one formula X DOES HAVE AN ACCENT BUT (and variations thereof) was among the most common sequences in the RMP-C&K corpus. Users drawing on this formu- laic strategy acknowledge the presence of a language feature that is highly stigmatized but proceed to counter the assumptions of the ideology of nativeness in some other way, for example, by pointing to the instructors’ ability to compensate for communication difficulties or suggesting that any communication difficulties are only temporary. Despite the frequency of objection to the presuppositions of the ideology of na- tiveness, I argue that it is still the dominant language ideology in the context of RMP. The structure of the previously mentioned formula is particularly suggestive of the ideology’s naturalized status. RMP users commenting on instructors who have Chinese or Korean last names appear to anticipate that their eventual readers will orient to the ‘Asianness’ of the instructors’ last names and iconically arrive at the conclusion that the instructor is NNES and, worse, that he or she is incomprehensible. This anticipation and the resulting acknowledgement (i.e. X DOES HAVE AN ACCENT) reflect the constraints that hegemonic discourses, like those that reproduce and transmit the ideology of nativeness, act as constraints on what can or must be said (Sealey 2007). In this case, the ideology of nativeness seems to demand an explanation for the ‘Asianness’ that some instructors’ last names present. Having decided that the instructor in question does not in some way conform to stereotypical presuppositions, many RMP users attempt to challenge the iconic associations between race, language, and incomprehensibility at least for the individual instructor. In spite of the objections these users leveled at the dominant language ideology, the ostensibly neutral or even positive comments about NNESs’ language that many posters felt compelled to make are themselves problematic (even if well-intended) in that they draw attention to an area where NNESs face continual disadvantage relative to NESs, largely as a result of the ide- ology of nativeness. In particular, even apparently positive comments about NNES instructors’ language must be interpreted against the silence about and assumed ‘perfection’ of NESs’ language that the dominant and ubiquitous language ideology, the ideology of nativeness, presupposes. Although the present study did not examine the way comments were interpreted by other RMP users, future research could examine how such positive or neutral statements about language are interpreted and specifically whether they lead to more positive or negative expectations about the instructor than comments that are silent on this topic. Such research might help to clarify the degree to which the apparent obligation for RMP users to comment on ‘Asian’ instructors’ language serves as a disadvantage for them.