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ABSTRACT

This study investigates the extent to which the Florida B.E.S.T (Benchmark for Excellent Student Thinking) English Language Arts (ELA) standards demand that students participate in dialogic interactions within the 10th grade ELA classroom. Dialogic demands, characterized by active discourse and collaborative sense-making, are the opportunities students interact with one another or with a text. The dialogic elements of classroom pedagogy are an increasingly recognized critical component of effective literacy instruction in contrast with the monologic classroom where teachers are the primary source of information. A Critical Discourse Analysis through the lens of Fairclough is used as this research aims to identify specific instances where students are required to engage in meaningful dialogue with one another or with a text. The analysis examines the standards' language, the distribution of the standards, and the underlying ideological stance of the standards that students interact with. By assessing the presence or absence of dialogic demands within the standards, this study seeks to provide insights into the alignment between the Florida B.E.S.T ELA standards and the principles of dialogic pedagogy. Findings from this research can inform curriculum development, instructional practices, and educational policies aimed at promoting more robust and participatory approaches to literacy education in Florida schools.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Background

According to Schaffalitzky (2024), "dialogic classroom talk is explorative and positions the students as collaborating producers of knowledge” this is in contrast with the traditional view of education where the teacher is seen as the source of all information in the classroom. Dialogism, or dialogic interactions are interactions that create shared meaning amongst participants in the interaction. In the classroom setting, Dialogism refers to the opening of conversation that supports the learning of students (Maine & Wegerif, 2021). Statement of Problem

In 2020, the Florida Department of Education released the B.E.S.T standards “to make Florida the most literate state in the nation” (Florida Department of Education, 2020a). The standards have been received with mixed results. In an analysis in June of 2020, Friedberg et al. (2020) found that the standards left significant gaps in learning for students—specifically regarding disciplinary literacy, listening and participating in discussions, and multimedia literacy. They determined that “standards are not suitable until and unless [these] revisions occur.” However, in another independent review, Berner and Steiner (2020) determined that while there were some things that the B.E.S.T standards should be revised for, like clarifications of the reading lists, and some “moderate” changes to the technology and multimedia standards, that the B.E.S.T standards were some of the strongest in the country.
Purpose

The purpose of this study is to analyze the Florida B.E.S.T ELA standards for their inclusion, if any, of demands for students to engage in dialogic conversations and interact with text in such a way that they are creating meaning for themselves.

Selection of 10th Grade Curriculum

To frame this study, one grade level’s standards were selected for the research. Since the state of Florida assigns the weight of passing an end of year test to qualify for graduation on the 10th grade (Florida Department of Education, 2023) – it seems probative that the focus of this study should be on the 10th grade standards. Considering the importance of the exam, ideally the standards for the 10th grade would encourage practices—like dialogic interaction—that promote learning and retention.

Significance of Study

As there are opposing analyses of the current B.E.S.T standards, this study aims to analyze specifically one grade level—10th—for a singular aspect—dialogic demands—to determine if the standards are effective conveyors of dialogic interactions. The B.E.S.T. standards have only been used in the 10th grade for the last two academic years, and there is not much research on their effectiveness. This study aims to continue the scholarship around the B.E.S.T standards with the goal of determining the best practices to support 10th grade students.
Research Question

This study will address the following research question:

“How do the current Florida English Language Arts standards demand dialogic interactions in Florida’s tenth grade English standards-based curriculum?”

Theoretical Framework

This study relies on the theoretical frameworks of sociocultural theory – Lev Vygotsky, and the theory of dialogism—Mikhail Bakhtin. Both theories emphasize learning through interaction, and they go hand in hand with one another.

Sociocultural theory states that learning is a social process and must first happen at a social level and then an individual level (Vygotsky, 1978). It is “in collaboration with more capable peers” (Vygotsky, 1978) that potential development can be determined. Through the facilitation of discourse, collaboration, and the gradual release of material within a classroom, teachers encourage social practice that encourages learning and development.

While dialogue is defined as a conversation between two parties (Merriam-Webster Dictionary, 2023), dialogism, according to Mikhail Bakhtin (1984), is the method in which people make meaning of the world both through interactions with language and one another. It is more than just speaking to other people-- it is how meaning is made through communicating with others. Bakhtin said that “To live means to participate in dialogue” (1984). It is through the dialogic lens of Bakhtin that language and communication- in all its forms- can be seen as an ongoing social process (Kumar Mishra, 2015). It is through Bakhtin’s theory of dialogism that meaning can be derived from dialogue on whatever level that dialogue takes place (Coghlan & Brydon-Miller, 2014).
Together both theories emphasize the importance of interactions in the classroom. Flynn et al. (2023) found in a study of US and UK highly effective teachers of multilingual students that they “intentionally design language-rich activities that grow multilingual students' learning assets”. Kilag et al. (2024) found that in an online classroom environment the utilization of sociocultural principals led to “increased engagement and participation, improved learning outcomes, [and] enhanced sense of community”. In both studies, it was the application of sociocultural theory, and the consequential application of dialogic interactions that had a positive impact on learning.

The Sociocultural theory of learning and the theory of dialogism both acknowledge that learning is not a monologic endeavor, and that learning requires cooperation and collaboration.

**Methodological Framework**

This study will utilize Critical Discourse Analysis as defined by Fairclough. James Paul Gee also studied and defined discourse analysis. Specifically, Gee (2011) defined “Discourse” with a capital “D” as the “ways in which such socially based group conventions allow people to enact specific identities and activities” and discourse with a lowercase “d” as language in use. Gee’s model employs the way language is used, however within the scope of this study, Fairclough’s model of CDA is more appropriate in its applicability to curriculum. Fairclough’s model of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) uses a three-layered model for the analysis of text (Fairclough, 1995). The first layer of analysis is what the text says or taking the text at face value. The second layer of analysis is focused on the development and distribution of the text, asking how the text is used. The third, and final, layer of analysis considers the underlying ideologies of the text (Fairclough, 1995).
When this methodological framework is applied within the theoretical framework of Vygotsky and Bakhtin to the state standards, each layer of analysis is used to determine the types of interactions that students are demanded to have based on the standards.

In the first layer, this study analyzes the dialogue amongst students as well as the dialogue that is demanded to occur between texts and students lived (social and cultural) experiences.

In the second layer, this study analyzes the demanded dialogue in the distribution of these standards amongst students and the dialogue demanded between texts and students lived (social and cultural) experiences.

In the third layer of analysis, this study analyzes the underlying ideological stance of the standards through the “recommended” reading list for the 10th Grade ELA. As the texts from this list are selected to use as these standards are taught, the social and cultural experiences within these texts will have a dialogue with the lived experiences of students. Understanding this underlying ideological stance will help determine the benefits of the dialogic and social interactions demanded in the standards.

**Terms and Definitions**

The following terms are used frequently throughout this study. Below they are defined as they are used and interpreted by the researcher.

1. **B.E.S.T. Standards**: The Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking, established in Florida in 2020. These standards are the basis of all curricula in the state of Florida.
2. CDA: Critical Discourse Analysis as defined by Fairclough. This methodology takes a simultaneous three-tiered approach, analyzing the literal, practical, and ideological discourse of a text (Fairclough, 1995)

3. Classical: Within the B.E.S.T standards, classical refers to any text from the Greco-Roman period.

4. CSP: Critically Sustaining Pedagogy, coined by Paris and Alim (2017), is the pedagogical practices that help students to sustain their individual cultures, versus the traditional assimilation that happens in the classroom.

5. Curriculum: Within the scope of this study, this term refers to the standards-based curriculum that is the basis of all curricula, due to Florida law. These are currently, the B.E.S.T. standards.

6. Demand: The B.E.S.T standards are established through Florida law, and students are required by another law to pass an end of the year “Florida Assessment of Student Thinking” in their 10th grade year to qualify for graduation. The term demand is used in this study to indicate the weight of the standards on curriculum and therefore the students.

7. Dialogic Classroom: A classroom that posits student interaction and collaboration as the source for meaning making.

8. Dialogism: As defined by Mikhail Bakhtin (1984) is the method in which people make meaning of the world both through interactions with language and one another.

9. Dialogue: Interactions between 2 entities. This can be verbal interaction between two individuals, and individual and a text, or a text and an individual.
10. Discursive Practice: This term refers to the distribution and utilization of the discourse within Critical Discourse Analysis (Fairclough, 1995)

11. E.L.A. Expectations: The English Language Arts Expectations are six standards that are part of the

12. F.A.S.T: This refers to the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking. This assessment is given three times a year to 10th graders to determine the progress they are making in terms of the B.E.S.T. standards. Scoring a three or higher (out of five) on the third administration of this assessment is a requirement for graduation as determined by Florida law.

13. Ideological Stance: Within the scope of this study, this refers to the third layer of simultaneous analysis in Fairclough’s CDA. This stance is the underlying trend in beliefs and, principles, and values of a group – in terms of this study, the authors of the recommended readings.

14. Modes of Interaction: This term refers to the different iterations of interactions as defined by the study. These interactions are student to student, student to text, and text to student.

15. Mood: According to the B.E.S.T. standards mood is the “feelings evoked in the reader”

16. Mythological: According to the B.E.S.T. standards, this refers to any culture’s early texts.

17. Religious: According to the B.E.S.T standards, this refers to any text that is significant to a religion – the clarification includes a reference to the Christian Bible.

18. Sociocultural Theory: The theory that an individual’s development is impacted by both their cultural experiences and their social interactions. Vygotsky argues that humans not only use physical tools for learning, but utilize their mind, their social and cultural experiences as well as language, during development (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 25-30)
19. Standards Based: This term is used in reference to curriculum that is created based on a predetermined set of standards or skills.

20. Strands: Within the B.E.S.T. standards, strands are used to organize and categorize the various standards by their applicability. Strands are informational text, literary text, texts across genres, vocabulary, and communication.

21. Text: This term has a wide range of definition, however within this study the term “text” refers only to written and published works.

**Conclusion**

Through the utilization of Vygotsky’s Sociocultural Theory and Bakhtin's theory of Dialogism, this study seeks to understand how, if at all, the Florida’s B.E.S.T 10th grade ELA standards demand that students interact to promote learning. The following chapter will explore the theoretical frameworks and Florida’s B.E.S.T 10th grade ELA standards in depth.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction to the Literature Review

This chapter provides an overview of research on sociocultural theory, dialogism, and dialogic interactions in the classroom as well as the history of the standards-based curriculum of the 10th grade English classroom. The chapter begins with a focus on the sociocultural theory of learning, dialogism, educational applications. This discusses the theoretical concepts that drive this study and will help situate the importance and necessity of this research. Through the standards, the researcher identifies the modes of dialogic interactions demanded in them. The methodological framework of Fairclough’s critical discourse analysis (CDA) is introduced and connected to the theoretical concepts that this study is built on. This chapter finally will provide context for the term “dialogical demands” before the chapter concludes with the specific state standards that this study analyses, both at their content and the adoption history of these standards to the state of Florida.

Sociocultural Theory of Learning

Sociocultural theory is a theory of learning pioneered by Lev Vygotsky in the 20’s. Primarily, this theory of learning is focused on the use of social and cultural aspects—including language as a social and cultural tool—to aid in child development; Vygotsky argues that humans not only use physical tools for learning, but utilize their mind, their social and cultural experiences as well as language, during development (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 25-30). Consequently, every individual’s development is unique to their lived experiences and their interactions with others within a cultural sphere.
The Social

In terms of the classroom applicability, sociocultural theory suggests students learn better through social interactions with their peers. The “Zone of Proximal Development” or “ZPD” is another term coined by Vygotsky that refers to the metaphoric space between what a person can do on their own, and what they could do with help from a more advanced peer or teacher - and it is in this ZPD that learning occurs (1978, p.90). This concept of the ZPD emphasizes the importance of social interactions in terms of learning and development. Bryzzheva (2002) summarizes this phenomenon by writing “every member of the group becomes a teacher and learner at the same time”. Through interactions (in this case, dialogue), students can bridge the ZPD and learn from one another in social situations. Mello (2012) states that to “achieve the potential level of development, learning environments need to be reorganized to foster interaction among peers with different level(s) of competence”.

Sociocultural theory, as applied to the English language classroom, is often used in relation to second language acquisition. This theory, based on the work of Lev Vygotsky, posits that second language acquisition is a result of students’ participation in social use of language and cultural interactions (Aimin, 2013).

This theory emphasizes the role of social practices, such as students utilizing language and discourse, in aiding the student’s successful crossing of the zone of proximal development (ZPD). This concept is particularly relevant in English language arts instruction, where language learning is facilitated through social interaction.

According to Ramadan and Jember (2024), through interaction with peers, learners gain exposure to diverse language styles, accents, and vocabulary. This exposure not only enhances
their linguistic competence but also broadens their understanding of diverse cultures and social contexts, both concepts vital to second language learners' success.

Sociocultural theory provides the framework for understanding how social interactions and cultural contexts shape second language acquisition. It underscores the importance of social practice and peer interaction in facilitating language learning and entrance into the ZPD.

Another application of sociocultural theory to English curricula, is the correlation between writing and this theory as students can integrate their experiences into written words, and able to collaborate with peers for editing or even brainstorming. Behizadeh (2014) posits “that an understanding of literacy as a social practice is the foundation for all sociocultural literacy theories” and Perry (2012) defines literacy as “what people do with reading, writing, and texts in real-world contexts and why they do it” (p. 54). Based on these definitions, English curricula—in terms of this study the standards—function as the social practice as they determine (demand) what students do with texts in real world contexts. VanDerHeide asserts that “learning to write in classrooms is not about learning particular forms; rather, it is learning to participate in social action to achieve particular moves” (2017). These “social actions” and “particular moves” are participating in a specific culture.

Behizadeh’s (2014) paper poses another critical evaluation of English curricula—specifically writing instruction—in terms of sociocultural theory. They point out the timed writing assessments on which students are scored, and the topics that are not immediately relevant to their lives are inaccurate and fail to apply culturally sustaining pedagogies—practices founded in sociocultural theory (Paris & Alim, 2017) – “assessments encouraging culturally sustaining pedagogy must allow students to express their linguistic competence in ways resonant with both home and school literacy practices” (Behizadeh, 2014).
The Cultural

It is not only the social aspects of this theory that contribute to student development, but the culture around the interactions that contribute as well. Vygotsky posits that different cultures will result in different paces of development, depending on the nuances of each culture. Bryzzheva (2002) writes that the “peculiarities of sociocultural and historical factors are responsible for the unique development of thinking and speech in individuals”. The culture surrounding an individual is a culmination of their experiences, family, religion, race, and the historical factors that surround their being.

The importance of culture and development within the classroom is utilized within culturally sustaining pedagogy (CSP). CSP is a term coined by Django Paris (2012), based on sociocultural theory – specifically the cultural aspects of sociocultural theory. CSP calls to the forefront of education the importance of “critically centering...ways of youth and communities of color” and “center cultural, linguistic, and literate pluralism” (Paris & Alim, 2017). When considering the cultural aspect of sociocultural theory within a classroom, CSP calls for pedogeological practices that embrace and sustain a student’s culture to aid in their development, rather than the traditional purpose of schooling -- “to forward the ...assimilationist and often violent White imperial project” (Paris & Alim, 2017).

Nash (2023) observed the practices a teacher employed while utilizing their understanding of culturally sustaining pedagogy while instructing a second-grade multilingual student. The teacher used student interests - crafting and creating– in addition to culturally relevant details – books in Spanish and English, about cultural foods that the student was familiar with- in this case- tamales. Nash concluded that the use of these theories in curriculum, and in the
support of preservice teachers can “provide a more respectful, equitable classroom experience, particularly for those students whose cultures, identities, and literacies have been marginalized in classrooms with more traditional, print-based approaches to knowledge and literacy” (2023).

Annela Teemant and Hausman (2013) conducted a quantitative study of the effectiveness of critical sociocultural perspectives in English classrooms. The study's classrooms used the theory of sociocultural learning and incorporated culturally relevant practices into their classroom dynamics to determine if test scores would be positively impacted. There was a positive correlation for both English Language Learners, and for native English speakers on their exams at the end of the year and their experiences in a socio-culturally responsive classroom. The findings from this study are in line with Kallick’s analysis of dialogue – according to Socrates– “dialog responds with a more and more interesting and sophisticated answer as the sophistication of our questions increase” (Kallick, 1989). The more interaction with one another (social) and the more interaction with language (culture) the more the data suggests that students learned.

The language and use of language creates dialogue, and it is through that dialogue that participants can “actively interact with each other and refine their arguments through the progression of the dialectic, in the way that a written text is simply unable to.” (Yuzawa, 2019).

**Dialogism**

Dialogism is a term that Bakhtin used to describe the tension between conflicting voices and perspectives in literature – specifically in Dostoevsky’s novels *Crime and Punishment* and *The Brothers Karamazov* (Bakhtin, 1984). This tension is created by the participation of individuals with different voices. In application outside of literature, these voices are the participants within a dialogue.
Dialogism as a theory is the theory that people make meaning of the world both through interactions with language and one another. Bakhtin said that “If an answer does not give rise to a new question from itself, it falls out of the dialogue” (1986). The “dialogue” that Bakhtin refers to is the development of meaning. This is similar to Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory; this theory relies on the interaction of various entities for meaning making to occur. According to Bakhtin, dialogue can happen between—not only the voices of a novel and individuals, but also between individuals and texts, and in some cases, dialogic interactions do not require language to occur, but can happen between two entities who grow and play off one another—such as with jazz music. (Maine & Wegerif, 2021).

Dialogue is more than the verbal interaction between two people, it is the meaning making that occurs in various contexts. This dialogue can occur between individuals and texts—as a person reads a text, they engage in a form of dialogue with it as they interpret, question, and make meaning based on their own lived experiences and perspective to develop an understanding of a text. The different discourses or ideological positions within a text can create a dialogue of their own as well. Readers engage with each of these discourses and ideologies and form their own understanding of them based on their relationship to one another. Even between individuals and their cultural or social contexts dialogue occurs. An individual’s understanding of the world around them is shaped by their social and cultural background and previous lived experiences. A dialogue between an individual and their personal social or cultural context influences their perceptions, beliefs, actions, and responses to the world around them (Bakhtin, 1984a; 1984b).
In conclusion, Bakhtin’s concept of dialogue extends beyond verbal interaction between two people. It encompasses the dynamic process of meaning-making that occurs in various contexts, involving individuals, texts, discourses, ideologies, and cultural or social contexts.

**Dialogism and Sociocultural Theory**

Both theories—sociocultural theory and the theory of dialogism—are vital to education and the classroom. They both rely on the interplay of diverse voices, perspectives, and experiences to foster growth, development, and learning. The social interactions that an individual has—with others or through interactions with other entities—build meaning for the individual, and in the case of education, the student. It is the ties to their communities and culture that keeps the meaning making relevant to those in the conversation (Paris & Alim, 2017), but when the interactions that students experience are all the same, or share one ideological stance (Fairclough, 1992), the students' individual experiences don’t necessarily give rise to new questions, so they can fall out of the dialogue (Bakhtin, 1986), and that is where they will no longer be able to span the Zone of Proximal Development (Vygotsky, 1978).

**The Dialogic Classroom**

Based in both the work of Bakhtin and Vygotsky, the dialogic classroom emerges. The dialogic classroom centers on the experiences and voices of students to make meaning and gain a deeper understanding of the world. It contrasts with the monologic classroom, where the teacher’s voice acts as a fount of knowledge, while the dialogic classroom posits a realm where students create meaning from interaction with one another.

The dialogic classroom, dialogic teaching, and dialogically organized instruction are all different ways to label the same concept that “capitalizes on the power of talk to further students'
thinking, learning, and problem solving” (Kim & Wilkinson, 2019). While there is no one definition of what a dialogic classroom is, all the definitions share similar traits (Alexander, 2018). The practice of prioritizing dialogue and collaboration in the classroom is grounded in not only the social but the “role of culture” as well (Kim & Wilkinson, 2019). In the dialogic classroom, an ideal dialogic classroom, students are grouped into heterogeneous groups based on demographics and ability level. The groups develop their own culture and work together, in a small community to build deeper understanding through dialogue while the teacher acts as a facilitator when necessary (Mello, 2012).

According to Alexander (2018), most classrooms still reply on the traditional “closed questions” followed by “recall answers” structure of learning. This model is monologic, relying on the voice of the teacher as the source of knowledge. Alexander’s research into dialogic classrooms yielded evidence that emphasizing social and cultural interactions in the classroom clearly affects students’ learning. In a 2018 study over the course of 20 weeks (about 4 and a half months) of intervention with teachers and students utilizing dialogically supported practices—including conversation and collaboration—“students in the intervention group were two months ahead of their control group peers in standardized tests of English” (Alexander, 2018).

Alexander (2005) outlines the importance of culture on a dialogic classroom in a keynote speech at the International Association for Cognitive Education and Psychology’s 10th International Conference. He defines pedagogy as a “cultural intervention” and asserts that it is dialogue that mediates cultural spaces.

Not only is the dialogic classroom a combination of sociocultural theory and dialogism, but it also creates a learning environment that centers students’ voices in the process of learning
and meaning making. In a dialogic classroom learning is a social process that occurs between students as they make meaning out of interactions with one another.

Not only has dialogic pedagogy been considered in the classroom, but in a 2015 study, Brindley, and Marshall (2015) considered the integration of dialogic assessment as well. Considering the earlier evaluation that standardized tests do not always dialogize with the culture and experiences of the students taking them, a dialogic assessment would provide an honest conversation for students and teachers to measure the change that has occurred as a result of learning through communication. Brindley and Marshall (2015) conclude that “Dialogic assessment is... not a series of processes, but rather an extension of the dialogic classroom” after their experiences in both monologic and dialogic classrooms.

Tong & Ding (2024) refer to the dialogic interactions and assessment in a college classroom as “an interesting and effective method through which students acquire critical thinking skills for processing the knowledge around them”. Their study was aimed to improve “academically low-performing students’ engagement in productive dialogue” and Tong & Ding found that over the course of the classes—students were more engaged, and that more engaged students had a better understanding of the domain (2024).

In summary, the dialogic classroom is a learning environment in which student voices are valued as they are active participants in the learning process—making meaning of the interactions in the classroom. Contrasting with the monologic approach in which learning is seen as a transmission of information from teacher to student, it is based on the theories of dialogism and sociocultural theory and emphasizes the importance of dialogue and social interaction to the
learning process. The dialogic classroom helps to cultivate critical thinking, communication, and problem-solving skills.

**Relationship to the Research**

The effectiveness of dialogue in the classroom is supported by the research into the dialogic classroom, and the theories of Bakhtin—dialogism—and Vygotsky—sociocultural theory. The research question posed in this study: “How do the current Florida English Language Arts standards demand dialogic interactions in Florida’s tenth grade English standards-based curriculum?” is based on the theory that students learn through interaction, specifically dialogic interactions with one another and with their culture. Through the analysis of the standards, the researcher hopes to identify instances where the standards demand dialogic interactions from students to determine if the standards support a dialogic or monologic view of the classroom. This is important because all curriculum in the state of Florida is based on these standards- and despite the pedagogical beliefs of individual teachers, all teachers in the state are obligated to cater instruction to the demands of the standards.

To analyze the standards, the modes of dialogic interaction in them must be determined to assess their frequency and if they are at all demanded by standards.

**Modes of Dialogic Interactions**

According to Bakhtin, at any level dialogic interactions can happen (1984). When analyzing the standards for English language arts, there are three primary interactions that occur in the classroom between students and texts based on the standards. These interactions can be external—verbal—or they can be internal as a student's lived experiences interact with the dominant culture of the classroom and the curriculum being taught.
Student to Student Interaction

The first interaction based on the standards is student to student interaction. Through the communication strand and the ELA Expectations collaboration and communication between students is prioritized. This is the simplest form of dialogism, the conversation between two individuals (Bakhtin, 1981). The conversations demanded (if any) in the standards would allow students to enter the ZPD and gain a deeper level of understanding through that social interaction and dialogue (Bakhtin, 1981; Vygotsky, 1978).

Student to Text Interactions

When utilizing the literature, informational, communication and vocabulary strands, students are interacting with a text in a dialogic manner. Students read and then perform analysis on the texts assigned through their approval on the state’s reading list. The analysis that students perform is their interaction with the words on the page to find deeper or hidden meanings in the text. It is through these standards that students are performing a dialogue with the text.

Text to Student Interactions

Bakhtin posits that novels show us how outside forces influence a person’s being (Morson, 2007). It is with this in mind that the third interaction is developed – the text to student interaction. While students are interacting with texts, the texts interact with the student’s lived experiences. The texts outlined as appropriate for 10th grade English language arts, communicate with the students through the dialogic interactions demanded from the standards. It is the outside forces- the author’s demographics, and the underlying ideology, which dialogizes with the student, allowing or disallowing the student to make connections to their life and experiences, helping them to develop further into their being.
Curriculum as a Discourse

This study will specifically analyze the standards-based curriculum as a form of discourse to determine the dialogic demands of the state standards and how frequently they necessitate dialogic interactions among students, between students and the texts they interact with, and the interaction of the text with the lives of the students through their relevancy to the students. Analyzing a standards-based curriculum as a form of discourse involves examining the demands for dialogic interactions, and the connections the curriculum has with the students' lives. This curricular approach fosters critical thinking, communication, problem solving skills and encourages active participants in the learning process.

Curriculum has been analyzed as a discourse through the lenses of - most frequently – Fairclough (Ahmad & Shah, 2019; Barker, 2021; Ezer et al., 2018; Kopińska, 2020; Wood, 2020). Fairclough’s Critical Discourse Analysis strives to see language as a social practice and investigates the social effects of language (Fairclough et al., 2004). The application of this analysis to education and curriculum—specifically standards-based curriculum—will help analyze the lasting impact that the English standards-based curricula will have on students through the dialogic interactions prescribed within.

An analysis with Fairclough’s Critical Discourse Analysis considers three distinct levels of analysis. Primarily, what the text says – in this case the standards will be analyzed for their demands for dialogic interactions through what they say along. Second, they will be analyzed for how they are distributed, in the case of the standards, this study will analyze the additional documents and the ELA Expectations that are to be taught in tandem with all the other standards. Finally, this study will analyze the “suggested” reading list for the underlying ideological stance,
if any. This underlying stance, if any, will be the cultural influence of the standards, and the culture that the students will interact with as they make meaning in the classroom.

The Basis of Curriculum in Florida

In 2019, Florida’s Governor – Ron DeSantis — issued executive order 19-32 which eliminated Common Core standards from Florida’s classrooms (Office of the Governor, 2019) and established the creation of the “Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking” (Florida Department of Education, 2020). Previously, Florida’s English curriculum was based on the Language Arts Florida Standards (LAFS) (Florida Department of Education, 2020) which were a revision of the Common Core Standards that were adopted in 2010 (Florida Department of Education, 2014). According to Florida state statute Fl.1003.41 “The state academic standards establish the core content of the curricula to be taught in the state and specify the core content knowledge and skills that K-12 public school students are expected to acquire” (The Florida Legislature, 2023). The Florida legislature determined that the curriculum in the state is based on the standards, which, based on the B.E.S.T standards, will be used to ”build knowledge-rich curricula that will nurture students by immersing them in the study of great works of literature, history, and the arts” (Florida Department of Education, 2020).

The Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking Standards

The Florida Department of Education (2020) adopted the new B.E.S.T standards for the English Language Arts classrooms on February 12th, 2020. The B.E.S.T is an acronym that stands for “Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking.”

In a 2020 independent review of the state standards, by the Johns Hopkins Institute for Education Policy, the assertion is made that “In its essential elements, the B.E.S.T standards are
the strongest in ELA currently in use in the United States” (Berner & Steiner, 2020). Further than this though, this review states that these standards should be reviewed in an international light instead of in conjunction with the other states standards for ELA (Berner & Steiner, 2020). Berner and Steiner (2020) highlight that the focuses of the standards are knowledge building, coherence, and instructional guidance—which is built into the standards themselves, and vertically aligned design of the standards.

The B.E.S.T. standards were developed for grades K through 12, with a staggered release into the classrooms. The standards designed for English II, 10th grade classrooms, were implemented for the first time during the 2022-2023 school year. The standards are grouped into different “Strands” – each one centering on a different aspect of ELA learning.

**Strands of Standards**

The strands contained in the Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking include focuses on English Language Arts Expectations, Literature, Informational, Communication and Vocabulary. The standards also contain a recommended reading list for each grade level. Each one of these standards emphasizes a different type of dialogic interaction.

**English Language Arts Expectations**

The English Language Arts Expectations are comprised of six standards that are “overarching skills that run through every component of language arts” (Florida Department of Education, 2020, p.8). According to the Florida Department of Education (FLDOE) these are meant to be utilized across all the other standards and over the gambit of grade levels. These are indicated with the label of “E.E.”
The ELA Expectations highlight all three of the dialogic interactions. Student to student interaction is encouraged as students utilize voice, tone, formatting, and collaboration. They also encourage student interaction with texts as students cite, read, and comprehend. The ELA Expectations also include opportunities for texts to interact with students as students apply their prior knowledge and experiences to their reading as they make inferences. As these are not meant to be taught in isolation but are utilized across all the other standards (Florida Department of Education, 2020, p.8), these add dialogic demands into the other strands of standards.

**Literature Strand**

There are four literature standards labeled with “10.R.1.” followed by the number of the standard. These standards encompass literary elements, theme, poetry, perspective, and point of view (Department of Education, 2020, p.114).

The key elements that these standards focus on are setting plot, characterization, conflict, point of view, theme, and tone. The literary elements standard emphasizes the layers of meaning developed in a text. Similarly, the poetry standard focuses on multiple meanings and ambiguity in poetry, a divergence from the 9th grade standard where students focus on the form of epic poetry. Theme is specifically defined as a universal theme and asks for two or more to be compared in their development throughout the selected text.

The literature strand emphasizes the interaction of students with excerpts of literature. The standards demand that students interact with various texts including poetry, classical literature, and modern adaptations of classical literature, all which are accounted for on the recommended reading list.
**Informational Strand**

Similarly, to the literature standards, there are four standards that apply solely to informational texts. These standards are labeled “10.R.2.” followed by the number of the standard. The skills they address are structure, central idea, purpose, perspective, and argument (Florida Department of Education, 2020, p.115-116).

The structures refer to the organizational methods that authors utilize to structure their arguments. They include structures such as description, sequence, chronological and comparison and contrast. The features refer to graphic features of a text specifically- footnotes, glossary, annotations, captions, photos, etc.

Two of the standards in this strand, central idea and purpose and perspective, delineate the type of text that students should be analyzing—historical American speeches and essays. This specification of genre does have an impact on the suggested reading list for the tenth grade, as all the speeches and essays are by American authors.

The final standard—the argument standard—focuses on the development of two opposing arguments on the same topic, and analyzing the effectiveness of the claims when two different arguments use the same information in differing ways.

While these standards are exclusive to informational texts, they demand dialogic interactions between historic texts and students. Students interact with the text as they analyze the structure and central idea of texts, perspectives of authors and their arguments and the historical cultural events dialogize with student’s current cultural experiences.
Reading Across Genres

The third strand that deals with texts is the “Reading Across Genres” standards, which can be applied across literature and informational texts alike. These standards are labeled with “10.R.3.” followed by the number of the standard. The skills addressed in this strand are broader than the other two strands because they apply to more than one genre. These skills include paraphrasing, rhetoric, figurative language, and comparative reading.

Figurative language and rhetoric are organized into specific terms that students are expected to be familiar with. Figurative language includes nine distinct types of figurative language while rhetoric includes ethos, pathos, and logos in addition to seven additional figurative language terms. Since figurative language and rhetorical appeals are present in both literature and informational texts, it follows that these standards apply to multiple genres.

The comparative reading standard asks for students to compare mythological, classical, or religious texts to adaptations of the same stories. This standard defines classical as being from ancient Greek or Roman origins and mythological as from any early civilization. The term religious text is only defined as “includes works such as the bible” (Florida Department of Education, 2020a). Based on the other definitions in the standard, it is unexpected that the definition of religious text would be limited to a single example and no clear definition. Another contradiction within this standard is the inclusion of mythological and religious texts in a standard that is labeled as “across genres.” Typically, while classical text can include non-fiction speeches and fiction texts, religious and mythological texts are not often considered non-fiction.

Reading across genres is the last of three strands that demand a specific interaction with texts and is the only one of the three that calls for interaction with more than one type of text.
**Communication Strand**

The communication strand contains nine standards, covering five different domains. The label for these standards is “10.C.” followed by the domain and standard. The first domain focuses on writing including argument, expository, narrative, and improving writing. Domain two focuses on oral communication through presentation. This domain has a rubric for each grade level that dictates what effective oral presentation is. Domain three focuses on following standard conventions of English grammar and spelling. Domain four is centered on researching and using information, while domain five is centered on creating and collaborating with multimedia, technology, and communication (Florida Department of Education, 2020, p. 116-118).

These communication standards do not demand dialogic interactions as much as they dictate how those interactions happen. Through domain one and two, writing (student to text) and presentation (student to student), students dialogically interact. Domain three focuses on the quality of the interactions through the grammatical and spelling conventions. Domain four demands research, which means that students will dialogically interact with texts and in domain five they will dialogically interact using technology in those communications.

**Vocabulary Strand**

The vocabulary strand of the B.E.S.T. standards contain three standards that encompass academic vocabulary, morphology, and context and connotation. These standards are labeled with “10.V.1.” followed by the standard number (Florida Department of Education, 2020, p.118).

The demands of these standards focus on students utilizing vocabulary that is grade level appropriate in speaking and writing and interacting with text and their prior knowledge-
specifically through their analysis of context and connotation and the morphology of words. Context clues and word relationships are defined in an additional document within the standards. The morphology standard requires etymology and derivations to determine the meaning of words and phrases. Students are required to have knowledge of word affixes and common etymological roots they might encounter.

**Recommended Reading in the Curriculum**

The 10th grade standards for English Language Arts focus on American authors, the coming-of-age novel, and American speeches. This is reflected in the "suggested” reading list. (Florida Department of Education, 2020, p.162).

This study focuses on the interactions demanded between students and the suggested reading materials, including texts that are novels, stories, speeches, and poems. These texts interact with students' own lived experiences and with those of the authors and characters portrayed through a dialogic interaction of experiences and culture. The analysis will examine the dominant ideologies conveyed through the suggested reading list to assess how they may influence students who engage in dialogic interactions with these texts. As indicated by Paris & Alim (2017) students of color have more success in school when they can enroll in courses that center their experiences. Through the analysis of the standards with Critical Discourse Analysis, the dominant—if anyone is dominant—ideology or cultural perspective will be determined, and, through this analysis and research, teachers will be able to critically select texts that do center the experiences of their students to help them be more successful in education in general. The selection of texts from the suggested reading list plays a crucial role in facilitating these interactions and the subsequent meaning-making process for students. As Bakhtin (1986)
suggests, if students' individual experiences fail to generate new questions or insights, they risk disengaging from the dialogue they are attempting to establish with the texts and consequently lose the opportunity to create meaning from them.

**Conclusion**

Through the utilization of Critical Discourse Analysis, the B.E.S.T standards will be analyzed for dialogic interactions that the standards demand from students. The standards and the recommended reading that is paired with the standards contribute to the social interactions, cultural ideology, and dialogue that is pervasive in the classrooms. This analysis will help to determine how effective the standards are in terms of the dialogues demanded, as sociocultural theory, and the theory of dialogism both propose that learning happens through the interaction of individuals with the people and culture around them.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Research Question and Introduction to Methodology

This study aims to answer the following research question:

“How do the current Florida English Language Arts standards demand dialogic interactions in Florida’s tenth grade English standards-based curriculum?”

This chapter gives an overview of the methodological approach taken, the rationale for the chosen research design, and the underlying theoretical framework of Critical Discourse Analysis through the lens of Fairclough.

Researcher’s Positionality

I was a student in a large central Florida school district for my public-school education. Through middle and high school, I experienced changes in standards, curriculum, and testing from the perspective of a student. I remember spending a lot of time working on assignments independently, rather than with partners or groups. I spent much of my high school experience preferring to work alone rather than in a group, and I felt ill prepared to work with others in a professional capacity when I went to college.

For the last eight years I have been a teacher in high schools in central Florida, across two different districts. I have taught 9th, 10th, and 11th grade English as well as Advanced Placement English. I have been in the classroom as a teacher, experiencing the shift from LAFS standards to the B.E.S.T standards over the last two years and have firsthand experience with the differing demands and expectations of the new standards. As they have not been in use for a long time,
there is less research on them than the common core or LAFS standards, and my interest in them is what sparked the idea for this research.

One of the strengths of the B.E.S.T. ELA standards, that I have not experienced with past standard iterations, is that they incorporate instructional supports directly into the standards (Berner & Steiner, 2020). As I was entering into a new school year, once again attending summer trainings on the standards and other curricular materials, I wondered how the B.E.S.T standards demanded opportunities for dialogic interactions from students in ways that other iterations had not.

As I began my journey in my master’s program, I learned more about dialogism and dialogic interactions in the classroom. I remain enthralled with the idea of student communication with one another and with texts and them making meaning through that communication. As an avid reader myself, I went into teaching to help students develop a passion for texts, in all shapes and forms. Utilizing the opportunities for dialogic interactions within my own classroom means that students are taking the texts they read and interacting with them to create conversation and something new, whether verbal, analytical, creative, or artistic. Students use those interactions to further their understanding of a text and incorporate their own lived experiences, increasing the relevancy of my class to their own lives—and that is how this research question came to fruition:

“How do the current Florida English Language Arts standards demand dialogic interactions in Florida’s tenth grade English standards-based curriculum?”
Research Design

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is “problem-oriented interdisciplinary research” (Wodak & Meyer, 2009) with “roots in rhetoric, text linguistics, anthropology, philosophy, sociopsychology, cognitive science, literary studies and sociolinguistics, linguistics and pragmatics” (Wodak & Meyer, 2001).


Fairclough’s Critical Discourse Analysis

Fairclough’s model of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) uses three levels of simultaneous inquiry (Fairclough, 1995) or a three-dimensional model (Cempa-Danziger, 2023). In this model, writing is analyzed through the text or chosen words, discursive practice, and the effect of words on societal values and social practice (Cempa-Danziger, 2023; Fairclough, 1992, 1995).

When applied to standards-based curriculum, the three layers of analysis are the text or the standards as they are written—the 10th grade Florida Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking in English Language Arts. As they are written the words can be interpreted to
determine what dialogic demands are contained within based on the word choice and structures of the standards.

Discursive practice is found within the use of the standard. According to Fairclough (1992), discursive practice is the “production, distribution, and consumption” of the text. When applied to the Florida standards-based curriculum, this includes the ELA expectation strand because it is taught with all other standards as well as the additional resources that direct educators in the demands of the standards, and in doing so, control their practice and the power they have in the classroom.

The third layer of analysis is the social practice surrounding the discourse (Fairclough, 1992). In the light of standards-based curriculum, these would be the practices that evolve due to the demands of the standards—including the texts that are used and the views of the dominant culture (Jacobs, 2022) that are emphasized through those texts. This study aims to analyze specifically at how a standards-based curriculum is designed to influence (demand) student’s dialogical opportunities in the classroom along with the types of interactions that they have due to the underlying ideological stance of the standards.

The enactment of standards-based curriculum is a social practice—teachers instruct students in a social setting—with a power structure. According to Symonds (2021), the teacher pupil power relationship in higher education is “accepted between both teachers and learners”. The authority of the teacher, the regard to the teacher—from the learner, and the teacher’s ability to encourage and support the learner (Symonds, 2021), all contribute to the continuation of that power relationship. This same dynamic is seen in K-12 classrooms too, especially through mandated curriculum. Jacobs (2022) asserts that “dominant culture is privileged within
instructional practices and curricular choices” and in terms of the Florida classroom, the law dictated that the instructional practices and curricular choices be based in the B.E.S.T Standards (The Florida Legislature, 2023).

This social practice—using a standards-based curriculum—is based off a series of written language—the B.E.S.T. standards, making the lens of Fairclough the most applicable to this research. Richard and Kayumova (2022) assert that “Critical Discourse Analysis can illuminate how educational resources reshape or maintain power structures” (p. 2). The dialogic interactions that are demanded by the standards will comprise the Social Practice and in using CDA, this study aims to determine where the power lies in the B.E.S.T. Standards when focused on the dialogical demands in a standards-based curriculum.

**Sampling**

This study will utilize at the Florida B.E.S.T English Language Arts Standards for 10th grade. This encompasses the twenty-three individual standards, the forty recommended texts for reading, and the supporting documents included in the standards (Florida Department of Education, 2020).

The 10th grade standards were chosen due to the emphasis put on the end of course assessment – the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking—and the graduation requirement of earning a passing score on the assessment (Florida Department of Education, 2023).

**Data Collection and Analysis**

This study will use the 10th grade B.E.S.T. standards and will analyze them using Fairclough’s 3-tiered approach. Applying Fairclough’s three-tiered approach (Fairclough, 1995) means that each of the 10th grade ELA Standards will be analyzed through all three tiers of the framework.
The various strands of the standards will be organized by their role— as a standard, a standard for distribution, or a source to apply to the standards. This allows for the data to be analyzed at all levels, for all three types of discourse interaction.

Each of the standards will be used to answer one or more of the following analysis questions, depending on the strand:

1. Text: What does the standard say? What forms of discourse are demanded by the standard?
   a. This question will consider each of the standards by itself and not at any of the additional standards or texts. The strands that will be analyzed under this question are reading literature, reading informational, communication and the vocabulary strand.

2. Discursive Practice: What forms of discourse are demanded within the discursive practice of the standards?
   a. This question considers all the supports that the B.E.S.T standards contain and how they impact the theoretical utilization of the standards. This includes the additional reference documents referenced within the clarifications for each standard as well as the ELA Expectation strands for the 10th grade within the standards, as the expectations are not to be taught in isolation but in conjunction with the other strands.

3. Social Practice: What ideology do the demanded dialogic interactions within the standard ascribe to?
a. This question will consider, specifically, the texts recommended within the standards. These texts interact with the students’ lived experiences through the experiences of authors and characters, and it is through those interactions that students make meaning.

All this data was compiled and organized into charts that contain the text of the standards, organized by their label as well as an analysis of the dialogic demands. The reading list was also placed into a chart that summarizes and delineates the author’s age, race and gender, year of publication, as well as the type of text to help determine the ideological undercurrent of the B.E.S.T standards, if any.

**Triangulation**

The research question for this study, and the subsequently derived questions are designed to analyze the text and documents of the B.E.S.T. standards for dialogic interactions. This study utilizes multiple theories in conjunction with the methodological approach of Critical Discourse Analysis.

Through the utilization of Fairclough’s CDA (Fairclough, 1995), this study analyzes the discourse of curriculum on multiple levels, rather than just reading the standards-based curriculum as written. Fairclough’s methodology includes the literal – as written standards-based curriculum—and moves forward to further analyze the discursive practice and distribution of the standards-based curriculum as well as any underlying ideological stance that is perpetuated through the enactment of the standards-based curriculum.

The analysis that will occur by utilizing CDA is based on the theories of both Vygotsky and Bakhtin. Sociocultural theory (Vygotsky, 1978) emphasizes that learning occurs through
social interaction and the cultural experiences of an individual. Dialogism emphasizes that learning occurs when two entities are engaged in a dialogue or an exchange of ideas and posits that that dialogue can continue in perpetuity (Bakhtin, 1981). If there is a dialogue, meaning making is happening.

In this study the standards will be analyzed for the demanded social interactions, as well as the cultural—or ideological—stance that is perpetuated by the 10th grade English language arts B.E.S.T standards. The analysis will focus on demands for interaction, specifically dialogic interaction, where meaning making can occur for students. These interactions are not only conversational—between two students, but also occur between texts and students, and vice versa (Bakhtin, 1981).

The utilization of multiple theories allows for an analysis of dialogic demands within a standards-based curriculum, with consideration of the cultural influence of the dominant ideologies that are present in the curriculum.

**Limitations**

While this study is focused on one specific element of curriculum—namely the 10th grade English Language Arts Standards in Florida—there are limitations to this research. While this focus can provide detailed insights, it may miss the broader context of how dialogic interactions are introduced and developed in earlier grades or how they transition to higher education. Findings from this study cannot be easily generalized beyond the Florida educational context as other states have different standards and practices based on their educational law.
**Delimitations**

External factors that could influence the implementation of standards, such as variations in school resources, teacher training, or changes in educational policies, are also not considered within the confines of this study, as this study focuses solely on the standards as written and not implementation. It is because of this study's nature that the perspectives of various stakeholders such as students, parents, or administrators are left out of this analysis—in favor of analyzing the standards as written, not as they are interpreted. Finally, the evaluation of "demand" for dialogic interactions involves some subjectivity, as it relies on interpretations of standards as written. While the supporting documents in the appendices of the B.E.S.T. Standards—that are directly referenced in the 10th grade standards and reading list is available to clarify, there will be no outside additions to the data pool from other grade level bands or subjects.

**Ethical Considerations**

An application for conducting research was submitted to the Institutional Review Board of the University of Central Florida and the determination of the application was that the research does not involve human subjects. All data points are to be collected from publicly available data.
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

Introduction

This chapter provides a report of the findings for this Critical Discourse Analysis of the 10th grade B.E.S.T. English Language Arts standards for their demands of dialogic interactions. This study utilized the CDA model through the structures of Fairclough (1995) and analyzed the following research question on three distinct levels.

Findings

Research Question

The following research question was used when applying the three levels of Fairclough’s (1995) analysis.

“How do the current Florida English Language Arts standards demand dialogic interactions in Florida’s tenth grade English standards-based curriculum?”

Each level considered a different aspect of the B.E.S.T. Standards for dialogic demands – or demands that encouraged students to work with texts or one another in such a way that a conversation – or influence from both directions – was achieved.

The first level of inquiry is what the text says on a literal level. According to Fairclough (1992), this is how the text is created.

Level 1: What the Text Says

This level of analysis was through what the text said, literally. This only focused on the four strands of standards – Reading Literature, Reading Information, Communication, and Vocabulary—the text of the standards themselves. Each standard was analyzed for demands that
fit any or all of three types of dialogic interactions—student to text, text to student, or student to student. The following table displays an overview of which standards demanded which interactions. Cells marked with an “X” indicate a demand for that type of discourse within the written portion of the standard. Cells marked with a “/” indicate discourse that would occur not as a demand, but through the act of meeting the demand of the standard, there is potential for discourse to occur in a different, not explicitly demanded mode of interaction. Within the 10th grade base standards, there are only 2 definitive interactions of students with one another and 2 potential interactions. All but one standard demands textual interactions of students.

*Table 1: Level 1 - Dialogic Interactions Demanded in the Standards*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Types of Discourse</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student to Text</td>
<td>Text to Student</td>
<td>Student to Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.1.1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.1.2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.1.3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.1.4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.2.1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.2.2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.2.3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.2.4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.3.1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.3.2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.3.3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Types of Discourse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student to Text</td>
<td>Text to Student</td>
<td>Student to Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.3.4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.1.1</td>
<td>No 10th Grade Standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.1.2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.1.3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.1.4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.1.5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.2.1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.4.1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.5.1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.5.2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.1.1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.1.2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.1.3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level 2: How the Standards Are Used**

The second level of analysis continues to analyze the standards- this time utilizing the supporting documentation provided in the B.E.S.T. Standards – to determine how they influence the consumption of the standards. Table 2 outlines the supporting documentation and their demands including the standards that reference each document. Table 3 displays the analysis of the ELA Expectations – which according to the B.E.S.T Standards—are not standards meant to
be taught in isolation, but to be taught with all other standards (Florida Department of Education, 2020). The “X” indicates the types of discourse supported by the specific support standard.

Table 2: Level 2 – Discursive Practice – Determining How Documents Dictate Discourse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Document</th>
<th>Standard Reference</th>
<th>Description of Document</th>
<th>Discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literary Periods</td>
<td>10.R.1.4</td>
<td>Outlines the literary periods that texts can be associated with</td>
<td>Not applicable – Does not define a type of discourse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical Appeals</td>
<td>10.R.2.3, 10.R.3.4, 10.C.1.3</td>
<td>Defines, describes, and provides examples of the Rhetorical Appeals referred to in the B.E.S.T Standards.</td>
<td>Not applicable – Does not define a type of discourse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical Devices</td>
<td>10.R.2.3, 10.R.3.4</td>
<td>Defines, describes, and provides examples of the Rhetorical Devices referred to in the B.E.S.T Standards.</td>
<td>Not applicable – Does not define a type of discourse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Figurative Language</td>
<td>10.R.3.1, 10.R.3.4, 10.V.1.3</td>
<td>Defines, describes, and provides examples of the Figurative Language referred to in the B.E.S.T Standards.</td>
<td>Not applicable – Does not define a type of discourse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Types</td>
<td>10.C.1.2, 10.C.1.3, 10.C.1.4</td>
<td>Defines the types of writing students in grades K-12 will encounter in the B.E.S.T. standards.</td>
<td>Defines text/student discourse but does not demand that students engage in it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative Techniques</td>
<td>10.C.1.2, 10.C.1.3</td>
<td>Defines the types of narrative techniques students in grades K-12 will encounter in the B.E.S.T. standards.</td>
<td>Defines text/student discourse but does not demand that students engage in it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaborative Techniques</td>
<td>10.C.1.3</td>
<td>Defines the types of elaborative techniques students in grades K-12 will encounter in the B.E.S.T. standards.</td>
<td>Defines text/student discourse but does not demand that students engage in it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Document</td>
<td>Standard Reference</td>
<td>Description of Document</td>
<td>Discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Oral Communication Rubric</td>
<td>10.C.2.1</td>
<td>Delineates the proficiency levels of a student’s oral communication from emerging to mastery at each grade level.</td>
<td>Defines that mastery of student-to-student communication should be thorough, organized, and effective. The existence of this rubric and reference to it indicates a demand for oral communication in the 10th grade ELA classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention Progression by Grade Level</td>
<td>10.C.3.1</td>
<td>Defines, describes, and provides a grade level progression of the ELA conventions referred to in the B.E.S.T Standards.</td>
<td>Outlines the quality of the written communications students should abide by but does not demand any specific interactions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context Clues</td>
<td>10.V.1.3</td>
<td>Defines and provides the types of context clues in text as they are referred to in the B.E.S.T Standards.</td>
<td>Not applicable – Does not define a type of discourse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Relationships</td>
<td>10.V.1.3</td>
<td>Defines and provides the types of word relationships in text as they are referred to in the B.E.S.T Standards.</td>
<td>Not applicable – Does not define a type of discourse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Complexity</td>
<td>ELA.K12.EE.2.1</td>
<td>Defines the qualitative, quantitative, and student-centered expectations for choosing a text for a grade level.</td>
<td>Not applicable – Does not define a type of discourse.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Level 2—Discourse in the ELA Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELA Expectation</th>
<th>Summary of Expectation</th>
<th>Student to Text</th>
<th>Text to Student</th>
<th>Student to Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELA.K12.EE.1.1</td>
<td>Cite evidence to explain and justify reasoning.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA.K12.EE.2.1</td>
<td>Read and comprehend grade-level complex texts proficiently.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA.K12.EE.3.1</td>
<td>Make inferences to support comprehension.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA.K12.EE.4.1</td>
<td>Use appropriate collaborative techniques and active listening skills when engaging in discussions in a variety of situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA.K12.EE.5.1</td>
<td>Use the accepted rules governing a specific format to create quality work.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA.K12.EE.6.1</td>
<td>Use appropriate voice and tone when speaking or writing.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level 3: Ideological Stance of the Standards**

The third and final level of analysis aims to identify the ideological stance of the standards through ideologies that the dialogic interactions perpetuate. When observing the B.E.S.T Standards and how they are utilized by teachers – the recommended reading list is the source of dialogic interactions (student—text and text—student) in addition to being the topic of interactions (student-student). Table 4 lists all 39 texts on the suggested reading list, and
delineates the text type, year published, author’s age, race, sex, and any other details that are relevant to the ideological stance of the author. Most of the authors are white, and most of them are men. There are several religious figures—all from Christian denominations. In addition, most of the suggested texts are fiction.

Table 4: Level 3—Social Practice of the Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>F/N</th>
<th>Text Type</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Constantly Risking Absurdity”</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Poem</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Thanatopsis”</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Poem</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The Story of Pygmalion”</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Short Story</td>
<td>AD 8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Samuel from Bible</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Short Story</td>
<td>Ukn</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Tale of Two Cities</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Novel</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cry, The Beloved Country</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Novel</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fahrenheit 451</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Novel</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankenstein</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Novel</td>
<td>1818</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatea</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Novel</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord of the Flies</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Novel</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macbeth</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Play</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midsummer Night’s Dream</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Play</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of Mice and Men</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Novel</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozymandias</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Poem</td>
<td>1818</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prometheus Unbound</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Play</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pygmalion</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Play</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Crucible</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Play</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Piano Lesson</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Play</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Red Badge of Courage</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Novel</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Scarlet Letter</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Novel</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Second Coming</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Poem</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncle Tom’s Cabin</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Novel</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Rasin in the Sun</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Play</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Checkers” Speech</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Cross of Gold”</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Farewell Address”</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Farwell Speech”</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This chapter outlined the research into the 10th grade ELA standards, to determine what dialogic interactions are demanded by the standards. The data spans three levels of analysis – what the standards say, how the supporting documents and standards direct the interactions, and how the reading list directs the ideological experiences of the dialogic interactions.

The following chapter will discuss the findings, implications, and opportunities for further research as applied to the research question:

“How do the current Florida English Language Arts standards demand dialogic interactions in Florida’s tenth grade English standards-based curriculum?”
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary of Research

This study was designed to analyze the 10th Grade Florida B.E.S.T. English Language Arts standards, through the theoretical lens of Fairclough (1992) to determine how they demand dialogic interactions from students. In utilizing Fairclough’s Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), the discourse—in this case the standards—are analyzed on three levels, each applied to a different area of the B.E.S.T standards. Primarily, CDA analyzes what the text says—the standards themselves—followed by how it is distributed—the ELA Expectations and the additional documents referenced in the standards—and then the social practice that stems from the text in its application—the texts on the “suggested” reading list. The following results will go through an analysis on all three levels for the 10th grade ELA B.E.S.T Standards.

Interpretation of Results

Level 1: What the Text Says

This level analyzed the standards themselves and their clarifications, searching for three types of dialogic interactions—student to text, text to student, and student to student—with the analysis and how they are explicitly demanded by the standards.

Summary of Findings

The first level of inquiry for the research question analyzed the standards as they are written and what dialogic interactions they demanded from students. Dialogic interactions were defined as student interaction with a text (student to text), textual interactions with students lived experiences or past learning experiences (text to student) and as student interaction with one another (student to student).
Within the standards, all but two of them demand that a student interact with a text. Students are asked to analyze, explain, and determine various details or elements of the writing structures in a text or multiple texts.

The second type of discourse, text to student, was more implied than explicitly demanded in the standards. Explicitly, there is nothing that indicates that a text will interact with the student as a reader in ten of the standards, however, since students are doing analysis of a text, it is natural that their previous experience would integrate into the way they read and experience the text. While not an explicit demand, students have the potential to make connections or relate to a text on their own.

Explicitly, the standards that ask students to determine mood (R.1.1 and R.3.1), explicitly demand that students determine the “feelings that are evoked in the reader” - which means that students are using their knowledge and experiences with emotions, connotation, and word choice to determine what the text brings out for the reader- in this case the student.

The communication strand of standards demands more interaction of text to student, as this strand focuses on the creation of writing. Whether in the creation of writing narrative (C.1.2), argument (C.1.3), or expository (C.1.4) essays, students use texts that they have read, combined with their own experiences, and understanding to develop essays. They use feedback to improve writing, considering the input from texts and experiences (C.1.5). As well as using information and research to develop and share information (C.2.1, C.4.1, C.5.1, and C.5.2).

Student-to-student interaction was only found to be demanded in two standards. In C.1.5 - improving writing based on feedback and in C.5.2 - using technology collaboratively. There were opportunities for student-to-student interactions in C.2.1--oral presentation and in C.5.1--
creating digital presentations, but those standards also allow for presentation to a teacher or the creation of a standalone digital experience, rather than interaction with peers, and because of this, dialogic student to student interaction was not deemed demanded by this standard.

**Analysis**

Considering the exhaustive and rigorous nature of the B.E.S.T. standards (Berner & Steiner, 2020), there were only a few instances of interactions between students, but there were plentiful opportunities for students to interact with texts.

The consistent demand for students to interact with texts means that students will—in theory—be exposed to quite a wide range of literature over the course of 10th grade. They will be exposed to “historical American speeches and essays” as well as the coming-of-age story. They will analyze ambiguity and read mythological texts from early civilizations and religious texts (Florida Department of Education, 2020). This exposure to a theoretically broad range of text should indicate that students are broadening their cultural repertoire and understanding of other people who have diverse lived experiences.

**Level 2: Distribution and Utilization**

The second level of Fairclough’s analysis is the distribution and application of the standards. When applied to B.E.S.T, this is created through the ELA Expectations and the additional documentation cited in the standards. These documents and the Expectations help teachers to determine how and what to apply to the standards within their classrooms (Florida Department of Education, 2020).
Summary of Findings

Of the additional documents referenced in the standards—12 of them—none of them demanded any sort of interaction.

The “Writing Types,” “Narrative” and “Elaborative Techniques” documents all describe types of writing; however, they do not demand any type of interaction. The “Conventions Progression” chart delineates the expectations for the quality of the writing completed by 10th graders, and the “Secondary Oral Communication Rubric” delineates what is considered proficient for communication, but none of these by themselves demand any type of dialogic interaction. One may argue that these documents imply that students should be interacting with text and one another via writing and oral communication; however, there is no explicit demand in these documents, which was the focus of this study.

According to the B.E.S.T. Standards—the ELA Expectations are “overarching skills that run through every component of language arts” and “should be us[ed] throughout the strands” (Florida Department of Education, 2020); it is because of this, they were considered part of the distribution and utilization of the B.E.S.T Standards.

Within the “ELA Expectations,” one of them (EE 1.1) focuses on citing evidence. The clarification for this expectation emphasizes both written and verbal communication with peers and instructors. This is the only one of the EE’s that explicitly demands dialogic interaction on all three levels.

EE.2.1 and EE.3.1 both demand dialogic interactions between students and text and text to student. These focus on reading and comprehending text proficiently and making inferences based on texts, respectively.
EE.4.1 demands appropriate collaborative techniques for students – student to student dialogic interaction. This is the only dialogic interaction that is demanded from this standard.

EE.5.1 demands students to text interaction as they create “quality” work. This expectation only demands that students interact with a text, not necessarily that they dialogize in any other manner.

EE.6.1 focuses on students using appropriate voice when speaking or writing. This expectation demands that students interact with text, and that they interact with one another utilizing two types of dialogic interaction.

**Analysis**

Where there was a deficit in the dialogic interactions in the standards, and in the additional reference documents, this is more than made up for in the ELA Expectations. The ELA Expectations, as these are use in the distribution of all the other standards, bring with them the dialogic interactions between students when the other standards are being applied to a text. As these standards are meant to be utilized in conjunction with the other standards, they are effectively supplemental and allow any other standard to utilize dialogic interactions in the classroom.

Regardless of the standards that students are practicing, through the utilization of the EE’s, students have opportunities, through the demands within the EEs, to interact with one another and expand their dialogic interactions with text.
Level 3: Ideology of the Standards

The third level of analysis focuses on the ideologies conveyed through a text, in this case the 10th grade B.E.S.T. standards. Considering the heavy focus on student to text interactions in the standards, the ideological stance of the standards for the sake of this study, is based in the texts that students interact with.

According to Berner and Steiner (2020), the list of texts in the B.E.S.T standards needs to be clarified in terms of what is required reading. The reading in the B.E.S.T standards is currently labeled as suggested, and there is no clarification on what an appropriate number of selections would be, however the texts that are suggested share several glaring similarities that highlight the ideological stance of the standards.

Summary of Findings

When discussing the ideological stance within the texts provided as suggested reading this study analyzed the authors of the texts that students would potentially interact with.

Primarily, the texts are written by men. Only six women are represented in the suggested reading. Overwhelmingly, out of thirty-nine (39) suggested texts, only eight (8) are authored by people of color – one native voice and seven Black voices are represented in the suggested texts. When considering the intersection of race and gender, two Black women are represented on the list, one with a play and one a historical speech. Four of the suggested readings were published after 1970, everything else before –a majority in the 1800’s. The only suggested religious text is the bible, and there are no myths from any early civilizations suggested. The sermon of a Christian preacher is included on the suggested list as well.
**Analysis**

Taking into consideration all the data from the authors, that the ideological stance of the 10th grade ELA B.E.S.T standards is predominantly that of the Christian, White, American man. If teachers chose texts at random from this list to apply the standards to, there is a significant chance that they could ignore authors of color, and women writers completely.

For students to have authentic dialogue with a text, they need to see themselves in the texts they read. Students, as they read, make connections with text, and strive to find themselves within the pages. For their interactions to be authentic and engaging, they need to build connections with the author or the story (Bishop, 1990; Ladson-Billings, 1995). While there are white Christian men in the classrooms, many classrooms are far more diverse than that.

According to the Florida Department of Education (2020b) only 36% of 10th graders in the state of Florida are white, while 21% of students are Black or African American. Another 36% of students in the Florida 10th grade are Hispanic or Latino, an identity that is not at all represented on the reading list. The other 7% of tenth grade students in the state are Asian, Native, Pacific Islander, or identify with 2 or more races. Only one text on the list represents one of these identities.

Considering the demographics of the reading list, it does not reflect the same demographic makeup as the students in the state. It is also important to consider these are the demographics on a state level and individual districts will have different demographics; even though all students in the state are exposed to the same limiting list.
Implications

Overall, it is safe to say that the 10th grade Florida B.E.S.T standards do demand that students engage in dialogic interactions in three different ways. There is a rigorous demand for students to engage with text—considering the frequency of the interactions that students have with them—and for them to engage with one another—courtesy of the ELA Expectations. The inclusion of an oral presentation rubric reinforces the demand that students speak and interact with one another. The standards provide a demand that students interact with a variety of texts and that they compose a variety of written works themselves, including through the utilization of technology and multimedia.

The ideological stance that is dominant in the standards does leave room for improvement. The glaring lack of diverse voices, and the dated texts that are suggested leave little room for students to relate to and truly dialogize with the texts in a way that will allow them to make meaning for themselves. Paris & Alim (2017) defined the traditional purpose of schooling as wanting to “assimilate and perpetuate a violent, white, imperial project”. Considering the white imperial ideological stance that the standards ascribe to, even if unintentionally, the assumption can be made that the standards in the B.E.S.T. list are designed to assimilate students to a singular cultural perspective, that silences authors of color, and therefore silences students of color.

Not only is the suggested reading incomplete in this way, but the suggested reading does not completely support the rigor of the standards it was designed to uphold. Although the standards demand “classical, mythological, and religious texts” only Greek and Roman texts are suggested. There are no myths from any other culture or civilization, nor are there any religious
texts outside the *Bible* on the reading list. This limitation, and lack of clarification, can limit the texts chosen in a classroom. While teachers can explicitly pick biblical stories and passages to introduce in the classroom—there is even one book of the *Bible* listed explicitly in the recommended reading—there is no specification that teachers can pick passages from the *Torah*, *Qur’an*, *Tripitaka*, or the *Bhagavad Gita*. The only religious text that is acknowledged as a religious text in the B.E.S.T. standards is the Christian *Bible*.

**Personal Experiences**

As the reading list is “suggested” one may argue that it is not truly an ideological representation of the standards. I would argue that the suggestions are clearly representative from one ideological standpoint, despite the attempts at the standards to be wider reaching and more rigorous than previous iterations.

As a teacher in a public school—in Florida no less—it is important that I share my experiences with the standards as I explore their demands. In the state of Florida there have been several political moves made to limit the curriculum in the state.

In 2022, the Florida State Legislature passed HB 1467, HB 1557, and in 2023, House Bill 1069. House Bill 1476 is referred to as a “curriculum transparency” bill. It calls for established procedures to any material (instructional or otherwise) used in the classroom that faces parental objections. HB 1557 and HB 1557 allow more parental objections to curricula and books in the classroom (The Florida Senate, 2022a; The Florida Senate, 2022b; The Florida Senate, 2023).

It is because of these bills, it has been my experience, that teachers, administrators, and even district level professionals treat the suggested reading list as the only source of texts that teachers can choose from. These limitations are placed on teachers out of concern for parental
objections to the texts in the classroom, and as a result, classrooms are limited to the texts that are selected as “suggested” in the B.E.S.T standards.

For a state concerned with the indoctrination of students, it is surprising that the underlying ideological viewpoints of the standards are so strongly correlated with one perspective and experience.

**For Teachers**

This research can and should be considered on a classroom level by teachers and administrators. The importance of dialogic interactions in the classroom, and the dialogic demands in the standards, is reflected in the ability of dialogic interactions ability to help students to learn and retain information more permanently than in a teacher centered classroom (Chaiklin, 2003; Coghlan & Brydon-Miller, 2014; Holquist, 2003; Nesari, 2015; Repko, 2022; Reynolds, 2019).

The standards, and their supporting documentation, are rigorous, and provide ample opportunity for students to participate in a variety of dialogic interactions. Teachers should be cognizant of the integration of the ELA Expectations, as these enhance the dialogic demands of the other strands of standards.

Regarding the ideological standpoint of the standards, teachers should know the underlying patterns they see in selecting texts for their classrooms. To reach the demands of the standards, texts should be chosen that are not necessarily on the suggested reading list.
Standard Revisions

In line with Berner and Steiner (2020), based on the analysis in this research, I would agree that these standards are rigorous. There is room for improvement in the suggested reading. While Berner and Steiner (2020) suggested clarification on the list of reading—I would suggest additional texts, consisting of more diverse authors and perspectives as well as additional texts that apply to the standards—more poetry, more coming of age stories, myths, and religious texts from various religions that are acknowledged as such.

Recommendations for Future Research

When considering how this research can be expanded in the future, acknowledging the limitations of this study is important. This study analyzed, specifically, the 10th grade standards, documents, and suggested reading lists and the interactions demanded within. The other grade levels from K through 12th grade have yet to be studied through Critical Discourse Analysis. The vertical progression through the standards, and how the ELA Expectations interact with the standards at the various levels is also an avenue for research.

Another question that this research raises is what the ideological stances of the suggested texts across the B.E.S.T standards in all grade levels. Is the 10th grade, the only grade level with limited perspectives suggested or is there a different dominant ideological standpoint in the other grade levels? As the B.E.S.T. standards have not been in circulation for a significant number of years, looking at the effects of the standards on graduates is also an area of interest for future research.

As this study focused on Critical Discourse Analysis of the standards, and only incorporated the viewpoint of the researcher into the analysis, there is also room for research on
teacher perspectives and student perceptions of the B.E.S.T standards as well as how they implement or react to the suggested reading list in the classroom. As the researcher’s perspective is limited to one district, analyzing the use and adoption of the standards across the state is of interest as well.

**Conclusion**

The 10th Grade Florida B.E.S.T ELA Standards aim to foster excellent student thinking and prepare students for college and career. In doing so they demand dialogic interactions in three distinct dynamics.

Student-to-Text interactions involve students engaging directly with the text they are studying. It encourages critical thinking, analysis, and interpretation. Students are expected to actively read, analyze, and respond to various types of texts, including literature, informational texts, and multimedia. Through a variety of texts and their own lived experiences students practice their analytical skills and make meaning of works. Even vocabulary is not taught in isolation but through a dialogue with texts.

In text-to-student interactions, the text itself is central. The standards emphasize close reading, evidence, and understanding the author’s purpose, tone, mood, and style. To do this, a dialogue occurs between the text and the student. Students are asked to extract meaning from the text on multiple levels and engage in discussions, debates, and written responses based on their understanding of the text. The text interacts with the experiences of the students as students make connections to modernity or to their own lives.

Student-to-student dynamics involves collaborative learning and discussion among students. Through peer interactions, students share their interpretations, perspectives, and
insights. There is a specific strand, the ELA Expectations, which emphasizes the importance of these interactions—and these expectations are taught in conjunction with all other standards. Students learn to listen actively, respond thoughtfully, and engage in respectful dialogue. Group discussions, debates, and collaborative projects are encouraged, and it is through these dialogic interactions that students create meaning rather than just transfer knowledge from teacher to student.

The ideological stance that was determined, while not explicitly endorsed by the B.E.S.T. standards, does influence the dialogic interactions that students participate in, especially because there is such a heavy focus on the dialogues between texts and students. The recommended reading provides a limited perspective. Most of the texts are predominantly white, Christian, American, male authors and the worldview of this demographic is reinforced through the recommended reading list. To combat this, teachers should critically consider engaging students with a diverse range of texts in addition to the recommended reading list. To expand student’s ability to dialogize and make meaning of texts, the texts that they study should reflect voices, identities, and perspectives that are present in the classroom. This means the inclusion of works by authors from different racial, ethnic, religious, gender, and socio-economic backgrounds. Through the critical analysis of texts through dialogic interactions with them, students will develop a more nuanced understanding of the world as they begin to question assumptions and recognize underlying biases.

In conclusion, while the B.E.S.T. Standards provide a framework for three different types of dialogic interactions, educators play a crucial role in ensuring that these interactions promote inclusivity, critical thinking, and a broader understanding of diverse viewpoints. By intentionally
selecting texts and facilitating meaningful discussions, educators can mitigate any ideological biases and create a more enriching learning experience for students. Through the inclusion of diverse texts, from diverse voices that reflect the diversity in the classroom, students can make meaning of their world and become more well-rounded citizens.
APPENDIX A: DATA TABLES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Standard Text</th>
<th>Discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literary Elements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA.10. R.1.1: Analyze how key elements enhance or add layers of meaning and/or style in a literary text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Clarifications:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarification 1: Key elements of a literary text are setting, plot, characterization, conflict, point of view, theme, and tone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarification 2: For layers of meaning, any methodology or model may be used as long as students understand that text may have multiple layers and that authors use techniques to achieve those layers. A very workable model for looking at layers of meaning is that of I.A. Richards:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Layer 1) the literal level, what the words actually mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Layer 2) mood, those feelings that are evoked in the reader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Layer 3) tone, the author’s attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Layer 4) author’s purpose (interpretation of author’s purpose as it is often inferred)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarification 3: Style is the way in which the writer uses techniques for effect. It is distinct from meaning but can be used to make the author’s message more effective. The components of style are diction, syntax, grammar, and use of figurative language. Style helps to create the author’s voice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| R.1.2 | <strong>Universal Themes</strong> | |
| <strong>Student to Text:</strong> Students are expected to not only read and understand the reading, but they will also use their own experiences and prior knowledge to build a deeper understanding of the text in terms of mood, tone, and purpose. | <strong>Student to Text:</strong> Yes. Student interaction with the text, with the intent to find layers of meaning, indicates student interaction with the text and the probable interaction of the text with students' past experiences. Specifically, in the search for mood, students are expected to determine the feelings that the text evokes within them and how those feelings are developed. |
| <strong>Student to Student:</strong> Not Applicable, nothing in the standard demands the interaction of students with one another. | <strong>Student to Text:</strong> Students are required to not only read and... |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELA.10. R.1.2</th>
<th>Analyze and compare universal themes and their development throughout a literary text.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Clarifications:</td>
<td>understand the reading, but they will also use their own experiences and prior knowledge to build a deeper understanding of the text while tracking more than one central idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarification 1: A universal theme is an idea that applies to anyone, anywhere, regardless of cultural differences. Examples include but are not limited to an individual’s or a community’s confrontation with nature; an individual’s struggle toward understanding, awareness, and/or spiritual enlightenment; the tension between the ideal and the real; the conflict between human beings and advancements in technology/science; the impact of the past on the present; the inevitability of fate; the struggle for equality; and the loss of innocence.</td>
<td>Text to Student: Probable- but not able to make a definitive determination on this standard alone. Student interaction with the text, with the intent to find central, indicates student interaction with the text and the probable interaction of the text with students' past experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student to Student:</strong> Not Applicable, nothing in the standard demands the interaction of students with one another.</td>
<td><strong>Student to Text:</strong> Students are required to not only read and understand the reading, but they will also use their own experiences and prior knowledge to think critically about the coming-of-age experience and how it is developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student to Student:</strong> Probable- but not able to make a definitive determination on this standard alone. Student interaction with the text, with the intent to analyze the development of the “coming of age” text, indicates student interaction with the text and the probable interaction of the text with students' past experiences.</td>
<td><strong>Text to Student:</strong> Probable- but not able to make a definitive determination on this standard alone. Student interaction with the text, with the intent to analyze the development of the “coming of age” text, indicates student interaction with the text and the probable interaction of the text with students' past experiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Perspective and Point of View**

| R.1.3 | ELA.10. R.1.3: Analyze coming of age experiences reflected in a text and how the author represents conflicting perspectives. |
| R.1.4 | *Poetry*  
ELA.10. R.1.4: Analyze how authors create multiple layers of meaning and/or ambiguity in a poem.  
**Benchmark Clarifications:**  
- Clarification 1: For more information, see Literary Periods. |
| R.2.1 | *Structure*  
ELA.10. R.2.1: Analyze the impact of multiple text structures and the use of features in text(s).  
**Benchmark Clarifications:**  
- Clarification 1: Students will evaluate the use of the following structures: description, problem/solution, |
| R.2.2 | **Central Idea**  
ELA.10. R.2.2: Analyze the central idea(s) of historical American speeches and essays. | **Student to Text**: Students are required to not only read and understand the reading, but they will also use their own experiences and prior knowledge of American history to think critically about how central ideas are developed across multiple texts.  
**Text to Student**: Probable- but not able to make a definitive determination on this standard alone. Student interaction with the text, with the intention of analyzing central idea(s) indicates student interaction with the text and the probable interaction of the text with student's past experiences.  
**Student to Student**: Not Applicable, nothing in the standard demands the interaction of students with one another. |
| R.2.3 | **Purpose and Perspective**  
ELA.10. R.2.3: Analyze an author’s choices in establishing and achieving purpose(s) in historical American speeches and essays. | **Student to Text**: Students are required to not only read and understand the reading, but they will also use their own experiences and prior |
### R.2.4 Argument

**ELA.10. R.2.4:** Compare the development of two opposing arguments on the same topic, evaluating the effectiveness and validity of the claims, and analyzing the ways in which the authors use the same information to achieve different ends.

**Benchmark Clarifications:**
- **Clarification 1:** Validity refers to the soundness of the arguments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark Clarifications:</th>
<th>knowledge to think critically about the author’s choices – specifically Rhetorical Appeals-in developing perspective in the text.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Clarification 1: In this grade level, students are using and responsible for the appeals of logos, ethos, and pathos.</td>
<td><strong>Text to Student:</strong> Probable- but not able to make a definitive determination on this standard alone. Student interaction with the text, with the intention of analyzing the impact of text structure, indicates student interaction with the text and the probable interaction of the text with students’ past experiences and learning regarding American historical documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarification 2: See Rhetorical Appeals and Rhetorical Devices</td>
<td><strong>Student to Student:</strong> Not Applicable, nothing in the standard demands the interaction of students with one another.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student to Text:** Students are required to not only read and understand the reading, but they will also use their own experiences and prior knowledge to think critically about both arguments and how the same information is used for different purposes.

**Text to Student:** Probable- but not able to make a definitive determination on this standard alone. Student interaction with the text, with the intention of analyzing the impact and use of the same evidence to reach different purposes, the text, and the probable interaction of the text with student's past experiences and learning.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R.3.1</th>
<th>Interpreting Figurative Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELA.10. R.3.1:</strong> Analyze how figurative language creates mood in text(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Clarifications:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarification 1: Figurative language use that students will analyze are metaphor, simile, alliteration, onomatopoeia, personification, hyperbole, meiosis (understatement), allusion, and idiom. Other examples can be used in instruction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarification 2: See Secondary Figurative Language.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R.3.2</th>
<th>Paraphrasing and Summarizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELA.10. R.3.2:</strong> Paraphrase content from grade-level texts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Clarifications:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarification 1: Most grade-level texts are appropriate for this benchmark.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| R.3.3 | **Comparative Reading**  
ELA.10. R.3.3: Analyze how mythical, classical, or religious texts have been adapted.  

**Benchmark Clarifications:**  
- Clarification 1: The classical source texts for this benchmark should be from ancient Greece or Rome’s Classical period (1200 BCE–455 CE). Mythical texts for this benchmark can be from any civilization’s early history. Religious texts for this benchmark include works such as the Bible.  

| R.3.4 | **Understanding Rhetoric**  
ELA.10. R.3.4: Analyze an author’s use of rhetoric in a text.  

**Benchmark Clarifications:**  
- Clarification 1: Students will analyze the appropriateness of appeals and the utilizing their skills to pare down the text into the most important key details.  

| Student to Student: Not Applicable, nothing in the standard demands the interaction of students with one another.  

| Text to Student: Students are required to read and understand the reading, but they will also use their own experiences and prior knowledge to think critically about the adaptation of key elements into newer texts.  

| Text to Student: Probable- but not able to make a definitive determination on this standard alone. Student interaction with the text, with the intention of analyzing the ways in which classical and religious texts have been adapted, and the probable interaction of the text with students' past experiences and learning regarding argument development.  

| Student to Student: Not Applicable, nothing in the standard demands the interaction of students with one another.  

| Text to Student: Probable- but not able to make a definitive
effectiveness of devices. In this grade level, students are using and responsible for the appeals of logos, ethos, and pathos.

- Clarification 2: Rhetorical devices for the purposes of this benchmark are the figurative language devices from 10.R.3.1 with the addition of irony, rhetorical question, antithesis, zeugma, metonymy, synecdoche, and asyndeton.
- Clarification 3: See Secondary Figurative Language. Clarification 4: See Rhetorical Appeals and Rhetorical Devices
determination on this standard alone. Student interaction with the text is intended to analyze the author’s rhetorical choices and the probable interaction of the text with students past experiences and learning about argument development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C.1.1</th>
<th>This standard does not have a 10th grade band. The focus of this standard is K-5 and on Cursive Handwriting and ends at 5th Grade.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **C.1.2** | **Narrative Writing**
ELA.10. C.1.2: Write narratives using an appropriate pace to create tension, mood, and/or tone.
**Benchmark Clarifications:**
- Clarification 1: See Writing Types and Narrative Techniques. |
| **C.1.3** | **Argument Writing**
ELA.10. C.1.3: Write to argue a position, supporting claims using logical reasoning and credible evidence from multiple sources, rebutting counterclaims with relevant evidence, |

**Student to Text:** Students are creating their own text; the discourse is not between a text and student but a student and a page as they develop their own writing.

**Text to Student:** Students are creating their own text; the discourse is not between a text and student but a student and a page as they develop their own writing.

**Student to Student:** Nothing in the standard demands the interaction of students with one another.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>C.1.4</strong></th>
<th>Using a logical organizational structure, elaboration, purposeful transitions, and maintaining a formal and objective tone.</th>
<th>Will utilize other texts to build their argument.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Clarifications:</strong></td>
<td>- Clarification 1: See Writing Types and Elaborative Techniques. - Clarification 2: The tone should be both formal and objective, relying more on argument and rhetorical appeals rather than on propaganda techniques. Use narrative techniques to strengthen writing where appropriate.</td>
<td><strong>Student to Student:</strong> Nothing in the standard demands the interaction of students with one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expository Writing</strong></td>
<td>Expository Writing</td>
<td><strong>Student to Text:</strong> Students are creating their own text; they will utilize other sources and texts within their writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA.10. C.1.4: Write expository texts to explain and analyze information from multiple sources, using logical organization, purposeful transitions, and a tone and voice appropriate to the task.</td>
<td><strong>Text to Student:</strong> Students are creating their own text; Students will utilize other texts to build their own writing.</td>
<td><strong>Student to Student:</strong> Not Applicable, nothing in the standard demands the interaction of students with one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Clarifications:</strong></td>
<td>- Clarification 1: See Writing Types.</td>
<td><strong>Student to Text:</strong> Students are creating their own text; they will utilize other sources and texts to improve their writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.1.5</strong></td>
<td>Improving Writing</td>
<td><strong>Text to Student:</strong> Students are creating their own text; Students will utilize other texts to improve their writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA.10. C.1.5: Improve writing by considering feedback from adults, peers, and/or online editing tools, revising to address the needs of a specific audience.</td>
<td><strong>Student to Student:</strong> Yes. Explicitly, students will consider feedback from peers to help them revise their writing and make improvements.</td>
<td><strong>Student to Text:</strong> Students will develop information based on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.2.1</strong></td>
<td>Oral Presentation</td>
<td><strong>Student to Text:</strong> Students will develop information based on</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ELA.10. C.2.1: Present information orally, with a logical organization and coherent focus, with credible evidence, creating a clear perspective. | Benchmark Clarifications:  
- Clarification 1: At this grade level, the emphasis is on the content, but students are still expected to follow earlier expectations: volume, pronunciation, and pacing. A clear perspective is the through-line that unites the elements of the presentation.  
- Clarification 2: For further guidance, see the Secondary Oral Communication Rubric. | texts to create an oral presentation with a clear perspective – this grade level is focused on content, so students need to make sure that their texts are reliable and valid.  
**Text to Student:** Students will interact with sources to develop the presentation – this grade level is focused on content, so students need to make sure that their texts are reliable and valid.  
**Student to Student:** This standard potentially has students interact in a presentation aspect, but this does not reflect the back and forth of a dialogue. |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Conventions** | **ELA.10. C.3.1:** Follow the rules of standard English grammar, punctuation, capitalization, and spelling appropriate to grade level.  
**Benchmark Clarifications:**  
- Clarification 1:  
  - Skills to be mastered at this grade level are as follows:  
    - Add variety to writing or presentations by using parallel structure and various types of phrases and clauses.  
  - Skills to be implemented but not yet mastered are as follows:  
    - Use knowledge of usage rules to create flow in writing and presenting.  
- Clarification 2:  
  - See Convention Progression by Grade Level for more information. | **Text to Student:** Not Applicable, nothing in the standard demands the interaction of students with a text, this standard focuses on the quality of written communication but not the need for communication itself.  
**Text to Student:** Not Applicable, nothing in the standard demands the interaction of text with a student, this standard focuses on the quality of written communication but not the need for communication itself.  
**Student to Student:** Not Applicable, nothing in the standard demands the interaction of students with one another. |
| C.4.1 | **Researching and Using Information**  
ELA.10. C.4.1: Conduct research to answer a question, refining the scope of the question to align with findings, and synthesizing information from multiple reliable and valid sources.  
**Benchmark Clarifications:**  
- Clarification 1: While the benchmark does require that students consult multiple sources, there is no requirement that they use every source they consult. Part of the skill in researching is discernment—being able to tell which information is relevant and which sources are trustworthy enough to include. |
| C.5.1 | **Multimedia**  
ELA.10. C.5.1: Create digital presentations to improve understanding of findings, reasoning, and evidence.  
**Benchmark Clarifications:**  
- Clarification 1: The presentation may be delivered live or delivered as a stand-alone digital experience. |

**Student to Text:** Students will use the texts they select to answer a research question and interpret them to support their positionality.  

**Text to Student:** The texts that students select will help support and defend the arguments that students build within their research questions.  

**Student to Student:** Not Applicable, nothing in the standard demands the interaction of students with one another.  

**Student to Text:** Yes – Students will create presentations of information.  

**Text to Student:** Yes – Students will create presentations of information.  

**Student to Student:** Only if the presentation is delivered live as indicated in the clarifications, but this is not a standard requirement.
## Technology in Communication

**ELA.10. C.5.2:** Use online collaborative platforms to create and export publication-ready quality writing tailored to a specific audience, integrating multimedia elements.

*Student to Text:* The creation of writing would be the students interacting with and developing the dialogue between them and a text.

*Text to Student:* The development of a piece of writing is influenced by the sources addressed as the student develops their writing.

*Student to Student:* Yes – students use collaborative online platforms to share with their peers.

## Academic Vocabulary

**ELA.10. V.1.1:** Integrate academic vocabulary appropriate to grade level in speaking and writing.

**Benchmark Clarifications:**

- **Clarification 1:** To integrate vocabulary, students will apply the vocabulary they have learned to authentic speaking and writing tasks independently. This use should be intentional, beyond responding to a prompt to use a word in a sentence.
- **Clarification 2:** Academic vocabulary appropriate to grade level refers to words that are likely to appear across subject areas for the current grade level and beyond, vital to comprehension, critical for academic discussions and

*Student to Text:* Yes – Students must integrate their vocabulary into all speaking and writing.

*Text to Student:* No – there is no specific text demanding use.

*Student to Student:* Not Applicable, nothing in the standard demands the interaction of students with one another.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V.1.2</th>
<th>Morphology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELA.10. V.1.2: Apply knowledge of etymology and derivations to determine meanings of words and phrases in grade-level content.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Clarifications:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarification 1: Etymology refers to the study of word origins and the ways that words have changed over time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarification 2: Derivation refers to making new words from an existing word by adding affixes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student to Text:** Yes – Students are required to integrate their vocabulary knowledge into their reading.

**Text to Student:** No – there is no specific text demanding use.

**Student to Student:** Not Applicable, nothing in the standard demands the interaction of students with one another.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V.1.3</th>
<th>Context and Connotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELA.10. V.1.3: Apply knowledge of context clues, figurative language, word relationships, reference materials, and/or background knowledge to determine the connotative and denotative meaning of words and phrases, appropriate to grade level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Clarifications:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarification 1: Review of words learned in this way is critical to building background knowledge and related vocabulary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student to Text:** Yes – Students to integrate their vocabulary into all speaking and writing.

**Text to Student:** No – there is no specific text demanding use.

**Student to Student:** Not Applicable, nothing in the standard demands the interaction of students with one another.

---

**Level II Part I: Discursive Practice**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Document</th>
<th>Standard Reference</th>
<th>Description of Document</th>
<th>Discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literary Periods</td>
<td>10.R.1.4</td>
<td>Outlines the literary periods that texts can be associated with</td>
<td>Not applicable – Does not define a type of discourse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical Appeals</td>
<td>10.R.2.3, 10.R.3.4, 10.C.1.3</td>
<td>Defines, describes, and provides examples of the Rhetorical Appeals referred to in the B.E.S.T Standards.</td>
<td>Not applicable – Does not define a type of discourse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical Devices</td>
<td>10.R.2.3, 10.R.3.4</td>
<td>Defines, describes, and provides examples of the Rhetorical Devices referred to in the B.E.S.T Standards.</td>
<td>Not applicable – Does not define a type of discourse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Figurative Language</td>
<td>10.R.3.1, 10.R.3.4, 10.V.1.3</td>
<td>Defines, describes, and provides examples of the Figurative Language referred to in the B.E.S.T Standards.</td>
<td>Not applicable – Does not define a type of discourse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Types</td>
<td>10.C.1.2, 10.C.1.3, 10.C.1.4</td>
<td>Defines the types of writing students in grades K-12 will encounter in the B.E.S.T. standards.</td>
<td>Defines text/student discourse but does not demand that students engage in it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative Techniques</td>
<td>10.C.1.2, 10.C.1.3</td>
<td>Defines the types of narrative techniques students in grades K-12 will encounter in the B.E.S.T standards.</td>
<td>Defines text/student discourse but does not demand that students engage in it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaborative Techniques</td>
<td>10.C.1.3</td>
<td>Defines the types of elaborative techniques students in grades K-12 will encounter in the B.E.S.T standards.</td>
<td>Defines text/student discourse but does not demand that students engage in it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Oral Communication Rubric</td>
<td>10.C.2.1</td>
<td>Delineates the proficiency levels of a student’s oral communication from emerging to mastery at each grade level.</td>
<td>Defines that mastery of student-to-student communication should be thorough, organized, and effective. The existence of this rubric and reference to it indicates a demand for oral communication in the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Convention Progression by Grade Level

**10.C.3.1**

Defines, describes, and provides a grade level progression of the ELA conventions referred to in the B.E.S.T Standards.

Outlines the quality of the written communications students should abide by but does not demand any specific interactions.

### Context Clues

**10.V.1.3**

Defines and provides the types of context clues in text as they are referred to in the B.E.S.T Standards.

Not applicable – Does not define a type of discourse.

### Word Relationships

**10.V.1.3**

Defines and provides the types of word relationships in text as they are referred to in the B.E.S.T Standards.

Not applicable – Does not define a type of discourse.

### Text Complexity

**ELA.K12.EE.2.1**

Defines the qualitative, quantitative, and student-centered expectations for choosing a text for a grade level.

Not applicable – Does not define a type of discourse.

---

## Level II Part 2: Discursive Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELA Expectation</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Clarifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELA.K12.EE.1.1</td>
<td>Cite evidence to explain and justify reasoning.</td>
<td>K-1 Students include textual evidence in their oral communication with guidance and support from adults. The evidence can consist of details from the text without naming the text. During 1st grade, students learn how to incorporate the evidence in their writing. 2-3 Students include relevant textual evidence in their written and oral communication. Students should name the text when they refer to it. In 3rd grade, students should use a combination of direct and indirect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discourse**

- **Student to Text** – Finding evidence.
- **Text to Student** – Justifying using reasoning.
- **Student to Student** - Oral and written communication
citations. 4-5 Students continue with previous skills and reference comments made by speakers and peers. Students cite texts that they have directly quoted, paraphrased, or used for information. When writing, students will use the form of citation dictated by the instructor or the style guide referenced by the instructor. 6-8 Students continue with previous skills and use a style guide to create a proper citation. **9-12 Students continue with previous skills and should be aware of existing style guides and the ways in which they differ.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELA.K12.E E.2.1</th>
<th>Read and comprehend grade-level complex texts proficiently.</th>
<th>See Text Complexity for grade-level complexity bands and a text complexity rubric.</th>
<th>Student to Text Text to Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELA.K12.E E.3.1</td>
<td>Make inferences to support comprehension.</td>
<td>Students will make inferences before the words infer or inference are introduced. Kindergarten students will answer questions like “Why is the girl smiling?” or make predictions about what will happen based on the title page. Students will use the terms and apply them in 2nd grade and beyond.</td>
<td>Student to Text Text to Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA.K12.E E.4.1</td>
<td>Use appropriate, collaborative techniques and active listening skills when engaging in discussions in a variety of situations.</td>
<td>In kindergarten, students learn to listen to one another respectfully. In grades 1-2, students build upon these skills by justifying what they are thinking. For example: “I think... because...” The collaborative conversations are becoming academic conversations. In grades 3-12, students engage in academic conversations discussing claims and justifying their reasoning, refining, and applying skills. Students build on ideas, propel the conversation, and support claims and counterclaims with evidence.</td>
<td>Student to Student – demands collaboration, discussion, and participation in a variety of situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA.K12.E E.5.1</td>
<td>Use the accepted rules governing a specific format to create quality work.</td>
<td>Students will incorporate skills learned into work products to produce quality work. For students to incorporate these skills appropriately, they must receive instruction. A 3rd grade student creating a poster board display must have instruction in how to effectively present information to do quality work.</td>
<td>Student to Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA.K12.E E.6.1</td>
<td>Use appropriate voice and tone when speaking or writing.</td>
<td>In kindergarten and 1st grade, students learn the difference between formal and informal language. For example, the way we talk to our friends differs from the way we speak to adults. In 2nd grade and beyond, students practice appropriate social and academic language to discuss texts.</td>
<td>Student to Text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Fiction/non-fiction</th>
<th>Text Type</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addres to William Henry Harrison</td>
<td>A challenge posted to the treaty by WHH arguing that land cannot be sold because it belongs to Native people collectively.</td>
<td>Chief Tecumseh</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Native American – Shawnee</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Chief of Shawnee Tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Checkers” Speech</td>
<td>Nixon argued on national television defending his innocence when accused of misappropriating campaign funds.</td>
<td>Richard Nixon</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Senator, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Constantly Risking Absurdity”</td>
<td>Compare the loneliness of a poet to the experience of a tight rope walker.</td>
<td>Lawrence Ferlinghetti</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Poem</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>PhD, Educational Advocate for art accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Cross of Gold”</td>
<td>Advocated for silver and gold to fund U.S. currency</td>
<td>William Jennings Bryan</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Democrat, former Senator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Farwell Speech”</td>
<td>General MacArthur reflected on military experience, highlighted the sacrifice of soldiers, and warned about communism.</td>
<td>Gen. Douglas MacArthur</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Military leader, Speech to congress, Dismissed by President Truman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Author/Spokesperson</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Farewell Address”</td>
<td>A letter to the people announcing Washington's retirement as he leaves the presidency and sets up the expectations for future presidents.</td>
<td>George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, James Madison</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>First President of the United States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“For the Equal Rights Amendment”</td>
<td>Speech to Congress advocating for the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution.</td>
<td>Shirley Chisholm</td>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Congresswoman, Advocate for gender and racial equality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“A House Divided”</td>
<td>Abraham Lincoln's acceptance Speech to the presidential nomination</td>
<td>Abraham Lincoln</td>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Republican, Presidential candidate, President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I am a Democrat and not a Revolutionist”</td>
<td>Senator David Hill advocated for reform through established political channels rather than through radical or revolutionary means.</td>
<td>Sen. David Bennett Hill</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Democrat, Senator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozymandias</td>
<td>Reflects on the transience of human power and the inevitable decay of empires</td>
<td>Percy Bysshe Shelley</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Poem</td>
<td>1818</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>A well-known author, in authors' circles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Tha motopsis”</td>
<td>Reflection on death and the interconnectedness of nature and humanity</td>
<td>William Cullen Bryant</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Poem</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Second Comin g</td>
<td>The poem describes a sense of impending doom and the breakdown of traditional systems of order, with images of violence, darkness, and turmoil post-World War I</td>
<td>William Butler Yeats</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Poem</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Poet, Irish, Playwright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The Story of Pygmalion”</td>
<td>Myth of artist whose sculpture of a woman turns human after he prays for it</td>
<td>Ovid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Short Story</td>
<td>AD 8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Ancient Roman Writer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“What to the Slave is the Fourth of July”</td>
<td>In the speech, Douglass sharply critiques the hypocrisy of celebrating American independence while millions of African Americans remain enslaved.</td>
<td>Fredrick Douglass</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Abolitionist, former slave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“What’s Wrong with ‘Equal Rights’ for Women?”</td>
<td>A critique of the proposed Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) to the United States Constitution.</td>
<td>Phyllis Schlafly</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Pamphlet</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Samuel from Bible</td>
<td>Continues the narrative from the First Book of Samuel, focusing on the reign of King David after the death of Saul.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Short Story</td>
<td>6th-10th Century</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Biblical stories- Christianity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Other Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A Rasin in the Sun</em></td>
<td>A play that follows the Younger family, an African American family living in Chicago's South Side, as they grapple with dreams, racial discrimination, and the pursuit of a better life.</td>
<td>Lorraine Hansberry</td>
<td>Play</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Focuses on Race, identity, American Dream</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A Tale of Two Cities</em></td>
<td>The novel explores themes of sacrifice, redemption, and the struggle for justice amidst the chaos of revolutionary France.</td>
<td>Charles Dickens</td>
<td>Novel</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Victorian era author</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Common Sense</em></td>
<td>Advocated for American independence from Britain</td>
<td>Thomas Paine</td>
<td>Pamphlet</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>American Revolutionary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cry, The Beloved Country</strong></td>
<td>Set in apartheid-era South Africa, the story follows a Zulu pastor named Stephen Kumalo as he searches for his son, Absalom, in the city of Johannesburg.</td>
<td>Alan Paton</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Novel</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White, South African</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>South African</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fahrenheit 451</strong></td>
<td>Fahrenheit 451 is a dystopian novel by Ray Bradbury, set in a future society where books are banned, and &quot;firemen&quot; burn any that are found.</td>
<td>Ray Bradbury</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Novel</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Published several books, popular author. anti-technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Frankenstein**

Victor Frankenstein, a young scientist, creates a grotesque creature through an unorthodox scientific experiment. As the creature struggles to find acceptance and meaning in a hostile world, Victor grapples with the consequences of his actions.

**Mary Shelley**

1818

F

White

21

Published anonymously

---

**Galatea**

Pygmalion retelling, Pygmalion is a sculptor who creates a statue named Galatea and falls in love with her.

**Madeline Miller**

2013

F

White

35

Retells myths
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Land of Hope: An Invitation to the Great American Story</strong></th>
<th>The book offers readers an invitation to explore the foundational principles, key events, and diverse individuals that have shaped the American experience from its beginnings to the present day.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wilfred C. McClay</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Lord of the Flies</strong></th>
<th>The story of a group of British boys stranded on a deserted island and their descent into savagery as they attempt to govern themselves without adult supervision.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>William Golding</strong></td>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play</td>
<td>Author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Macbeth</em></td>
<td>William Shakespeare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Macbeth&quot; is a tragedy by William Shakespeare that tells the story of a Scottish general named Macbeth who receives a prophecy from three witches that he will become king.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Midsummer Night's Dream</em></td>
<td>William Shakespeare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A comedy that revolves around the intertwining romantic escapades of four young lovers, a group of amateur actors, and magical fairies in the Athenian Forest. Confusion, mistaken identities, and love potions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
create a whimsical and fantastical atmosphere as the characters navigate their relationships amidst the enchanting woodland setting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Of Mice and Men</th>
<th>Set during the Great Depression. It follows the story of two displaced ranch workers, George, and Lennie, who dream of owning their own piece of land.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Steinbeck</strong></td>
<td>F Novel 1937 M White 35 Nobel Prize, wrote about social injustice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Prometheus Unbound**
The play reimagines the myth of Prometheus, who defies the tyrannical rule of Zeus and suffers for it, but triumphs through his defiance and the power of love.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Theatre Type</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percy Bysshe Shelley</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Play</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>Romantic Poet, Byron, and Keats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pygmalion**
Tells the story of a phonetics professor, Henry Higgins, who makes a bet that he can transform a Cockney flower girl, Eliza Doolittle, into a refined lady through speech and manners training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Theatre Type</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George Bernard Shaw</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Play</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Nobel Prize winner</td>
<td>Socialist, Nobel Prize winner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Autobiography of an Ex-Colored Man</td>
<td>It tells the story of a biracial man who navigates issues of race, identity, and belonging in America during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The protagonist recounts his experiences growing up in the South, passing as white to access social privileges, and grappling with the complexities of his racial heritage.</td>
<td>James Weldon Johnson</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Autobiography</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Crucible</em></td>
<td>The story follows John Proctor, a farmer caught up in the witch hunt, as he grapples with his own moral failings and struggles to uphold his integrity in the face of persecution.</td>
<td>Arthur Miller</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Political and Social Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Piano Lesson</em></td>
<td>The story centers around a family heirloom, a piano carved with the faces of their enslaved ancestors, and the conflict between siblings Berniece and Boy Willie over whether to sell the piano.</td>
<td>August Wilson</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Focuses on personal experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
piano or keep it as a symbol of their heritage.

The Red Badge of Courage

Follows the experiences of Henry Fleming, a young Union soldier, during the American Civil War. The story explores themes of courage, fear, and the complexities of warfare as Henry grapples with his own doubts and insecurities on the battlefield. Throughout the novel, Henry undergoes a journey of self-discovery and finds a

| The Red Badge of Courage | Follows the experiences of Henry Fleming, a young Union soldier, during the American Civil War. The story explores themes of courage, fear, and the complexities of warfare as Henry grapples with his own doubts and insecurities on the battlefield. Throughout the novel, Henry undergoes a journey of self-discovery and finds a | Stephen Crane | F | Novel | 1895 | M | White | 23 | War correspondent wrote about war. |
The Scarlet Letter

It tells the story of Hester Prynne, who is condemned for committing adultery and forced to wear the scarlet letter "A" as a mark of shame.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>The Souls of Black Folk</strong></th>
<th>It is a collection of essays that addresses the social, economic, and political issues facing African Americans in the United States at the turn of the 20th century. Du Bois explores topics such as race relations, the concept of double consciousness, the role of education, and the challenges of being black in America.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uncle Tom's Cabin</strong></td>
<td>It tells the story of Uncle Tom, a slave, and his experiences under various masters, depicting the cruelty and inhumanity of slavery in the United States.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Up From Slavery</strong></td>
<td>Autobiography by Booker T. Washington, recounting his remarkable journey from enslavement to becoming one of the most influential African American leaders of his time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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The IRB determined that the proposed activity is not research involving human subjects as defined by DHHS and FDA regulations.

IRB review and approval by this organization is not required. This determination applies only to the activities described in the IRB submission and does not apply should any changes be made. If changes are made and there are questions about whether these activities are research involving human in which the organization is engaged, please submit a new request to the IRB for a determination. You can create a modification by clicking Create Modification / CR within the study.

If you have any questions, please contact the UCF IRB at 407-823-2901 or [irb@ucf.edu](mailto:irb@ucf.edu). Please include your project title and IRB number in all correspondence with this office.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Coker
UCF IRB
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