

Teacher Identity:

Community College Composition Teachers' Investment in Language Minority Students

© 2019

By

Shannon Denise Tumanut

Submitted to the graduate degree program in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies in Higher Education and the Graduate Faculty of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Chairperson, Dr. Susan Twombly

Dr. Heidi Hallman

Dr. Lisa Wolf-Wendel

Dr. Eugene Parker

Dr. Zachary Foste

Date Defended: April 11, 2019

The Dissertation Committee for Shannon Denise Tumanut
certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

Teacher Identity:

Community College Composition Teachers' Investment in Language Minority Students

Chairperson, Dr. Susan Twombly

Date Approved: April 11, 2019

Abstract

The number of language minority (LM) students enrolling in American community colleges continues to rise while institutions of higher education must also cope with mounting pressure to demonstrate accountability and outcomes. In this context, the dissertation investigated the underexplored origins of what mainstream writing teachers do and say in relation to the LM students with whom they work. The guiding research questions were: 1) How do community college mainstream writing teachers construct their professional identities in relation to LM students, with regard to: a) attitudes, b) beliefs, c) knowledge, d) previous experiences?, and 2): How do these professional identities influence their communication with and behavior towards LM students? In order to explore these questions, a qualitative research approach was used, focusing on narratives derived from a series of individual participant interviews. Each interview was examined for the appearance of the four focal categories: attitudes, beliefs, knowledge, and previous experiences; the resulting narratives were then organized into stanzas which were analyzed for both content and discourse. The main themes evident across the narratives were confidence, connections, and constraints, suggesting that participants' professional identities revolve around helping LM students build confidence in their academic skills primarily through facilitating connections with individuals and institutional entities. However, participants' abilities to foster LM students' confidence and help them establish meaningful connections are subject to constraints outside of teachers' control. The findings affirm current research underscoring the significant role of faculty in supporting LM students and point to a number of areas where institutions can work to support teachers of LM students. The results also reveal that teachers' professional identities develop gradually over the long term, most often through informal, unplanned personal and professional experiences. The

study highlights a number of important implications for pedagogy, policy, and professional development.

Acknowledgements

This dissertation has been a long time coming, and there are many individuals who deserve recognition. I would first like to thank several members of the Department of Education at the University of Kansas, including Dr. Susan Twombly, my advisor, who has stuck with me for the long haul; Dr. Hyesun Cho, whose course on Language and Identity first put me on the path to investigating teacher identity; and Dr. Heidi Hallman, who joined my dissertation committee late in the game, and whose feedback was supportive, encouraging, and helpful—an example to follow.

On a more personal note, this dissertation would not have seen the light of day if it had not been for my husband, who likely did not realize that proofreader, editor, computer guru, and library surrogate would be among his marital duties; my daughters, whose frequent and favored position in my lap while I work has kept me warm and content, and has helped me to develop some mad one-handed typing skills; and my mom, who gets what it takes and whose unwavering help, support, and commiseration I could not have done without.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	v
List of Tables	ix
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
1.1 Introduction to the Study	1
1.2 Theoretical Background.....	4
1.2.1 Learner Investment	4
1.2.2 Teacher Investment.....	5
1.3 Research Purpose and Research Questions.....	6
1.4 Organization of the Dissertation	7
Chapter 2: Literature review	9
2.1 Introduction.....	9
2.2 Language Minority Students.....	9
2.3 Critical English for Academic Purposes.....	11
2.4 Impact of Faculty on Community College Students.....	14
2.5 Teacher Identity	16
2.5.1 Conceptualizations of Teacher Identity	18
2.5.1.1 Positioning	18
2.5.1.2 Investment.....	19
2.5.1.3 Agency	20
2.6 Teaching Writing to Language Minority Students	21
2.7 Summary.....	25
Chapter 3: Methodology	28
3.1 Introduction.....	28
3.2 Narrative and Teacher Identity	29
3.2.1 Focal Categories.....	30
3.2.1.1 Attitudes.....	30
3.2.1.2 Beliefs	31
3.2.1.3 Knowledge.....	31
3.2.1.4 Prior Experiences.....	32
3.3 Data Collection	32
3.3.1 Participants.....	34
3.3.2 Institutional Context.....	36
3.4 Data Analysis	37
3.4.1 Narrative Research.....	38
3.4.2 Discourse Analysis.....	41
3.5 Researcher's Positionality.....	43
3.6 Summary.....	45

Chapter 4: Results	47
4.1 Introduction.....	47
4.2 Participants' Narratives.....	48
4.2.1 Amelia.....	48
4.2.1.1 Amelia: Narrative 1.....	48
4.2.1.2 Amelia: Narrative 2.....	54
4.2.2 Brad.....	60
4.2.2.1 Brad: Narrative 1.....	61
4.2.2.2 Brad: Narrative 2.....	65
4.2.3 Lana.....	67
4.2.3.1 Lana: Narrative 1.....	68
4.2.3.2 Lana: Narrative 2.....	74
4.2.4 Graham.....	83
4.2.4.1 Graham: Narrative 1.....	84
4.2.4.2 Graham: Narrative 2.....	94
4.2.4.3 Graham: Narrative 3.....	107
4.2.5 Noah.....	116
4.2.5.1 Noah: Narrative 1.....	117
4.2.5.2 Noah: Narrative 2.....	127
4.3 Summary.....	144
Chapter 5: Discussion.....	146
5.1 Introduction.....	146
5.2 Summary of Results.....	147
5.2.1 Focal Categories in General.....	148
5.2.1.1 Attitudes.....	148
5.2.1.2 Beliefs.....	150
5.2.1.3 Knowledge.....	152
5.2.1.4 Prior Experiences.....	154
5.3 Significance of Findings.....	157
5.3.1 Attitudes.....	157
5.3.1.1 Toward the Teaching Role.....	158
5.3.1.2 Toward Language Minority Students.....	158
5.3.1.3 Toward the Institution.....	158
5.3.2 Beliefs.....	159
5.3.2.1 About Educating Language Minority Students.....	159
5.3.2.2 About Writing and Giving Feedback.....	160
5.3.2.3 About Establishing Relationships.....	160
5.3.3 Prior Experiences.....	161
5.4 Implications.....	162
5.4.1 Pedagogical Implications.....	162
5.4.2 Policy Implications.....	164
5.4.2.1 Orientation.....	165

5.4.2.2 Assessment and Placement	166
5.4.2.3 Mentoring.....	167
5.4.3 Professional Development Implications	171
5.5 Study Limitations.....	174
5.5.1 Focal Categories.....	174
5.5.2 Participants.....	174
5.5.3 Institution	175
5.6 Future Directions	176
5.6.1 Participants.....	176
5.6.2 Feedback	176
5.6.3 What Is Absent.....	177
5.7 Conclusion	177
References.....	179

List of Tables

Table 3-1: Study participants	35
Table 4-1: Categories seen in Amelia, Narrative 1	48
Table 4-2: Categories seen in Amelia, Narrative 2	54
Table 4-3: Categories seen in Brad, Narrative 1	61
Table 4-4: Categories seen in Brad, Narrative 2	65
Table 4-5: Categories seen in Lana, Narrative 1	68
Table 4-6: Categories seen in Lana, Narrative 2	74
Table 4-7: Categories seen in Graham, Narrative 1	84
Table 4-8: Categories seen in Graham, Narrative 2	94
Table 4-9: Categories seen in Graham, Narrative 3	107
Table 4-10: Categories seen in Noah, Narrative 1	117
Table 4-11: Categories seen in Noah, Narrative 2	127

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Introduction to the Study

Teacher identity as a research construct is of increasing interest to studies of educational practice (Akkerman & Meijer, 2011; Clarke, 2009; Ruohotie-Lyhty, 2013; Tsui, 2007; Varghese, Morgan, Johnston, & Johnson, 2005; Vásquez, 2011; Zembylas, 2018). While not limited to the field of language teaching (c.f. Bjuland, Cestari, & Borgerson, 2012; Bryce, Wilmes, & Bellino, 2016; Saka, Southerland, Kittleson, Hutner, 2013; Yagi & Venenciano, 2017), explorations into teacher identity specific to the field of writing and second language pedagogy are not uncommon (e.g. Cheung, Ben Said, & Park, 2015; Huang, 2014; Kanno & Stuart, 2011; Lee, 2013; Miller, Morgan, & Medina, 2017). Studies of teacher identity in general and in language education in particular focus on the formation and enactment of teacher identity (Arvaja, 2016; Brown & Heck, 2017; Kanno & Stuart, 2011; Lee, 2013), as well as its relevance to pre-service and in-service teacher education (e.g. Donato, Tucker, & Hendry, 2015; Jenlink, 2014; Mockler, 2011; Oyler, Morvay, & Sullivan, 2017). However, there seems to be an emphasis on teacher identity as it relates to elementary and secondary education (e.g. Barr & Clark, 2012; Cross, 2011; Huang, 2014; Ruohotie-Lyhty, 2013; Song, 2016; Yoon, 2008), highlighting the apparent deficit of research on the topic at the postsecondary level. Above all, there is a notable dearth of investigations of teacher identity in the community college context.

The lack of research in this area is highly problematic. One reason is that, as institutions that are open to “nearly anyone who wants to attend college” (Bailey, Jagers, & Jenkins, 2015, p. 1), community colleges provide postsecondary access to a considerable swath of the population (Bunch & Endris, 2012). Characterized by Dougherty and Townsend (2006) as “a multivalent institution” (p. 11), community colleges encompass a broad range of missions

including transfer to baccalaureate institutions, occupational training, developmental education, and general service to the community (Dougherty & Townsend, 2006; Dougherty, Lahr, & Morest, 2017). Further, the affordability, flexibility, and location offered by community colleges (Ruecker & Ortmeier-Hooper, 2017; Teranishi, Suárez-Orozco, & Suárez-Orozco, 2011) as well as the perception of less demanding coursework (Ruecker, 2015; Ruecker & Ortmeier-Hooper, 2017) render them a feasible alternative for students who may be underrepresented in or underprepared for four-year institutions (Bailey et al., 2015; Ruecker & Ortmeier-Hooper, 2017). Research into community colleges continues to be necessary and timely (Dougherty et al., 2017; Kanno & Harklau, 2012) because of their openness to serving a wide demographic of students with various needs and aspirations (Bailey et al., 2015; Goldrick-Rab, 2010; Hagedorn, 2010).

Moreover, many students whose primary language is not English initially enter the U.S. postsecondary system through community colleges (Almon, 2010; Bunch, 2009; Kanno & Harklau, 2012; Nuñez & Sparks, 2012; Razfar & Simon, 2011; Rodriguez & Cruz, 2009; Ruecker & Ortmeier-Hooper, 2017). Blumenthal (2002) argues that “[o]ne feature of the ESL population in the community college that is easily recognized but not as easily measured or addressed is its diverse makeup” (p. 46). Indeed, language minority (LM)¹ students encompass recent and not-so-recent immigrants, political and religious refugees, international students, and foreign-born students who have graduated from U.S. high schools but whose English language proficiency remains non-native-like. Once enrolled in the community college, LM students may be required to take English-language coursework, which is often categorized as remedial or developmental (Bers, 2007; Blumenthal, 2002; Chisman, 2008; Rodriguez & Cruz, 2009) or

¹ Although not the central focus of this dissertation, much debate exists about the appropriate term for students whose primary language is not English (see Chiang & Schmida, 1999; Leung, Harris, & Rampton, 1997; Thesen, 1997). The term “language minority” (LM) will be used throughout this document, but it should be noted that many have and continue to problematize the terminology associated with learners who speak a language other than English at home or who are multilingual.

prerequisite to college-level study (Bunch & Endris, 2012; Jenkins & Cho, 2011/2012; Rodriguez & Cruz, 2009), resulting in potentially longer time to completion. In an era so focused on outcomes, attainment, and accountability (Bailey et al., 2015), LM students and their college-related experiences should be of concern to institutional leaders who are interested not only in creating better schools overall but who are also trying to understand and improve the completion rates of all community college students. As Kanno and Harklau (2012) state, “[I]f we are serious about increasing college graduation rates, we need to make concerted efforts to facilitate LM students’ pathways to and through college” (p. 2).

Finally, within the context of the community college, most of the contact students have with faculty occurs in the classroom (Barnett, 2011; Chang, 2005), meaning that a failure to fully comprehend the fundamental function fulfilled by faculty signifies both a threat to the internal health of the institution as well as a neglected opportunity to the achievement of learning outcomes and goals for completion. Research on community college student achievement and persistence acknowledges the paramount role of faculty and staff (Levin, Cox, Cerven, & Haberler, 2010; Schreiner, Noel, Anderson, & Cantwell, 2011). That is to say, “Students don’t stay in or leave institutions as much as they stay in or leave relationships” (Schreiner et al., 2011, p. 333). In an institutional context touted as open and accessible to a wide range of potential students, causes and rates of attrition become critical areas for concern, especially given the growing pressure on institutions of higher education to demonstrate accountability and outcomes. A more nuanced appreciation of how what teachers do in the classroom relates to LM students is thus a necessary piece of the puzzle.

The significant growth of students with variable English proficiency in the educational system as a whole (Kanno & Harklau, 2012; Ruecker & Ortmeier-Hooper, 2017) effectively

renders *all* teachers, regardless of subject or level, teachers of LM students (Bunch, 2013; Galguera, 2011; Lucas & Villegas, 2010). Accordingly, as the number of students needing English language instruction increases, it is both opportune and fitting to promote investigation into teacher identity, most especially in the community college with its high levels of LM student enrollment and teacher-student interaction. Coming to a better understanding of community college teacher identity in relation to LM students can help to inform and strengthen current practice in regards to how best to teach this important and complex population of learners.

1.2 Theoretical Background

1.2.1 Learner Investment

In one of the first studies to bring together theories of identity and second language instruction—albeit with a focus on learners rather than teachers—Norton Peirce (1995) investigated immigrant women learning English in Canada and found that her subjects’ commitment to learning English was neither constant nor easily explained. “Theories of the good language learner have been developed on the premise that language learners can choose under what conditions they will interact with members of the target language community and that the language learner's access to the target language community is a function of the learner's motivation” (p. 12). The subjects in the study were not necessarily unmotivated to learn, but the opportunities they were afforded to practice their language skills were constrained by forces outside of their control. In order to further explain this idea of variable commitment to language learning and to contrast it to the prevailing concept of *motivation* in the field of second language acquisition, Norton Peirce (1995) made use of the term *investment*. Ultimately, she asserted that learner identity was much more complex and contentious than previously thought.

Rather than conceiving of learners as individuals unaffected by social, cultural, and political forces, the notions of identity and investment have come to be seen as providing an alternate point of view on how external influences shape the ways in which learners acquire an additional language. For LM students, then, explorations of identity aid in reaching beyond the cognitive and affective aspects of language as a system to investigate how society and culture also affect language learning. Such perspective may help all involved in the academic endeavor gain a better grasp of how the linguistic issues LM students must cope with extend far beyond questions of structure and vocabulary. Rather, language is intertwined with notions of identity and belonging and, as such, has repercussions outside of the classroom to LM students' membership in the institution at large.

1.2.2 Teacher Investment

For teachers of LM students as well, explorations of identity can prove equally fruitful. Whereas Norton Peirce's (1995) study focused on the identity and investment of learners, Reeves (2009) considers the identity and investment of teachers. In her study of a high school English teacher, Reeves (2009) argues that the focal subject of her study purposefully projected a particular identity by positioning his LM students as not in need of any specialized or individualized instruction. While this approach helped to achieve and reinforce his desired identity, the result is that the LM students in his class may not have received adequate or appropriate instruction. By considering teachers as individuals with the capability to position and invest in LM students, Reeves (2009) indicates that it is possible that what teachers do in one classroom may have both immediate and long-term repercussions beyond. This is particularly true of writing and language instructors who may be the first and most significant contact with LM students. Gaining a better understanding of the ways in which teachers relate both

consciously and unconsciously to LM students in the classroom may help broaden knowledge about how to better serve LM students in community college, with important implications for how we approach teacher education.

Studies on community college LM students frequently concentrate on students' perspectives on teachers' classroom practice (e.g. Harklau, 2000; Song, 2006; Zamel, 1995) or institutions' perceptions of these students' successes, challenges, and performance (e.g. Henderson, 2009; Miele, 2003; Santiago, 2008; Spurling, Seymour, & Chisman, 2008). While this research is undoubtedly valuable and necessary, it often neglects to consider in any deep or detailed manner the equally important perspectives of those who instruct community college LM students. Investigations of how teachers themselves come to develop their professional identities and how this process informs their classroom practice with respect to LM students in community college are critical yet less frequent. That is not to say that some studies do not take into consideration teachers' perspectives (e.g. Leki, 2006; Song, 2006; Zamel, 1995). Nevertheless, they fall short of attempting to account for how teachers' identities are formed and, equally as important, fail to connect how teacher identity is associated with what goes on in the classroom.

1.3 Research Purpose and Research Questions

The reasons for this gap in the research are unclear. Perhaps it is the preponderance of adjunct instructors in the faculty ranks of the community college, which renders it a difficult population to investigate. It may also be that, generally speaking, research on community college seems to be less prolific, or at least less publicized, than research done on four-year institutions (Townsend, Donaldson, & Wilson, 2009). Most importantly, faculty members' reluctance or unawareness of the need to systematically and critically reflect on their practice and to professionally evolve may stifle further exploration (Farrell, 2011). In an attempt to fill this

lacuna in the research, this dissertation addresses the relationship between teachers and LM students in higher education by investigating the following questions:

- How do community college mainstream writing teachers construct their professional identities in relation to LM students, with regard to:
 - a. Attitudes?
 - b. Beliefs?
 - c. Knowledge?
 - d. Prior experiences?
- How do these professional identities influence their communication with and behavior towards LM students?

1.4 Organization of the Dissertation

The dissertation is organized as follows. The current chapter presents the rationale for exploring the topic of teacher identity as it pertains to LM students in community college mainstream writing classes. The related concept of investment is prefaced, and the research questions that guided the study are introduced. Both teacher identity and investment are further explored in the subsequent literature review. The literature review provides an overview of other pertinent areas of research, including LM students, English language writing instruction, and the relationship between community college faculty and students. Chapter 3 details the study's methodology. In addition to establishing the appropriateness of using a narrative approach to investigate teacher identity, it also identifies the four focal categories that were used for analysis of the interview data. Further, it provides information about the study design, including the research setting and participants. The penultimate chapter presents the study's results by enumerating the findings in light of the four focal categories and synthesizing their relationship

to the construct of investment. Finally, the dissertation concludes with a discussion of how the study's findings apply to pedagogy, policy, and professional development, and points to potential avenues for future research.

Chapter 2: Literature review

2.1 Introduction

Investigating how any group of students makes its way through the postsecondary system is a daunting task; it is rendered even more so in the context of the community college. Part-time enrollment and irregular academic trajectories resulting from conflicting demands, such as the need to work outside of school and support family, are only some of the factors that characterize community college students as non-traditional (Almon, 2010; Crisp & Mina, 2012). Given the variety of external pressures influencing community college students' academic careers, there is actually very little institutions can control when it comes to affecting how students participate in terms of enrollment and persistence (i.e. continued enrollment over multiple terms). As a result, it is imperative that community colleges impact their students where they can—in the classroom. If faculty members are considered to be key players in the academic success of students, understanding how teachers of gatekeeper courses relate to students in their classes is particularly important because these teachers come into contact with a majority of students across disciplines and, therefore, may have substantial influence over students' academic futures.

2.2 Language Minority Students

The LM student body is comprised of a broad range of sub-populations, representing a spectrum of experiences and expectations. Galda (2009) recognizes that “the traditional concept of a ‘typical ESL student’ and his/her needs and identities might very well be erroneous or outdated” (p. 140). Indeed, as mentioned in the previous chapter, the diversity represented by this group of students is vast, bringing widely divergent life experiences to the classroom. Likewise, the reasons for which they enroll in postsecondary education are as disparate as their

corresponding educational goals. The challenge to attend to the needs and desires of this group of learners is thus apparent.

Several studies have investigated issues related to LM students' experiences in higher education; however, fewer studies exist that explicitly relate those experiences to the topic of LM students' progression through postsecondary institutions (Kanno & Harklau, 2012). For example, Harklau (2000), Ortmeier-Hooper (2008), and Marshall (2010) each investigate the transition from high school to college for immigrant students who have matriculated from North American high schools and discuss the ways that the process of "re-becoming ESL" (Marshall, 2010) mischaracterizes students as underprepared for postsecondary work. Likewise, Leki (2006) explores the interactions between LM students and mainstream faculty in order to investigate the ways in which English learners actively construct specific, individual classroom personae according to how they think others view them. Though the findings of these studies may be indirectly connected to LM students' movement through the postsecondary pipeline, there appears to be considerably less published research on LM students who enter postsecondary education through English language programs and these students' college-going patterns. Nevertheless, the research that does exist on this topic paints a discouraging picture of LM students' continued participation in college.

An institutional study by Spurling et al. (2008) of City College of San Francisco's English language program revealed that a majority of the program's students did not persist for more than one semester. Anecdotal evidence suggests this was due to a variety of possible reasons including conflicting work/family obligations and health issues. Those students who did complete the program and subsequently transitioned into credit coursework were found to have taken full advantage of additional programmatic features such as "matriculation services"

(including orientation and advising) and special enrollment possibilities (e.g. intensive skills-based classes, accelerated coursework); however, this only accounted for approximately eight percent of the students enrolled in the non-credit ESL program. As a result, most students neither completed the program nor matriculated into credit studies outside of the program.

Citing institutional data from a Massachusetts community college, Santiago (2008) states that, over a period of three years, only 73% of ESL students were still in college and only 18% had obtained a certificate or degree. On a national-level, Kanno and Cromley (2012) found that LM students whose linguistic abilities have been institutionally recognized as deficient persist and earn degrees at significantly lower rates than LM students who are English-proficient and students who are native speakers of English. Likewise, Almon (2010, 2012) found lower rates of programmatic and institutional retention and completion for LM students in community colleges. “[A]lthough some returned in a later semester, 70% of [students who were enrolled in at least one ESL class] did not persist to the subsequent fall” (Almon, 2012, p. 197). Given the markedly high attrition rates of LM community college students, it is increasingly evident that much more needs to be known about who and what influences these students in their postsecondary experiences.

2.3 Critical English for Academic Purposes

LM students are recognized as such because their linguistic skills and needs are considered to be distinct from those of first language (L1) English speakers. The result is that language becomes the determining factor in whether or not students are allowed access to mainstream coursework, regardless of their academic preparation. In order to frame this issue in a more just light, it is possible to draw on some ideas from critical English for Academic Purposes (EAP). Critical EAP, which is underpinned by the theories of Freire and Foucault,

among others, is presented as a response to traditional EAP. Whereas traditional EAP operates from the perspective that the purpose of academic English language courses is to prepare students for the rigors of content coursework, Benesch (2001, 2009) characterizes critical EAP as a dialogic approach to teaching that forefronts the rights of LM students without forsaking their immediate academic needs. “It takes into account the challenges non-native English speakers (NNES) face in their content classes while viewing students as active participants who can help shape academic goals and assignments rather than passively carrying them out” (Benesch, 2001, p. xv). The benefit of this approach for LM students is the chance to take ownership of their education and to become agents of change—the consequence of which is the opportunity to gain more meaningful learning, to partake more fully in the academic community, and, essentially, to become more engaged members of society.

Accordingly, the role of a practitioner of critical EAP is to facilitate this kind of development. Critical EAP is undeniably political by nature and seeks plainly to break from the status quo by building on the potential for English language teaching to be more equitable (Benesch, 1993, 2001; Morgan, 2009). As such, it provides a space for all parties to negotiate their complementary or conflicting agendas (Stone, 2008). Benesch (2001) details her own experiences teaching from a critical EAP stance. Working in the context of an EAP class paired with a psychology course, she describes her efforts to seek balance in a content curriculum that focused primarily on male contributions and concerns. In response, Benesch opted to delve more deeply into a topic that pertained more to women and received only superficial treatment in psychology lectures, that of anorexia. Although the focus on anorexia was met with resistance by some students, others found it to be interesting and relevant. Even so, Benesch (2001) recognized that this attempt at teaching from a critical EAP standpoint could have been improved upon and

retrospectively explores potential alternative means for achieving the same end—a more equal and engaging curriculum for LM students. Her experience illustrates a prevailing position of critical EAP, that “subject-area content can provide unique, intercultural opportunities for consciousness-raising and critical inquiry...in addition to the specific linguistic and textual requirements of academic discourse communities” (Morgan, 2009, p. 88).

Others, who do not overtly assign the critical EAP label to their work, nevertheless engage in praxis that problematizes the widely accepted norms upon which American postsecondary education is predicated. Lewis (2009), for example, studied immigrant students in a community college ESL program and found that these students’ reasons for pursuing ESL included the desire to develop a specific skill or knowledge set (e.g. to improve oral or aural comprehension of English) and to bring the benefits of education to the student’s family. Moreover, it was found that success is not static. Rather, these students’ beliefs about success varied according to their placement in and progression through the ESL program. That is, as language proficiency increased, students’ reported reasons for studying changed. Her research findings suggest that students’ personal understandings of success are not necessarily in line with institutional ideas of what is appropriate and necessary for this group of LM students. Likewise, Skillen and Vorholt-Alcorn’s (2009) exploration of migrant students enrolled in a community college ESL program illuminates the perceptual mismatches that may exist between students, teachers, and programs, and highlights the need for a clearer and more balanced perspective of community college LM students’ expectations with respect to the broader desires of the institution at large. These examples demonstrate the intent of critical EAP—to recognize that existing beliefs about the relationship between LM students and institutions bear scrutiny, and to

act intentionally to address divergence and inequity. Her example also acknowledges that the turn to more critical teaching is neither tidy nor straightforward (Benesch, 2009).

Critical EAP is an approach that “appeal[s] to teachers who are unhappy with current conditions, seeking ways to bring about pedagogical, institutional, and social change on behalf of and with their students” (Benesch, 2001, p. 138), but it should be noted that critical EAP is not limited to programs designated solely for English language learners. Rather, the approach “holds the assumption that educators need to research issues of ideology, power and inequality and that second/additional language teaching in contexts such as EAP can and should serve as a vehicle for institutional change and the promotion of social justice both within and beyond the university” (Morgan, 2009, p. 88). In order to effect this change, teachers who work with LM students must assume a central position as intermediaries, encouraging students to question predominant educational structures and concurrently permitting themselves that right as well.

2.4 Impact of Faculty on Community College Students

Teachers who work with LM students fulfill an essential role, in particular in the community college where it has been demonstrated that the interactions that occur between these teachers and students have significant potential to affect LM students’ subsequent academic experiences. In their study on programs at five California community colleges that demonstrate increased student outcomes, Levin et al. (2010) identified four common components: cohesion, cooperation, connection, and consistency. Each of the “Four C’s” is centered on the key role that faculty and staff play in conveying institutional and programmatic support of student achievement. Likewise, Schreiner et al. (2011) investigated the attitudes and beliefs of faculty and staff that bear upon high risk college students’ success and persistence, finding that “High-

risk students at community colleges spoke uniquely of faculty who respected them, had faith in them, and believed they could succeed” (p. 331).

When looking at the community college setting, it must be acknowledged that the bulk of students’ interactions with faculty take place in the context of the academic classroom (Barnett, 2011; Chang, 2005). To that end, many authors have turned their attention to the strong impact that faculty have in influencing community college students. For example, using data from the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), Ewers (2007) found that more frequent interaction with faculty contributed to higher rates of retention. (Although CCSSE does not restrict its definition of student-faculty interaction to what goes on in the classroom, “most [respondents] do not report having meaningful communications with instructors outside of the classroom” (CCSSE, 2012).) Chang (2005), who also used survey data to investigate how characteristics of students at two-year colleges correlated with faculty contact, asserts that faculty members play a central role in supporting community college students’ academic engagement which “is crucial for retaining and promoting students in the educational pipeline” (p. 794). The types of student-faculty interaction that were identified here included in-class discussion, asking questions immediately before or after class, and, less frequently, visiting teachers during office hours.

Where the studies cited above focus in the main on classroom-related student-faculty interactions, others suggest that interaction with faculty, whether directly related to the classroom or not, is highly influential for community college students. Levin et al.’s (2010) investigation of the ESL department at CCSF identified characteristics exhibited by faculty members that influence positive student outcomes, including clear communication of high standards, high levels of student interaction with faculty, and group solidarity/faculty cohesion. Likewise, in

their qualitative study of high-risk students across higher education and their teachers, Schreiner et al. (2011) used interviews to reveal faculty members' passion for work, their desire to impact students, their willingness to invest time and energy, and their ability to foster genuine and authentic connections—all of which were identified as paramount to practices that have a positive effect on student persistence. Further, Kinzie, Gonyea, Shoup, and Kuh (2008) argue that faculty members need to be cognizant of the individual needs of underrepresented students, and to adjust their teaching practices accordingly. Finally, Barnett (2011) suggests that students who have validating experiences are more likely to be academically integrated and more likely to intend to persist.

The need to more fully understand the influence of the interactions that occur between students and teachers in the community college classroom setting is undeniable if institutions and policymakers are interested, ultimately, in boosting LM students' persistence and completion rates. As cited above, there are many studies examining the course-related relationships of students and faculty. Although teachers may intend to affect students in positive and significant ways, the reality is more complex. To that end, it is necessary to acknowledge the ways in which teachers' desire and capacity to impact students are tempered by other significant factors over which they may have little awareness or control. In order to investigate the ways in which mainstream writing teachers interrelate with LM students, the present study makes use of the construct of teacher identity, specifically as it is enacted through teacher investment.

2.5 Teacher Identity

The notion of identity, while not new to second language scholarship, has been increasingly seen as fundamental in research on second language educational practice (Block, 2007; Norton & Toohey, 2011; Reeves, 2009). Identity, here, is viewed through a poststructural

lens, highlighting its dynamic, multiple, and socially-mediated nature (Norton, 2000, 2013; Norton Peirce, 1995; Norton & Toohey, 2011; Pavlenko & Norton, 2007). As such, it is seen as the result of a constant process of (re)negotiation between individuals and the communities and social institutions with which they come into contact (Cheung et al. 2015; Nieto, 2002; Norton Peirce, 1995; Norton & Toohey, 2011; Pennington & Richards, 2016).

In this dissertation, the social institution of American postsecondary education provides the context for conceiving of how community college LM teachers construct their professional identities in relation to LM students. Integral to this mutually constitutive concept of identity is the role of power (Darvin & Norton, 2015; Harklau, 2000; Nieto, 2002; Norton, 2000, 2013; Zembylas, 2018). Many contend that the power to assign the LM label to students whose primary language is not English lies mainly in the hands of faculty and institutions (c.f. Benesch, 1993, 2008; Marshall, 2010; Ortmeier-Hooper, 2008). Although students themselves have agency to assume or reject imposed labels (Chiang & Schmida, 1999; Costino & Hyon, 2007; Morita, 2004; Rodriguez & Cho, 2011), others, specifically teachers, are in positions of power and, thus, serve as gatekeepers within the community college.

Teacher identity is inherently politically and socially influenced (Benesch, 1993; Clarke, 2009; Darvin & Norton, 2015; Mockler, 2011; Zembylas, 2018), and this is notable because of the ways that teacher identity is manifested through interactions with learners. According to Reeves (2009), “the identity positions teachers claim for themselves and assign to others hold important implications not only for teachers’ practice...but also their students’ access to particular identities” (p. 36). That is, whether cognizant of it or not, teachers, their identities, and their subsequent actions inevitably impact students. The positioning of students in relation to teachers’ identities may, in fact, “[limit] the students’ opportunities to develop a positive sense of

themselves as learners” (Yoon, 2008, p. 499). In turn, these students may eventually come unquestioningly to assume and enact imposed identities thereby perpetuating significant stereotypes and inequities as a result (Benesch, 1993, 2008). Thus, it is necessary to consider how teachers, their identities, and the power they yield impacts LM students overall, but especially in the mainstream writing classroom.

2.5.1 Conceptualizations of Teacher Identity

2.5.1.1 Positioning

Different ways of interpreting teacher identity are present in research on LM teachers and students. Yoon (2008) and Reeves (2009), for example, make use of the concept of positioning (Harré & van Langenhove, 1991). Positioning refers to the ways that identities are created and claimed, assigned or resisted. In the case of the academic classroom, teachers deliberately and unconsciously adopt positions for themselves while simultaneously positioning others. Yoon (2008) investigated how three middle school teachers of regular (non-English language-specific) classrooms envisioned their roles in regard to English language learners (ELLs). Over the course of one semester, the author discovered that the teachers in her study positioned themselves differently—one as a teacher for all students, one as a teacher for non-ESL students, and one as a teacher of a single subject, English. Through the construct of positioning, the author determined that positions assumed by the teachers had diverse effects on their instruction and, thus, on their ELLs. In response, the ELLs came to identify themselves in particular ways. Where the “teacher of all students” worked to build an inclusive, culturally relevant classroom, all of the students were active and engaged. However, in the cases of the other two teachers, their classrooms were less attentive to the specific needs of ELLs. The LM students in these classes demonstrated less participatory behavior, interacted less with their peers, and claimed to feel unwelcome or unseen.

The author concludes that LM students' classroom involvement is highly impacted by their teachers' attention to their cultural, social, and linguistic needs. In effect, "The parameters of identity positions (whether the position is claimed or assigned) define what is expected of and socially possible for an actor" (Reeves, 2009, p. 36).

2.5.1.2 Investment

Another crucial lens through which to interpret teacher identity is that of investment. Investment is one way of understanding how teachers' identities translate into practice. As discussed earlier, Norton Peirce's (1995) notion of investment refers to the understanding that learners have socially influenced interests in language learning. That is, language learners may desire to learn to speak English, but their ability to actually engage in that endeavor may be constrained by social forces, many of which are outside of the learners' control. As a result, learners' apparent degrees of commitment and motivation to learning and using a second language may fluctuate. For example, in Norton Peirce's (1995) study, mentioned in the previous chapter, one participant, Eva, demonstrated a high level of interest and motivation to use English in her workplace, but she was reluctant to do so when co-workers and customers questioned her legitimacy to speak by drawing attention to markers of her immigrant status (e.g. her accent, her lack of pop culture knowledge). In contrast, another participant, Martina, asserted her right to speak at various times by situating herself as a mother instead of as a non-native speaker. In such a way she was able to take advantage of occasions to use her English that Eva was not. For Norton Peirce (1995), "The notion of investment conceives of the language learner, not as ahistorical and unidimensional, but as having a complex social history and multiple desires" (p. 9).

Whereas Norton Peirce (1995) initially conceived of investment as a more multidimensional way of understanding variability in *learners'* identities, and their desires to learn and engage in particular language learning practices, others purport that investment can also be used to interpret *teachers'* engagement in the language learning process. For instance, Reeves (2009) applied both positioning and investment in her study of a secondary school English teacher, Neal. Highlighting the meaning of investment as an economic exchange in which one expects a positive yield of some sort, Reeves (2009) asserts, "An actor invests in the identity of an other (by positioning the other) in order to achieve a return, that is, in order to assert and reinforce a self-identity" (p. 36). Neal's investment in students was intended to reinforce his own desire to be seen as a naturally competent and cool, yet strict teacher. It was important to him that he be considered distinct from his colleagues, so he worked to be viewed by his students as more effective, more relatable, and more demanding than their other instructors. Neal's vested interest in this identity had significant implications for the ELLs in his class who were not permitted any accommodations based on their linguistic and cultural differences. Reeves (2009) concludes that Neal's claimed identity position was problematic because it led to an assimilative approach to teaching the ELLs in his class.

2.5.1.3 Agency

Another integral aspect to the idea of investment discussed here is the concept of agency. Ahearn (2001) proposes a possible definition of agency as "the socioculturally mediated capacity to act" (p. 112). In a similar vein, Coldron and Smith (1999) refer to teachers' active location within a professional space as being subject to external forces. In either case, what holds true is that one's potential to act is not absolute. Rather, like investment, it is influenced and constrained by myriad social, cultural, and political factors. Agency is often discussed from a learner

perspective in second language learning research (e.g. Davis, 2009; McKay & Wong, 1996; Miller, 2010; Morita, 2004), but it cannot be forgotten that teachers, too, are agentic (Coldron & Smith, 1999; Rodriguez & Cho, 2011). The role of agency is relevant because it relates to the ability of teachers to act. Teachers' investment is influenced profoundly by numerous individual and socially-influenced factors including their personal and professional attitudes, beliefs, and previous experiences, but it is simultaneously mediated by their positions within the institutions where they work. In such a way, investment, as manifested through teachers' discourse and actions, is not wholly dependent on teachers' will to act but also on their capacity to do so.

2.6 Teaching Writing to Language Minority Students

The contextual focus of this study is the mainstream community college composition classroom. The cultural norms of American education dictate that expressing oneself well in writing is paramount, especially in the tertiary levels of the system (Curry, 2003; Riazantseva, 2012). This is no less true for LM students than it is for native English speakers. Writing is considered a potent indicator of academic achievement and promise, a skill on which future academic (and professional) success depends, particularly for LM students for whom writing can be particularly challenging (Hyland, 2007; Leki, 1992). However, “as a (nearly) universally sanctioned institution in the U.S.,” (Leki, 2006, p. 59), the first-year composition setting remains a fruitful space for exploring the experiences of LM students in higher education.

There is a plentitude of studies regarding LM students and writing, many of which tend to examine the pedagogical approaches that best facilitate students' success in the composition classroom (Leki, Cumming, & Silva, 2008; Matsuda, Ortmeier-Hooper, & You, 2006). In response, there has been a call to address what is lacking—understandings of how LM students in mainstream academic writing are impacted more broadly by forces external to the classroom.

“No amount of theoretical knowledge will be useful in shaping classroom practice unless we also understand how classroom practices are shaped by institutional policies and politics” (Matsuda et al., 2006, p. vii). As a result, research in second language writing has turned a critical eye to other issues, including how LM writers fare beyond the classroom setting, how they are impacted by institutional policy, and whether first-year composition is an appropriate gauge of academic literacy for LM students (Leki, 2006; Matsuda, Cox, Jordan, & Ortmeier-Hooper, 2011).

Riazantseva (2012) investigated the relationship between second language writing and broader academic success of three Russian immigrant students in college. The participants, who had come to the United States as teenagers with variable degrees of pre-arrival English and subsequently graduated from American high schools, came from highly literate homes. The author of the study found that the participants were able to achieve high academic standing despite their uneven performance in composition by demonstrating behaviors such as assertiveness, self-confidence, and ambition. “[T]he successful academic socialization skills that these students were inculcated with...made it possible for them to enjoy the level of success in higher education that may be incongruent with the quality of their academic work” (p. 184).

Ortmeier-Hooper (2008) conducted research on three LM students who, given the choice between an ESL or non-ESL section of a freshman writing course, chose to enroll in the latter to avoid being identified as different from their native English-speaking American peers. Like the participants in Riazantseva’s (2012) study, the participants here were born and raised for a certain amount of time outside of the United States. Having spent several years in the American educational system, however, they bristled at the possibility of being labeled as non-native English speakers. Ortmeier-Hooper (2008) demonstrates how the heterogeneity and inherent complexity of the LM student population may be a source of discord for postsecondary

institutions (Harklau, 2000; Nieto, 2002; Song, 2006). Studies such as these serve as reminders that the intersection of LM students and college writing is replete with promise as a site for further exploration.

One line of inquiry that builds on this potential looks at the myriad ways in which LM students and composition teachers interact with each other. Matsuda et al. (2011) contend that “first-year composition provides a continuous opportunity for students to negotiate both interpersonal and academic situations through writing and for teachers to refine their pedagogies as the student population continues to change” (p. 3). In the context of the composition classroom, one of the means by which writing teachers interface with LM students is through feedback on student writing. While studies on written corrective feedback are not new, over time this research has evolved from a focus on effectiveness and uptake (e.g., Ferris, 1995, 1997, 2006; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1994, 1996; Hyland, 1998; Hyland & Hyland, 2001; Truscott, 2007; Zamel, 1985) to consideration of the ways that teachers’ intentions and beliefs inform their responses to LM students’ writing and how that bears out in practice.

Ferris, Brown, Liu, & Stine (2011) examined the philosophies that inform college writing teachers’ feedback on L2 students’ work. In an attempt to bridge the gap between “first language (L1) and second language (L2) response research [that] has been completed and disseminated in separate arenas, with little consideration given to the current blurring of boundaries in many educational contexts between L1 and L2 student writers” (p. 207), the researchers sought to include in the study instructors of both mainstream and L2 composition courses. Participants demonstrated a variety of positions in regards to providing feedback on L2 writing ranging from 1) those who unconsciously avoided addressing L2 writers’ specific language errors, opting instead to focus on global issues of content and organization; 2) those who felt L2 writers did not

belong in their classes and needed to seek help elsewhere, or focused solely on L2 language errors; 3) those who were sensitive to L2 students' writing issues but did not feel prepared to address them; and 4) those who sought balance in addressing more global errors with select language-specific errors. The findings suggest that the types of feedback teachers give their rationales for doing so are reflective of their beliefs, knowledge, and experience.

Case, Williams, and Xu (2013) conducted a study of community college writing teachers' feedback on the work of LM and non-LM students. Looking at evidence of praise, criticism, and suggestions in teachers' feedback on student work, the investigators followed up with interviews to examine the impetus behind the differentiated feedback. All four participants denied figuring the population to which students belonged (e.g. native speaker, Generation 1.5, international) into their calculus of providing feedback. Rather, participants claimed that responding to each student's particular needs (as determined by a variety of needs analyses) is what drove them to comment as they did on students' writing. When compared to the quantitative analysis of feedback, however, it was determined their responses did illustrate a certain pattern. "Data exploring the source or philosophy driving how the instructors provided feedback suggested that they must balance a conflict between their beliefs and teaching philosophy, which support an individually based approach, and their actual feedback practices, which suggest that they differentiate their feedback across groups" (p. 98).

The benefit of this shift in research focus is that it brings to the fore a broader range of interactions and experiences that bear upon LM students in college composition courses while also recognizing inquiry into instructors as a legitimate and valuable subject of study. Matsuda et al. (2011) suggest that "the assumptions that guide composition professionals' interactions with second-language students are just as important as the interactions themselves" (p. 3). In other

words, it is equally important to acknowledge what influences instructors to act as they do as it is to investigate how they work with students in the classroom. Given their position as teachers of composition, these instructors are often gatekeepers to certificate and degree coursework.

Accordingly, it is advantageous to explore the ways in which their attitudes, beliefs, knowledge, and experiences inform their praxis, with an eye toward adapting curricular and institutional practices and policies to better suit the needs and desires of community college LM students.

2.7 Summary

The present study augments research on community college teachers of LM students by exploring the ways in which teacher identity is manifested through investment, as it is enacted in mainstream writing classes. Mediated by numerous individual and social influences, investment is neither singular nor static. Rather, it fluctuates and changes in relation to multiple factors and contexts. While Reeves (2009) contends that investment is essentially deliberate on the part of teachers so as to reinforce self-identified classroom identities, it is also possible to consider investment as less directed and intentional. That is, because identity is a site of struggle (Norton, 2000; Norton Peirce, 1995) and is constantly negotiated and in flux, investment may be an external expression of teachers' internal efforts to make sense of who they are professionally. Whether aware of it or not, the ways that teachers demonstrate or enact their investment inevitably impacts students in the classroom.

Lee (2012) argues that, "teacher identity resides in how teachers, as subjects of their activity systems...interpret their role within the system, and how they choose to act within it" (p. 13). In other words, teachers naturally situate themselves in relation to a host of forces that influence the ways they teach. In turn, students negotiate themselves in cooperation with teachers, which may have repercussions for students both in and beyond the classroom. By

considering how teachers, their investment, and the power they yield can affect LM students in a mainstream writing class, a better understanding can be reached of how teachers interrelate with this group of learners in postsecondary education. Certainly a clearer, deeper appreciation of this relationship would significantly increase the knowledge base that informs institutional approaches to the LM population.

Lundquist, Spalding, and Landrum (2002/2003) suggest, “Faculty members need to know that their influence spans across the educational domain—not only are they involved in knowledge delivery, but they also influence the student’s larger choice of whether or not to remain in school” (p. 132). Accordingly, this dissertation draws attention to the faculty-LM student relationship, by investigating how mainstream writing teachers at one Midwestern community college negotiate their professional identities in relation to LM students in their classrooms. The study is part of a relatively recent trend to investigate how teachers’ identities come into play with this particular population of learners. The choice of investment as an anchoring concept situates the study within the context of language learning and second language pedagogy, a worthwhile approach given the heterogeneity of current college composition classrooms (Ferris et al., 2011; Matsuda, 2013; Silva, 2011).

The ways in which teachers and students interact in the community college context should not be underestimated. The current understanding that faculty members are vital to community college student success (Levin et al., 2010; Schreiner et al., 2011) makes it clear that the interaction of teachers and students in the classroom should be looked at more closely in the immediate and long-term future. “[C]ollege leaders [need] to acknowledge faculty members as essential contributors to student outcomes and ensure that faculty members are not only central to college decisions and actions but also viewed as the critical or core element of student

development and attainment” (Levin et al., 2010, p. 24). Adopting the perspective of teacher investment in relation to LM students in a non-English language-specific course adds necessary depth and nuance to current understandings of how mainstream writing teachers interface with LM students in this setting.

Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This dissertation explores teachers' claimed professional identity (as defined by teachers' attitudes, beliefs, knowledge, and prior experiences) within the discursive context of practice, specifically as this issue relates to questions of teachers' investment in LM students. The research questions are:

- How do community college mainstream writing teachers construct their professional identities in relation to LM students, with regard to:
 - a. Attitudes?
 - b. Beliefs?
 - c. Knowledge?
 - d. Prior experiences?
- How do these professional identities influence their communication with and behavior towards LM students?

Beginning with a brief review of the rationale behind the choice of narrative research to investigate teacher identity, the chapter then presents a detailed explanation of the four focal categories. The subsequent section describes the data collection process, including tools, participants, and setting. Following this is a section that provides the definition of narrative that was applied in this study and delineates the discourse analytical approach that was employed. After describing my positionality, a reiteration of the study's design and purpose brings the chapter to a close.

3.2 Narrative and Teacher Identity

The current study draws on narrative methods to examine how mainstream writing teachers identify themselves with respect to LM students in their classrooms. The choice to focus on teachers' narratives is based on the notion that "teachers' professional and pedagogical understanding is strongly bound up within their narratives of practice" (Watson, 2006, p. 512). In other words, who teachers claim to be may be revealed by what they say about what they do (Cheung et al. 2015; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Golombek & Johnson, 2004; Kanno & Stuart, 2011; Watson, 2007). Johnson (2006), Pavlenko (2007), Georgakopoulou (2007a), Vásquez (2011), and others would take this statement one step further to maintain that *how* they say it is also notable. As such, teachers' narratives of practice shed light on "the (often) tacit nature of teachers' knowledge" (Loughran, Mitchell, & Mitchell, 2003, p. 853).

Kagan (1992) cautions that directly asking teachers what they think and why may not be an effective means by which to elicit authentic responses because teachers may not be conscious of or able to articulate why they believe what they do. In addition, inferring teacher beliefs by simply observing teachers in action may be misleading because teachers may behave in a particular way for a host of reasons not directly linked to teaching philosophy, including teaching context (Farrell & Lim, 2005; Kagan, 1992). To that end, Xu and Connelly (2009) contend that personal narrative can bring to the fore the origins of this hidden "form of personal practical knowledge that governs how people approach the practical world" (p. 223). Soliciting teachers' stories, therefore, allows teachers to speak about their experiences and "to reconcile what is known with what is hidden" (Golombek & Johnson, 2004, p. 308).

While it is generally accepted that what teachers do in the classroom is influenced by what they believe (Johnson, 1994), it is difficult to discover the nature of teachers' pedagogical

beliefs (Beijaard, Verloop, & Vermunt, 2000). Others, who echo the complexity inherent in such an undertaking, have tried to tease out each strand separately and, consequently, call for the need to differentiate between the individual constructs (Beijaard, Meijer, & Verloop, 2004; Pajares, 1992; Pettit, 2011). Accordingly, the four categories chosen for analysis in this study were attitudes, beliefs, knowledge, and prior experiences. It cannot be overlooked, however, that all of these pieces are interrelated and clear delineation between them is not entirely possible (Beijaard et al., 2004; Pajares, 1992). For example, attitudes and beliefs may be informed by knowledge and prior experiences, while knowledge is undoubtedly linked to prior experiences.

3.2.1 Focal Categories

3.2.1.1 Attitudes

A unitary definition of the research construct “attitudes” is difficult to distill from existing literature on the topic. For example, studies of teachers’ attitudes toward LM students in mainstream classrooms (Reeves, 2006; Youngs & Youngs, 2001) and their attitudes and behaviors in relation to student retention (Lundquist et al., 2002/2003; Schreiner et al., 2011) reveal a complex constellation connecting attitudes to expectation (Youngs & Youngs, 2001) or to behavior and perceptions (Schreiner et al., 2011). In her research on perceptions and attitudes of the inclusion of ESL students in mainstream classrooms, Reeves (2002) defines attitudes as “how teachers *felt* about ESL inclusion” (p. 36, emphasis added). Following Reeves (2002), the present study distinguishes attitudes from beliefs in that they represent teachers’ feelings toward particular aspects of the academic enterprise. This includes feelings that teachers have toward teaching as a profession, the institution, their program, and their individual and collective students.

3.2.1.2 Beliefs

As suggested by Pajares (1992), teachers' beliefs are a "messy construct." This sentiment is echoed by Pettit (2011) and Borg (2001), who claims that "the concept has acquired a rather fuzzy usage." In an attempt to clarify what is meant by beliefs in the literature, Borg (2001) enumerates certain qualities common to definitions of beliefs. In her view, beliefs may be consciously or unconsciously held. In addition, they are evaluative in nature and, therefore, have emotional resonance for the person who holds them. Beliefs also guide both thought and behavior, a view that is seconded by Pettit (2011). Similarly, in this study, beliefs include teachers' value-based thoughts (e.g. the value of the course, the value of language learning, the value of writing as a skill, the value of higher education) as well as teachers' future-oriented goals and ideas (e.g. teachers' own personal and professional futures, students' academic and professional futures).

3.2.1.3 Knowledge

Teacher knowledge has been defined in multiple ways. Connelly and Clandinin (1995), and Connelly, Clandinin, and Hu (1997), for example, metaphorically refer to knowledge as a landscape having multiple constituent parts. Borg (2003), who focuses on teacher cognition, also alludes to knowledge in a collective way by connecting "complex, practically-oriented, personalised, and context-sensitive networks of knowledge, thoughts, and beliefs" (p. 81). Fenstermacher (1994), however, suggests that knowing and believing are distinct insofar as "a claim to know is a special type of claim...requiring justification in ways that beliefs do not" (p. 30). While it is difficult to parse out what is meant precisely by teacher knowledge, Borg (2001) claims that "knowledge must actually be true in some external sense" (p. 186). In the present study, knowledge refers to information a teacher has gained specifically in relation to the act of

teaching through formal education or professional training and, as such, is treated as distinct from experience.

3.2.1.4 Prior Experiences

As mentioned earlier, there is clearly a relationship between knowledge and prior experiences, in particular when one considers knowledge as gained through previous formal educational experiences. Fenstermacher (1994) recognizes a distinction between formal knowledge, so-called knowledge *for* teachers, and practical knowledge, or knowledge *of* teachers. The latter refers to the knowledge teachers gain through the experience of teaching and reflection on that experience. Arguably, there are many types of experiences that impact one's teaching, whether or not they occur when one is part of the teaching profession. In this study, then, prior experiences are affiliated with teachers' unplanned and informal educative experiences across time. This includes teachers' experiences with language learning, different cultures, or specific individuals among a host of other possibilities. Even so, it is understood that the boundary between knowledge and prior experiences is somewhat blurred.

These four focal categories were investigated through teachers' narratives as elicited by interviews. We now turn to a discussion of the methods of data collection, including the rationale for employing interviews as the main tool for eliciting teachers' narratives.

3.3 Data Collection

Data collected for the study included questionnaires and regular semi-structured interviews. Questionnaires were used primarily to inform English faculty of the intent to do research and to solicit participation. Their secondary purpose was to gather contextual data about who Composition I writing teachers are (e.g. demographic information, length of time at the institution, educational background, etc.).

Interviews, the chief data collection tool used in the study, are commonly used to elicit narratives of personal experience in explorations of teacher identity. For example, Watson (2006) used interviews to “incite narrative” (p. 512) in her study of the professional identity of Dan, an experienced secondary teacher of English. Likewise, Johnson (2006) made use of interview to study how participants co-construct the identities of good research participant and good teacher. Varghese (2004) employed interviews to investigate identity formation in pre-service and in-service bilingual teachers. Here, participants were each asked to take part in a series of three individual interviews over the course of one semester, with each interview lasting approximately 45-90 minutes. The fact that the interviews occurred as a series is notable because, as Talmy (2011) notes, “respondents’ answers are oriented to, shaped by, and designed for the questions that occasion them; as well, answers are built on previous questions and answers the respondent has been asked and has (not) answered over the course of an interview or series of interviews” (p. 31). Accordingly, it is likely the case that the narratives provided by the interviewees over the course of the interview series were more extensive, more developed, or in other respects different than they would have been had participants only planned to take part in a solitary, stand-alone interview.

In total, five participants completed 14 interviews. The majority of interviews took place in an office adjacent to a shared adjunct faculty workspace. The only people in the office at the time of the interview were myself and the interviewee. The remaining interviews were conducted in the private offices of full-time faculty members or in classrooms before, during, or after observations. In the latter case, students were present at times. All interviews were audio recorded and transcribed.

There were two separate rounds of data collection. The first occurred in Fall 2014 and began with the distribution by e-mail of a questionnaire to all adjunct English faculty. Respondents who indicated interested in participating in the study (N=3) were contacted by e-mail to set up an interview schedule. The first interviews took place four-six weeks into the semester. The second interviews took place at midterm, either immediately before or during the classroom observation. Because of scheduling difficulties, the final interview for the first round of data collection took place at the beginning of the following semester, Spring 2015. Participants provided a selection of written student-directed communication throughout the data collection period.

The second round of data collection took place in Spring 2015. Again, it began with the distribution of a questionnaire by e-mail to all English faculty (adjunct as well as full-time) minus those who had participated in the study previously. Those respondents who indicated interest in taking part (N=2) were contacted by e-mail to set up an interview schedule. As in the first round of data collection the first interviews took place approximately one month into the semester. The second interview at the midterm preceded or coincided with the classroom observation. The final interview took place in the final week of Spring 2015. One participant was unable to complete the final interview.

3.3.1 Participants

The participants² in this study were a sample of mainstream writing teachers assigned to teach Composition I. All English adjunct instructors (N=21) scheduled to teach in Fall 2014 were asked to participate in the study through the completion of a questionnaire distributed via e-mail prior to the start of the semester. Initially only adjunct instructors were invited to participate; however, a low number of respondents in the first instance prompted the inclusion of full-time

² All participants' names have been changed.

faculty in a second round of the study in Spring 2015 (N=24). Ultimately, over the course of two semesters, a total of five participants elected to participate in the study (Table 1). All of the participants hold M.A.s of English. The three adjunct participants hold additional M.A.s in Education. The two full-time participants hold terminal degrees—one a Ph.D. in Education with a minor in Teaching English as a Second or Other Language (TESOL) and Composition, and the other with a Ed.D. in Education with a focus on language teaching. Noah, who holds the Ed.D. in Education, also holds a M.A. TESOL and was pursuing a second terminal degree, a Ph.D. in Composition, at the time of his participation in the study.

Table 3-1: Study participants

	Amelia	Brad	Lana	Grant	Noah
Gender	F	M	F	M	M
Age	35-49	35-49	35-49	35-49	50-64
Race	Caucasian	Caucasian	Caucasian	Caucasian	Caucasian
1st language	English	English	English	English	English
Other language(s)	German		French; Spanish	Chinese	Chinese
Educational background	M.A. English M.A. Education	M.A. English M.A. Education	M.A. English M.A. Education	M.A. English Ph.D. Education	M.A. English M.A. TESOL Ed.D. Education
Department	English	English	English; Business Administration	English	English
College level teaching	11-20 years	6-10 years	11-20 years	21+ years	21+ years
Writing Center	Yes	Yes			
Faculty status	Adjunct	Adjunct	Adjunct	Full-time	Full-time
EAP teaching experience				Yes	Yes

3.3.2 Institutional Context

The institution where the study occurred is a community college located in the Midwestern United States. It is classified as a large, two-year, public associate's college (Carnegie Classification, 2017). There are over 50 degree and certificate programs on offer, including four associate degrees—Associate of Arts (AA), Associate of Science (AS), Associate of Applied Science (AAS), and Associate of General Studies (AGS)—as well as numerous certificates of completion and career certificates. It also provides lifelong, or community, education and workforce training for those students who are not in degree or certificate programs. The institution is a member of the League for Innovation in the Community College, an international effort to facilitate innovation and experimentation of community colleges, and Achieving the Dream, a national initiative sponsored by the Lumina Foundation promoting community college student success, particularly of low-income students and students of color.

The institution employs approximately 330 full-time faculty members and 550 part-time or adjunct faculty members. Most faculty hold master's degrees in their field (or a related one), and many have or are pursuing doctoral degrees. At the time the study took place, there were 29 full-time English faculty members and 1 full-time EAP faculty member in the English and Journalism department, where both Composition and EAP courses are housed. Their adjunct counterparts numbered well over 50 for English and 15 for EAP. For several consecutive years, this institution has been deemed a “Great College to Work For” by the Chronicle of Higher Education based on reports of job satisfaction, professional development opportunities, and work/life balance. The voluntary turnover rate is less than 2%.

The institution has an exclusively undergraduate student body with nearly 22,000 students currently enrolled. The average student age is 25, and the majority of students are

enrolled part-time. Roughly half of the students have declared themselves degree or certificate seeking. More than three-quarters of the student body reside in the surrounding county, where the median household income is over \$74,000. The study body is 55 percent female and approximately 80 percent Caucasian.

At the time of the study, there were approximately 240 LM students enrolled at this institution. While demographic information on these students is not readily available, anecdotally it can be said that they span a wide range of ages, home languages, educational levels, and academic/professional goals. Students are placed into the EAP program as a result of their scores on the COMPASS ESL placement test. Typically, having tested into the EAP program, these students are required to complete the program before being allowed to enroll in Composition I.

3.4 Data Analysis

Definitions of what makes a narrative as well as what constitutes narrative research abound. Riessman (2008) refers to narrative analysis as “a family of methods for interpreting texts that have in common a storied form” (p. 11). Smith (2007) calls narrative research “an umbrella term for a mosaic of research efforts, with diverse theoretical musings, methods, empirical groundings, and/or significance all revolving around an interest in narrative” (p. 392). In other words, “narrative research means different things to different researchers” (Barkhuizen, 2011, p. 409). The breadth of inquiry that falls under the category of narrative research leads to a profusion of overlapping, sometimes contradicting terms. One feature that seems to be common in narrative research on identity, however, is the focus on language as enacted through discourse (c.f. Cheung et al., 2015; Georgakopoulou, 2007a; Johnson, 2006; Pavlenko, 2007; Vásquez, 2011).

Language, both spoken and written, is how meaning is made, and how actions and identities are realized (Christie, 2002; Gee, 2014a). However, it is not simply a question of taking at face value the words that are said. “Narrative analysts interrogate intention and language—*how* and *why* incidents are storied, not simply the content to which language refers” (Riessman, 2008, p. 11). Gee (2014a) argues that discourse, or language-in-use, cannot be untangled from the enactment of activity and identity. What teachers say (language-in-use) is inextricably linked with what they do (activity) and who they are (identity). This implies the interface of “language, actions, interactions, ways of thinking, believing, valuing, and using various symbols, tools, and objects to enact a particular sort of socially recognizable identity” (Gee, 2014a, p. 46). Likewise, Johnstone (2008) claims that identity is performed through discourse for a variety of reasons and that such identity performance can achieve different ends. As such, narrative research can provide insight into what informs teachers’ discursive manifestations of professional identity.

3.4.1 Narrative Research

While there may be broad agreement that “we live in a story-shaped world” (Smith & Sparkes, 2008, p. 5), there is no overwhelming consensus as to what does and does not make up a narrative (Barkhuizen, 2011; Georgakopoulou, 2007b; Riessman, 2008; Smith & Sparkes, 2006, 2008). In the present study, the following definition of narrative as explicated by Gubrium and Holstein (1997), is adopted. Narratives are:

“accounts that offer some scheme, either implicitly or explicitly, for organizing and understanding the relation of objects and events described. Narratives need not be full-blown stories with requisite internal structures, but may be short accounts that emerge within or across turns at ordinary conversation, in interviews or interrogations, in public documents, or in organizational records.” (p. 147)

This definition is appropriate for a number of reasons. First, while recognizing that narratives provide one with a way to arrange and present one's experiences, the authors allow that this may be implicit or explicit. That is, it may be either that the meaning of the narrative remains hidden (to the narrator and/or interlocutor) and, thus, is unable to be articulated, or that the narrator and/or interlocutor find the significance of the narrative to be plain and unambiguous, requiring no elucidation. A different reading of these same words may suggest that the narrator is conscious or unconscious of the meaning delivered by the narrative. (This ambiguity, whether intentional or not, allows for even broader possibilities in terms of what can be classified as narrative.) Second, the inclusion in the definition of both highly structured narratives along with shorter, more emergent stories allows for a breadth of story types, from big to small. As such, narratives do not necessarily have to follow a set narrative structure as suggested by Labov and Waletzky (1967) but rather can be seen as "story-like" (Watson, 2006). Third, this definition takes into account the circumstances in which the narrative is presented. Georgakopoulou (2007a) says "the interactional features of narratives are specifically and inextricably bound up with their context of occurrence" (p. 33). This sentiment is echoed by Riessman (2008) and Vásquez (2011), both of whom stress the need to attend to local contexts of production. To that end, it is necessary to account for the differing environments in which narrative occurs, whether they be informal, formal, free-form, or highly structured.

As mentioned above, interviews were the primary means of data collection for this study, so analysis began with consideration of the transcribed interviews. To start, references to and/or examples of the four categories indicative of the identity of an invested teacher (attitudes, beliefs, knowledge, and prior experiences) were identified and color-coded by focal category. These coded sections were compiled into four separate documents according to focal category and then

analyzed for recurring ideas or themes (e.g. patience, communication, relationships, institutional barriers, etc.). Sections that demonstrated evidence of such themes were then revisited in the context of their original interviews in order to better understand the broader circumstances in which the utterances occurred. Next, based on the definition of narrative provided above (c.f. Gubrium & Holstein, 1997), the identified sections in the transcriptions were searched for instances that could be called narrative. In the end, some narratives were short and bounded whereas others spanned the course of a full interview or more than one interview. Finally, more detailed analysis of the discourse used in those narratives was conducted. Thus, the eleven narratives that were included in this study for analysis were reconstructed from across each participants' series of interviews, meaning that, although participants' speech was initially separated according to the four focal categories, the resulting narratives encompassed several if not all of the focal categories.

Upon finding narratives touching on the four focal categories, designated portions of the data were re-transcribed using stanzas. According to Gee (2014b), stanzas are a way of breaking up extended instances of speech to render them more manageable for analysis.

“Each stanza is a group of idea units about one important event, happening, or state of affairs at one time and place, or it focuses on a specific character, theme, image, topic, or perspective. When time, place, character, event, or perspective changes, we usually get a new stanza.” (Gee, 2014b, pp. 80-81)

The length of the stanzas or even the entire narrative is not set, and the stanzas work individually but also together as a whole to create the narrative. Stanzas can be labeled structurally and/or thematically.

Riessman (2008) argues that this approach to analyzing narratives can bring to light themes that would otherwise go unnoticed. It may also make the data more accessible to readers; however, it should not be forgotten that the resulting transcriptions are representations of the

researcher's interpretation and what she deems notable for analysis. That is to say, there are benefits to presenting narrative data in this way, including a cleaner and more readable version of participants' speech, but there are drawbacks as well. For example, it should be noted that the narratives have been excerpted from the broader speech stream of the individual interviews, which means the narratives are not necessarily as linear in content and time as they appear. In addition, in attempting to present the data clearly, hesitations, pauses, and other discourse markers that could be considered relevant in a different mode of discourse analysis have been removed in favor of readability.

Gee (2014b) notes that the purpose of stanzas is "to be clear about what clusters of sense or meaning you as a listener or *interpreter* have seen in a stretch of speech" (p. 86, emphasis added). As a result, the narratives presented here have been judged as relevant for analysis according to criteria that I have identified as useful and pertinent, just as they have been presented in a way that represents the data in an appropriate and comprehensible manner. Once sections of the recorded data were transcribed as stanzas and each stanza labeled thematically, the resulting narratives were examined for evidence of the ways in which participants identified themselves as invested teachers through the use of language and other tools or resources.

3.4.2 Discourse Analysis

The choice of discourse analysis as analytical approach follows the work of other scholars who view narrative and identity through a discursive lens (Atkinson & Coffey, 2002; Barkhuizen, 2010, 2011; Bell, 2002; Gee, 2014a; Pavlenko, 2007; Vásquez, 2011). Freeman (2007) claims, "identity is produced and re-produced in specific discursive situations" (p. 159). Similarly, Johnson (2006) likens identity to "a construction within discourse or talk" (p. 231). The focus on identity construction through talk responds to a call to go beyond considering

narratives according to *what* they present and to place an emphasis on *how* they are presented. In such a way, it becomes necessary to move beyond an exclusive focus on the content of a narrative in order to attend as well to the “linguistic and narrative resources [speakers use] to present themselves as particular kinds of individuals” (Pavlenko, 2007, p. 177).

Accordingly, in order to look at narrative and identity in a discursive manner, it is necessary to go beyond thematic analysis in order to attend to the language used as well as the situational context and the purposes for which the narrative is presented. Bamberg (2007) promotes a discourse analytic framework as one well-suited to unpacking identity in narrative. He explains that

“narratives cannot be taken simply and interpreted solely for what has been said and told. Rather, they have to be analyzed, and the analysis of narratives has to work with what we have, the actual wording and the delivery/style of the wording. The analysis has to work through this in order to perceive how a ‘sense of self’—or an ‘identity’—has been conveyed and is indexed.” (p. 168)

In other words, it is necessary to examine narratives with an eye to the language and discursive features that narrators make use of in order to display an identity. Riessman (2008) likens this kind of analysis to the slowing down of a musical composition in order “to notice how a narrator uses form and language to achieve particular effects” (p. 81).

It is also crucial to examine the ways in which “[l]anguage is melded with other things in the act of enacting and recognizing identities” (Gee, 2014a, p. 24), the so-called “details of talk” (Georgakopoulou, 2007b, p. 149). These “other things” or “everything else” (to use Gee’s informal turn of phrase) refer to other factors at play in a narrative that may or may not be visible to the eye (or ear), factors such as feelings, beliefs, values, symbols, actions, tools, and objects (Gee, 2014a; Watson, 2006). Interaction, therefore, whether with other people and/or with “other

things” is a primary feature of discourse and must be taken into account in analysis (Vásquez, 2011).

Arguably, as proposed by Gee (2014a), interaction occurs not only between interlocutors but also between speakers and “everything else.” “To enact identities people have to talk the right talk, walk the right walk, behave as if they believe and value the right things, and wear the right things at the right time and right place” (Gee, 2014a, p. 24). In brief, discourse is a social process. Narrative research on identity must therefore, to the extent possible, account not only for the interface between the researcher and participant but also the role of other potential influences, be they human (e.g. colleagues or students in a classroom) or environmental (e.g. the institution at large or the broader community). Although this further complicates the researcher’s task, it falls within the responsibilities of an ethical researcher (Riessman, 2008).

3.5 Researcher’s Positionality

In the spirit of collaboration between researcher and participants espoused by narrative researchers, it is necessary that I, as the primary researcher, explain my own motivations for delving into the topic of teacher identity in relation to LM students in the mainstream community college writing classroom including my teaching background, beliefs about the student population in question, and relationship with the institution and study participants. Such information is provided in order to afford readers of the dissertation a sound, candid foundation upon which to base their understandings of my interpretations of the data and, moreover, to lend credibility to the study as a whole.

I have long been interested in language and writing. My experience teaching language spans nearly 20 years. I began teaching English to LM students in a second language context in 2004 and began working in community college in 2006. The institution where this research took

place has been my primary place of employment for the past decade. During this time I have taught in the school's English for Academic Purposes (EAP) program and have been occupied predominantly with teaching courses in academic writing.

One of the reasons I am interested in investigating the topic at hand is to better understand what happens to the LM students I have taught once they exit the EAP program. All degree or certificate seeking students at my institution are required to take Composition I. For LM students in the EAP program, successful completion of the highest level of EAP writing is a prerequisite to enter into this gatekeeper course. In particular, I am interested in how Composition I teachers, who may or may not necessarily be trained in ESL or who may or may not be fully aware of the aims of the field of ESL/EAP, conceive of and interact with LM students who have completed the EAP program. It may be that those who teach EAP are in some ways distinct from their non-EAP counterparts.

My involvement with the EAP program coincided with the start of my doctoral studies. I began to investigate the community college as a unique postsecondary institution and to explore, in particular, LM students in this environment. From the scholarship I have read on this topic over time, I have been left with the impression that the LM student-teacher relationship is oversimplified. That is, it seems that research on LM students in academic settings tends to conceive of teachers as either working for or against LM students. I believe it is erroneous to assume that certain teachers, specifically those with training and experience teaching in ESL, are working unequivocally in support of LM students whereas teachers trained differently are not. Rather than characterize EAP teachers as saints and their non-EAP counterparts as demons, I seek to reveal a more complex yet more truthful representation of teachers of LM students in community college.

My wish to complicate the portrait of LM students' teachers is directly related to my interest in teacher identity. As both a teacher and a student, I am acutely aware of how each of these positions offers me insight into my professional and academic practices. In my role as teacher, I continuously reflect on what I do in the classroom and wonder if I am facilitating my students' success or if I am imposing my own ideas of what success is onto my students. In my role as student, I attend very closely to what my teachers do and say, and how this communication impacts my feelings of capability, my decision-making, and my future outlook. Based on my personal experiences, my hope in carrying out this research is also to shed light on what I believe to be the considerable yet underexplored reciprocal relationship between teachers and their LM students.

3.6 Summary

This qualitative study draws on narrative methods and discourse analysis to examine how mainstream community college writing teachers conceive of themselves as professionals in relation to LM students in their classrooms. The use of narrative as a methodological approach relates to and underscores many of the notions relevant to both identity and investment insofar as individuals' stories are illustrative of the experiences, assumptions, beliefs, and knowledge that shape who they are (Bell, 2002; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Widdicombe, 1998). Data were collected over the course of one academic year (two semesters) and consisted primarily of interviews. Participants included both adjunct and full-time composition instructors. Data were analyzed discursively following Gee (2014a, 2014b) with the intent of understanding how language form and use intertwine with other contextual forces that together allow and constrain individuals' narratives of identity and investment.

In this chapter I have sought to establish the appropriateness of a narrative approach to exploring teacher identity and have argued for the utility of interviews as the primary data collection tool. Within this methodological framework I have also explained the relevance of a discourse-oriented analysis and have provided details regarding the study design and participants. Bearing this information in mind, we now turn to the results of the study.

Chapter 4: Results

4.1 Introduction

This study is an exploration of community college mainstream writing teachers' claimed professional identities and their investment in language minority (LM) students as expressed discursively through teachers' narratives. This section presents results from the study in the form of relevant narratives from each of the five study participants and identifies the four categories indicative of professional identity (attitudes, beliefs, knowledge, and prior experiences) present in each narrative. Before each narrative is presented, the different focal categories are summarized in table format, according to whether or not they are present in each of the stanzas that constitute the narrative. Each narrative is then presented by participant and in stanza form according to Gee (2014b). For most participants there are two narratives; for one participant (Graham) there are three (cf. Table 1 in Chapter 3 for additional participant details). Following the presentation of each participant's narratives, the results are summarized in light of how the four focal categories of teacher identity are represented.

Gubrium and Holstein (1997) attest that narratives do not necessarily need to be singular, fully formed stories but rather can be found in short accounts that occur in different types of formal or informal settings. In this case the majority of the 11 narratives emerged across a series of two or three semi-structured interviews; only two spanned the course of a single interview. Each of the interview narratives is identified by a general theme and further broken down into stanzas that, in turn, are labeled thematically. Stanzas, which are composed of participants' utterances and transcribed line by line, are "sets of lines devoted to a single topic, event, image, perspective, or theme" (Gee, 2014a, p. 157). Each line ends with a / or //. Lines ending in / indicate an incomplete utterance or thought that is continued on a following line; lines ending in

// indicate a complete utterance or thought. The narratives found below are presented by participant; however, the order of narratives is not indicative of any particular feature or preference.

4.2 Participants' Narratives

4.2.1 Amelia

Amelia is a Caucasian female whose first language is English. She holds a M.A. in both English and Education, and has between 11-20 years of teaching experience. She is currently an adjunct instructor in the English department, typically teaching at least one section of Composition I and/or II. She has also worked concurrently in the Writing Center in the past.

Two main thematic strands emerge in the interviews Amelia gave. One strand focuses on the trials of managing a teacher-student relationship where the participants can find no common ground; the other centers on her interests in and motivations for building students' confidence through writing. Both narratives are anchored in her interactions with LM students as individuals and as a group. Within this frame she speaks about the desires she has for her students and methods for achieving those goals as well as her passion for writing as a discipline. Amelia's narratives illustrate primarily three categories: attitudes, beliefs, and prior experiences.

4.2.1.1 Amelia: Narrative 1

Table 4-1: Categories seen in Amelia, Narrative 1

	Attitudes (A)	Beliefs (B)	Knowledge (K)	Prior experiences (PE)
Stanza 1	X			
Stanza 2	X	X		
Stanza 3	X	X		
Stanza 4	X	X		
Stanza 5	X			X
Stanza 6	X	X		X
Stanza 7	X	X		

Amelia's first narrative was prompted by the lead researcher's question, "Can you describe what you'd call an unsuccessful or difficult interaction with an LM student?" The resulting narrative, which is entirely from the first interview, recounts her relationship with what she finds to be a particularly challenging LM student. From Amelia's perspective this difficult situation stems from a mismatch between what she and the student see as problematic in the student's writing as well as what she views as an unwillingness on the student's part to act on her feedback (Stanzas 1 and 2). With respect to the category of attitudes, the feelings Amelia has about the individual student are on display here as she gives the background for her narrative. As she provides this background, she also demonstrates her view of her role as a teacher. It is her responsibility to guide the student to an understanding that content in academic writing is of primary importance and thus should take precedence over more minor issues like punctuation and grammar. In expressing her opinion about content versus grammar, Amelia hints at her belief about the value of learning to write well.

STANZA 1: Background (A)

Interview 1

1. I'm having [a difficult LM student interaction] right now //
2. I'm struggling. I'm really struggling //
3. I'm having sleeplessness over this person /
4. Because I have had countless meetings with this person /
5. And he's not taking any of my suggestions //
6. He just wants me to tell him what's wrong and fix it //
7. He keeps saying "I need help with my grammar" /
8. But it's not grammar //
9. It's really like he does not understand what he's saying //
10. And so, he's like, lifting /
11. Doing a little bit of plagiarizing //
12. He says a lot "Okay, I understand" /

13. Even though I know he doesn't understand //
14. And I've had to pause and just say "I know you don't understand. Let me try to explain" //
15. And he does understand directions /
16. But I said "I think you want this to be a grammatical issue, and it's really more about ideas" //

STANZA 2: Grammar vs. content (A, B)

17. And I'm definitely an instructor who ideas have to be there first //
18. On the totem pole of hierarchy /
19. Grammar is really down there //
20. We can fix that //
21. I can fix a comma and semicolon and tell you how to do it //
22. But if you don't have an idea that makes sense /
23. Who cares if it's perfectly punctuated if it has absolutely no relevance //

As seen in Stanzas 3 and 4 the difficulty of the situation is compounded by the LM student's perceived complacency concerning Amelia's efforts to provide useful feedback and his disregard for the time she has set aside to work one-on-one with him. Amelia's attitudes toward the student as well as her role as a teacher continue to be displayed here. Amelia's belief that writing well is a valuable skill becomes more evident as she reiterates the importance of content over grammar. Accordingly, Amelia demonstrates her belief that feedback, both providing it and accepting it, is a necessary step in one's development as an academic writer.

STANZA 3: Interaction with LM student (example) (A, B)

24. And so, for example, we met this morning //
25. He wanted to meet /
26. And I said the only time I really had was at 7:00, 7:15 //
27. And he was half an hour late/
28. Which is pretty common /
29. And then he was upset I only had 10 minutes to give him /
30. Because I had a class //

31. And it was the third draft of this essay that I'd already read through three times /
32. Made very, very /
33. I mean, we went through that word by word /
34. And he did not follow a single suggestion //
35. And so that's really difficult /
36. Because I'm at a crossroads with him //
37. I said "You want me just to fix grammatical things, but what I'm, we need to have
 you understand what you're saying" //
38. And so, I had given him the suggestion of reading /
39. Because when he reads it out loud /
40. He knows he's omitting//
41. He understands, like /
42. But he doesn't do it with anyone but me //
43. Even though I've suggested /
44. I'm not the sole audience /
45. And we can't do this seven days a week /
46. Especially when you don't change anything //
47. You just want to change commas and turn it back in /
48. Even though you've omitted ideas //
STANZA 4: Interaction with LM student (evaluation) (A, B)
49. So, this one's /
50. He's /
51. I want to help him /
52. But he's //
53. It's also kind of difficult /
54. Because I feel like I'm working a little bit harder than he is //
55. And he admits it //
56. I asked him today "Did you take any of these suggestions?" //
57. And he said "No" //
58. Instead he just brought it back to me //

In Stanzas 5 and 6 Amelia acknowledges the need for patience in working with this particular LM student and the apparent novelty of working with a student who blatantly disregards her feedback. She questions her own abilities to meet this student's needs but realizes, in comparison to her experiences with other students, this appears to be a singular occurrence. As in previous stanzas, Amelia's attitudes about the student himself and her role as a teacher can be seen. Here, though, her role expands beyond guiding and giving feedback she should provide to the kinds of characteristics a teacher should have (i.e. patience and clarity of expression). Also in these stanzas Amelia notably refers to other experiences with colleagues and students to help her reconcile her attitudes about this challenging LM student. These experiences provide a foil for her to examine her actions and feelings. While Amelia feels that patience with this student is necessary, she also concludes that his success is dependent less on her willingness to work than on the student's. Although she is reticent to accept this truth, in this case Amelia believes that working harder than others is necessary for this LM student to do well.

STANZA 5: Interaction with colleague (example) (A, PE)

59. I was in the office /

60. And one of my colleagues came over and said "You are the most patient person" //

61. I am not the most patient person /

62. But right now I am //

STANZA 6: Interaction with colleague (evaluation) (A, B, PE)

63. This is the first time where I've really kind of like //

64. I have another [LM] student in the same class who's dealing with a lot of the same issues /

65. But he's got all that follow-through /

66. And he's so much more successful //

67. So I'm using that as sort of my gauge //

68. "Okay, am I really being impatient? Am I not being articulate?" //

69. But I'm seeing success with students with the same assignments //

70. I have a feeling it's just more /
 71. He wants a quick fix //
 72. And I actually had to say "I know you don't want to hear this, but you're going to
 have to work harder than everybody else" //
 73. And that's a terrible thing to have to say to someone /
 74. But it's honest //
 75. I mean it's truthful //

Amelia acknowledges her ability to aid this LM student in a sufficient manner is constrained by forces outside her control (Stanza 7). Following her admission in the previous stanza that this student's diligence must outpace that of his classmates, here Amelia reiterates her feelings that her role as the teacher is to provide support. She demonstrates her continual willingness to aid this student on an individual basis and to help him seek additional alternative resources but is ultimately left with the realization that her role is circumscribed.

STANZA 7: Agency (A, B)

76. Lead Researcher (LR): Is this student going anywhere else?
 77. Amelia: He's not taken any of those suggestions //
 78. I've even offered to walk over there with him /
 79. And walk him through a session with a tutor //
 80. I have the tutors come into my classes and model what I'm asking them to do /
 81. And they've already done it this semester //
 82. So, he's already seen exactly what I'm asking him to do /
 83. But he hasn't gone //
 84. So, I'm, you know /
 85. That's one of those situations where you can lead a horse to water, right? //

Summary: In Stanza 1 Amelia suggests she feels challenged by this LM student "because I have had countless meetings with this person, and he's not taking any of my suggestions" (lines 4 and 5). As a result, Amelia claims she is "struggling" (line 2), and the situation is causing her "sleeplessness" (line 3). In Stanzas 3 and 4 Amelia further explains that the situation is

“difficult” (lines 35 and 53) because she is “at a crossroads with him” (line 36). Although she does not say so directly, Amelia demonstrates feelings of frustration based on his disregard for her time (lines 24-30) and effort (lines 31-34). She feels conflicted about what she wants to do (line 51) and what she is willing to do (lines 53 and 54). She cannot force him to take her suggestions, but the situation causes her to question whether she is doing what she should to help this student (line 68). In line 72 Amelia tells him, “I know you don’t want to hear this, but you’re going to have to work harder than everybody else.” Her phrasing suggests she does not necessarily want to make such a statement, but she reconciles this feeling with the reasoning that she is being honest with the student (lines 73-75). In Stanza 7 she further details what she has done to help this student specifically and all of her students in general, but ultimately she is left with the realization that he will not seek outside help (line 85) any more than he will accept her feedback.

4.2.1.2 Amelia: Narrative 2

Table 4-2: Categories seen in Amelia, Narrative 2

	Attitudes (A)	Beliefs (B)	Knowledge (K)	Prior experiences (PE)
Stanza 1	X	X		
Stanza 2	X			
Stanza 3	X	X		X
Stanza 4	X	X		X
Stanza 5	X	X		X

Amelia’s second narrative spans the entire series of three interviews and involves the same categories as her first (attitudes, beliefs, and prior experiences). Here, the narrative revolves less around her interactions with a particular LM student and more around the goals she has for all of her LM students, and her rationale for those goals, specifically why she feels passionately about composition as a discipline. Amelia’s first goal for her LM students is for

them to become more confident in their ability to understand and execute writing tasks (Stanza 1). Her second goal, which is related to the first but more concrete, is for her LM students to be able to decode the requirements of an assignment (Stanza 2). The categories on display in these stanzas are attitudes and beliefs. Amelia's attitude toward her role as a teacher is clearly expressed. Again, her responsibility is to guide her LM students toward the achievement of the composition goals she delineates. Further, she reveals her belief that attaining the goal of confidence in expressing oneself through writing is especially important at present because it is linked to valuable qualities applicable beyond the classroom (e.g. mindfulness and making a good impression).

STANZA 1: Goal 1 = confidence (A, B)

Interview 1

1. LR: What is it you want your LM students to have when they leave your room?
2. Amelia: I think the first day /
3. My prevailing message is "I would like you to feel more confident when you take on a task in writing" //
4. As opposed to feeling like I can't do this /
5. I want you to walk away saying "I know how and I can" //
6. There are lots of ways to meet that goal /
7. But confidence and maybe /
8. Confidence and maybe feeling more capable of articulation on paper /
9. Saying what you mean to say and knowing what you want to say //
10. Because I know in this digital world /
11. A lot of what we put is in writing /
12. Not necessarily on paper//
13. We have to be /
14. More mindful of words and the way our impression is made because of that //

STANZA 2: Goal 2 = understanding (A)

15. I would say /

16. That for a Comp I class would be first and foremost //
17. And whether [LM students] can understand an assignment //
18. But just being able to understand the expectations of an assignment /
19. And feeling confident that you can fill those expectations //

In Stanzas 3 and 4 Amelia acknowledges that in working toward the goals she enumerates for the LM students in her composition classroom, her LM students will ultimately be led to achieve goals beyond it. She assumes the role of facilitator and highlights the need to work one-on-one with LM students in order to meet her (and their) goals. The categories illustrated here are attitudes, beliefs, and prior experiences. Amelia makes general reference to her experiences with students as she highlights her attitude toward her job as a composition teacher. In displaying this attitude she further illustrates her belief that learning to write well has implications outside of the classroom and reiterates her position (revealed in Narrative 1) that valuing content over grammar is an important lesson in composition.

STANZA 3: Goals (reprise) (A, B, PE)

Interview 2

20. I love it when my [LM] students leave /
21. And they don't just say "I learned a lot about writing" /
22. But I feel like they learned a lot about learning //
23. I don't devalue the fact /
24. That maybe the goal for them is not quote writing a research paper /
25. But knowing how to find resources /
26. Knowing how to ask someone they think has authority over them a question //
27. I realize here /
28. That may be something a [LM] student has never done before //
29. I know that part of that is hard /
30. A lot of my [LM] students struggle with meeting with you one on one /
31. And then having to read their work out loud //
32. But I like them to value hearing it /

33. That it's important to hear the way it sounds /
34. And then when we pause and say "The sentence that you just said. Is that a sentence? What is the subject?" //
35. And that kind of thing //
- STANZA 4: LM students' expectations vs. teacher's expectations (A, B, PE)
36. I try to hear what [LM students] want //
37. In my experience they just want to feel confident that they're turning something in in good English /
38. But I really stress content //
39. Is it a good idea? //

In Stanza 5 Amelia's feelings for composition as a discipline underlie the manner by which she aids her LM students to meet their writing goals. She details the importance of the written word as a link between thought and emotion, and notes the central role of the writer as an individual. In this final stanza Amelia relates two experiences seemingly unrelated to her professional work that nevertheless have direct bearing on her pedagogy. The first is an episode in which a conversation with a friend requires Amelia to explain her stance on the subject of composition. In order to illustrate this Amelia calls on a past experience with a speech her brother wrote for her wedding. At the end of Amelia's description of these experiences she alludes to the ways in which these experiences affect both her beliefs about the personal nature of writing and her feelings about what it means to be a composition teacher.

STANZA 5: Importance of composition/Interaction with friend and sibling (A, B, PE)

Interview 3

40. I have a friend /
41. And she asked me the other day /
42. She says "Why is writing so important? Why do think it should never go away?" //
43. And I really had to articulate out loud why I think composition is so important //
44. And part of it is /
45. I just think words have power beyond /

46. And printed words as artifacts /
47. They connect both what's happening cerebrally with your emotion /
48. And those two things coming together //
49. It is the inception of thought /
50. And it is the continuation of thought //
51. There's really no way to replicate it //
52. You can't text it //
53. You can do a lot with it /
54. But there's really nothing more /
55. I think /
56. Symbolic and yet meaningful as writing //
57. For example /
58. I have a copy of the speech that my brother gave at my wedding /
59. And my brother died //
60. So, I have a hand-written copy on the yellow legal pad of the drafts he made /
61. And I said /
62. You know /
63. Some people wouldn't think //
64. I mean /
65. I have it on videotape //
66. It doesn't mean as much to me as seeing why he scratched out that word and chose a
different word /
67. And then seeing what actually made the cut //
68. I said /
69. I just can't articulate the importance of that //
70. A lot of thinking /
71. A lot of planning /
72. A lot of care /
73. But also it symbolized all of the things he was thinking and feeling together //
74. That's why I think composition should never be an online only /
75. Should never be a phone it in //

76. I think you need people behind composition //
77. I want to drive home the importance of words in academia to my students //
78. That words have power /
79. They can take you places /
80. They can make you feel things /
81. Think things /
82. Engage //
83. It can make paths where there are none //

Summary: In Stanzas 1 and 2 Amelia identifies her main goals for her LM composition students. The first goal is for LM students to be more confident writers. They should “walk away saying ‘I know how and I can’” (line 5) and be capable of “saying what you mean to say and knowing what you want to say” (line 9). Related to the first goal but still distinct is Amelia’s second goal, which is “to understand the expectations of an assignment” (line 18). Although these are Amelia’s stated classroom aims, there is an awareness and appreciation on her part that working to meet these goals will ultimately serve LM students beyond the composition classroom (lines 20-29). By becoming better writers they will become better learners. Amelia’s role as a composition teacher, then, is to facilitate this process. To that end she helps LM students move outside of their comfort zone by encouraging them to read aloud and talk about their writing (lines 30-35). Meanwhile, she balances her own expectations of content with the expectations her LM students have of being confident English language writers (Stanza 4). In Stanza 5 Amelia speaks avidly about composition. For her, writing is singularly personal, an inimitable and important mode of expression (lines 45-56). Her feelings are rooted in her personal experiences with writing (lines 57-73) and are the basis for her conviction that “you need people behind composition” (line 76). Accordingly, here as in her previous narrative, Amelia displays her belief that working on an individual basis with LM students in a face-to-face

setting is key to success in her composition class. Amelia's ultimate goal is "to drive home the importance of words in academia to my students" (line 77). Writing thus has the potential to afford students previously unforeseen access and freedom within their academic environment (lines 78-83).

4.2.2 Brad

Brad is a Caucasian male whose first language is English. He holds a M.A. in both English and Education, and has between 6-10 years of teaching experience. He is currently an adjunct instructor in the English department, typically teaching at least one section of Composition I in the evening and/or on weekends. He has also worked concurrently in the Writing Center in the past.

Brad's narratives differ notably from those of the other participants in two ways. For one, the narratives here are not grounded in specific interactions with individual students. Rather, Brad's narratives refer broadly to students as a group. In addition, Brad's narratives are substantially shorter in length than those of other participants. Nevertheless, the themes raised in his narratives mirror those brought up by others—the limitations of a teacher's role and the importance of building relationships with students. While Brad's first narrative centers on notions of constraint, whether institutional or personal, his second narrative reveals an interest in making connections with students within those boundaries. The category of attitudes dominates Brad's narratives, and the categories of prior experiences and knowledge appear as well.

4.2.2.1 Brad: Narrative 1

Table 4-3: Categories seen in Brad, Narrative 1

	Attitudes (A)	Beliefs (B)	Knowledge (K)	Prior experiences (PE)
Stanza 1	X			X
Stanza 2	X		X	
Stanza 3	X			X
Stanza 4	X			

Brad’s first narrative, which spans his first and third interviews, is centered on the topic of the limitations of his position as an adjunct teacher of composition. Brad explains what he sees as the purview of composition courses in general. This includes issues of ideas and organization but not grammar, which he establishes is a more basic problem and one that is not covered by the course objectives. Brad finds this situation problematic (Stanza 1). In this stanza Brad refers to an experience in which he felt challenged in his role as a composition teacher. The category of attitudes is evident as he indicates his feelings about his role, the course, and the level of his students. As the teacher Brad’s responsibility to his students (and the institution) is to convey course objectives. Some students, however, may require assistance beyond what is taught in the classroom.

STANZA 1: Brad’s predicament (A, PE)

Interview 1

1. So I think I had a bit more difficulty /
2. Or frustration /
3. With teaching at the Composition I and Composition II level /
4. Which in my mind /
5. Are courses that are designed /
6. As their objectives /
7. To improve students’ thinking and writing ability /
8. More in sort of a content and organizational way /

9. Not in a grammar way //
10. So it's always a difficult problem to be faced with /
11. To recognize that you have a student /
12. Who really needs really a lot more work at that more basic level /
13. Not what your class is meant to teach //

In Stanza 1 above Brad distinguishes between the content that is and is not covered by a composition course, and suggests the root of the predicament lies in how the course is designed. In Stanza 2 Brad extends his explanation that the course itself, not the teacher, is the problem. Brad feels he is adequately prepared to meet his students' needs and is capable of successfully teaching the course. However, he feels the system itself is at fault for failing to account for students who may require supplementary help and for imposing on Brad responsibilities that overreach his position as an adjunct instructor. In Stanza 3 Brad explains that ultimately he has the option to provide extra help to students or not. To do so, though, would require him to go beyond the course objectives and, therefore, his role in the classroom. Brad refers obliquely in Stanza 2 to the category of knowledge as he describes his attitudes about his role, the course, and the institution. He continues to express his feelings about these three topics in the following stanza. In Stanza 3 he also makes reference to experiences with students whose writing obliges him to confront the dilemma of going beyond the limitations of his position.

STANZA 2: System failure (A, K)

14. I feel that I'm lacking /
15. But I don't feel that I'm lacking what I need for what I teach //
16. What I do think is that the system /
17. The way we have it /
18. Speaking for myself /
19. It puts me in a position where /
20. I need to teach things that maybe my class wasn't intended to teach //

STANZA 3: Options available (A, PE)

21. For example talking about the variance of skill levels [with LM students] /
22. So I might see a paper from /
23. It could be any student /
24. I've had students as well that are native speakers /
25. And I see the first paper /
26. And I'm like "There are so many problems with this" //
27. And this class doesn't offer teaching these things /
28. Unless it's something I initiate outside of teaching a class /
29. And my work with what the class's objectives are //
30. And I can in that case /
31. Either offer to work individually with a student /
32. Or direct the student somewhere /
33. Where those kinds of things /
34. That I don't perceive as being one of the main objectives in the class I teach /
35. Where those kind of things /
36. They might be helped by someone else //

Brad concludes the narrative in the final interview by stating that he is conscious of the limitations of his adjunct position (Stanza 4). As indicated throughout this narrative Brad has clear opinions about the scope of the composition course and his role within it. The category of attitudes here is evident.

STANZA 4: Agency (A)

Interview 3

37. I think /
38. That probably has a lot to do with the nature of being an adjunct //
39. We're hired to teach classes //
40. And when it comes down to it /
41. I could show up for my class time and leave immediately afterward /
42. And that would be my job //

43. That would be it //

Summary: In Brad's first narrative he explains that the established objectives of composition classes render them challenging to teach (lines 1-9). If a student has issues with areas that fall outside of the given parameters, such as grammar, the instructor is placed in a difficult position (lines 10-13). In Stanza 2 Brad clarifies that the challenge of teaching these courses does not lie in his knowledge or ability to teach (lines 14-15) but rather in circumstances outside of his control. "The system," as Brad refers to it, is problematic because it places the instructor in the tricky situation of having to teach more than he was initially assigned to (lines 16-20). In Stanza 3 Brad presents an example of the dilemma he faces. At first he indicates that "variance of skill levels" (line 21) is a LM student problem, but he then clarifies that it could occur with any student. The problem, then, is not the type of student but the type of issues the student demonstrates in his or her writing. When confronted with a student who needs help beyond what is covered by the course objectives, Brad must negotiate with himself about how best to help the student. His recourse is to elect "to work individually with a student or direct the student somewhere" (lines 31-32) where there are presumably people and resources more adept at handling the situation. In either case Brad's options lie outside of the walls of his classroom. In the final stanza of the narrative Brad lays out in simple terms the sole responsibility of his adjunct position—to teach composition class. Brad is not required to stay outside of his scheduled time in the classroom. Given this characterization of his job, it is ultimately up to Brad's discretion whether or not to help students who require help beyond what is covered in the class. Interestingly, Brad uses the modal 'could' (line 41) in the description of his position. Highlighting what he is *able* to do leaves the impression that what he *would* do is quite different.

In fact, although he omits any such overt statement, it is implied that Brad would stay and help because there is a moral obligation to do so.

4.2.2.2 Brad: Narrative 2

Table 4-4: Categories seen in Brad, Narrative 2

	Attitudes (A)	Beliefs (B)	Knowledge (K)	Prior experiences (PE)
Stanza 1	X			
Stanza 2	X			X
Stanza 3	X		X	

Brad’s second narrative comes from the second and third interviews. In it he discusses the subject of making connections with students. In Stanza 1 Brad explains that establishing individual relationships with students is one of the most enjoyable aspects of being a composition teacher. Although the relationships may not be particularly deep or longstanding, for Brad it is rewarding to make contact with students and, in turn, have them respond positively to his teaching (Stanza 2). Brad references students generally here when he talks about his past experiences with them providing encouraging feedback on his class. Consequently, he displays the attitudes he holds about the appreciation he receives students and about the subsequent gratification he gleans from being a teacher.

STANZA 1: Relationships (A)

Interview 2

1. The thing I like most [about my class] is the students //
2. Those are temporary relationships /
3. And they’re fairly surface //
4. I would say that’s what I like best about it //

STANZA 2: Appreciation (A, PE)

5. I really am grateful that /
6. What I’ve heard so many people say /
7. Doesn’t seem really to be true /

8. At least not on this level /
9. That no one ever says thank you //
10. I appreciate getting the feedback that someone learned something from my class /
11. Or enjoyed the class on some level //

In the third and final interview Brad returns to the topic of making connections with students. He reiterates that he takes pleasure in forming relationships with students in the classroom setting and that feeling adequately prepared to teach is prerequisite to starting those relationships (Stanza 3). The category of attitudes is evident in Brad's suggestion that part of his role as the teacher is to establish a rapport with students. In order to do that the category of knowledge appears to play a part insofar as being sufficiently prepared facilitates his engagement with students.

STANZA 3: Relationships (reprise) (A, K)

Interview 3

12. I really like it when I can go to a class /
13. And I feel completely ready /
14. And I'm there a little bit early /
15. And I can be completely unoccupied with my mind /
16. And maybe just find out about people /
17. Or try to engage people a little bit /
18. And have a little relational thing //

Summary: The main thrust of Brad's second narrative is making connections with students in the classroom. Although the affiliations he is able to establish are "temporary" (line 2) and "fairly surface" (line 3), they are also the most enjoyable aspect of the course for him (Stanza 1). In Stanza 2 Brad raises the notion of reciprocity in the relationships he establishes with students. He provides them with teaching and, in return, they provide him with positive feedback. He is "grateful" (line 5) that his composition students demonstrate qualities that their

counterparts may not and explains that it is rewarding for him to hear students speak well about his teaching or the course itself (lines 10-11). The final stanza reprises the satisfaction Brad derives from being able to connect individually with students. He explains that in order for him to pursue such relationships he must first be sufficiently prepared to teach the course (lines 13-14). This enables him to devote the mental energy necessary to engage with students (lines 15-18).

4.2.3 Lana

Lana is a Caucasian female whose first language is English. She holds a M.A. in both English and Education, and has between 11-20 years of teaching experience. She currently has a dual appointment as an adjunct instructor in the English and the Business Administration departments. She typically teaches at least one section of Composition I and/or II, both face-to-face and online.

Lana's narratives refer mainly to the need for students to work hard, and to establish and maintain relationships in order to succeed. Consequently, Lana envisions her job is to instill and nurture the desire to work hard, to help students gain confidence in themselves, and to facilitate students' seeking help from others. The categories of attitudes and beliefs prevail in both of Lana's narratives with her references to experiences serving as examples that illustrate her feelings about her role as well as her opinions about the qualities and skills that are central to her students' success. She briefly alludes to the category of knowledge in her second narrative.

4.2.3.1 Lana: Narrative 1

Table 4-5: Categories seen in Lana, Narrative 1

	Attitudes (A)	Beliefs (B)	Knowledge (K)	Prior experiences (PE)
Stanza 1	X	X		
Stanza 2	X	X		
Stanza 3	X	X		X
Stanza 4	X	X		X
Stanza 5	X	X		X
Stanza 6	X	X		X

The notion of diligence is mentioned in Amelia’s first narrative within the context of her conversations with a difficult student. For her, it seems to be an option of last resort to tell the student that his success depends on him working harder than everyone else. For Lana, however, the need for LM students to work hard is self-evident. The theme is consistently repeated across the first two interviews in connection with the idea that diligence, in concert with confidence, will ultimately lead to success. In Stanza 1 Lana states that she wants her LM students to know that working hard is paramount. The implication is that, in comparison to native speaking students, LM students have distinct challenges that necessitate more dedication and effort to overcome. A corollary to working hard is the need to maintain pride in oneself for being multilingual. Lana recognizes that culture of origin may influence how students feel about their abilities and, in turn, their actions by suggesting this may lead LM students to plagiarize (Stanza 2). In both stanzas Lana’s attitudes about her role are on display. Namely, it is her responsibility as the teacher to provide LM students with the skills required to surmount difficulties they may face that other students will not. Her beliefs are not only that diligence, confidence, and pride are valuable qualities for LM students to possess but also that being able to follow her direction will aid in their success.

STANZA 1: Diligence (A, B)

Interview 1

1. The one thing that I really want my LM students to understand is /
2. Number one /
3. In general /
4. They have to work harder at it /
5. And how to work harder at it /
6. To really imbed in them a good skill set /
7. So that they have the tools to be able to persist //
8. I think they get discouraged more easily /
9. Sometimes the challenges seem insurmountable /
10. So I try and build the sense in them /
11. That number one they need to work harder than the other students //
12. That's just a reality /
13. If they want to be successful //

STANZA 2: Confidence (A, B)

14. Number two /
15. They really need to be proud of themselves /
16. Because I could not do what they are doing /
17. If I were living in France or Spain or whatever //
18. I would not be surviving in a French writing class or a Spanish //
19. It's just really hard //
20. I don't want them to be too hard on themselves /
21. But they also have to trust in their instincts /
22. And allow themselves to make mistakes /
23. And depending culturally on where they are from /
24. That doesn't go over very well //
25. Some of them are very perfectionist about //
26. I think that is why plagiarism tends to happen //
27. "I want it to be perfect /
28. And I can't make it perfect /

29. And I have all these ideas /

30. And oh this person said it so much better than I did” //

In Stanza 3 Lana provides an example of a student whose diligence paid off. She describes an experience in which a LM student followed her advice and, as a result, became a better academic writer. By bringing up this experience Lana lends credence to her belief that working hard is key to success while underscoring her attitude that part of her job as a teacher is to direct her students. Her role, then, is less facilitative and more authoritative.

STANZA 3: Diligence (example) (A, B, PE)

Interview 2

31. In my 12:30 class that you didn’t see /

32. I have just one [LM student] /

33. And he sometimes got it /

34. Sometimes worked on it /

35. Sometimes didn’t bother //

36. But he went to the Writing Center a lot //

37. He really improved over the semester //

38. It was sort of amazing how much he’s got in control of his writing /

39. Because he did what I told him /

40. Which is you have to work harder than everybody else //

41. And you have to get yourself to the Writing Center //

42. So I think that’s a little bit more of a challenge for them perhaps /

43. Because it’s explaining yourself //

In Stanza 4 Lana explains that providing positive feedback is a tool she uses to help build students’ confidence. She understands that her LM students have valid, complex ideas and appreciates the difficulties they encounter trying to express those ideas in a sophisticated, meaningful way. This awareness informs the feedback she gives students on their writing. Here Lana’s attitude about her role shifts away from directing students to supporting them. This

attitude is related to her belief that building LM students' self-esteem is concurrent with her emphasis on hard work.

STANZA 4: Feedback (A, B, PE)

44. I would think that my feedback is really good for them //
45. I don't know! //
46. They definitely need the esteem part of it /
47. I think we talked about this before /
48. Non-native speakers' ideas are as developed and interesting as anybody else's /
49. But they have a hard time expressing that //
50. So that to me is all the more reason to tell them /
51. "That was a great idea" /
52. Or "I really like that you did this or that " /
53. "Now let's work on..." //
54. That's what I think is helpful to them //
55. I don't know //
56. I never asked them //

In Stanza 5 Lana demonstrates awareness that her directive nature as a teacher may be perceived as harsh; however, it appears that students are not put off. She provides the example of a former LM student who was a serial plagiarizer. Unlike the LM student referenced in Stanza 3, it is unclear whether the student in this example took to heart her feedback to work hard and seek outside help. Rather, Lana implies that this student is a success in her eyes because he persisted in the class. The aspect of Lana's role that is alluded to here is that of director or manager. As seen above part of Lana's job is to ensure that students follow appropriate composition conventions such as avoiding plagiarism. Her attitude toward her role, though, simultaneously highlights her feelings about her students as well. Students are expected to follow her direction in order to progress in their writing. Although accepting her guidance may be difficult, it is

necessary. Students who persevere are respected and thus support Lana's belief that diligence is a valuable characteristic for LM students.

STANZA 5: Persistence (A, B, PE)

57. I keep expecting some of them to just walk out /
58. And never come back /
59. Because you think /
60. Oh my god /
61. They're going to be so discouraged at this point //
62. Or the ones who keep plagiarizing and plagiarizing /
63. I mean that one student /
64. Two semesters ago? /
65. Last semester? /
66. That kept copying and copying //
67. Every time I'd send it back /
68. And every time he'd just keep fixing it //
69. I don't know what kept him going /

Lana returns to the topic of feedback in the final stanza and reiterates her hope that the comments she gives LM students are helpful and constructive. Here Lana recognizes the dual natures of her teacher role—supporter and director. On the one hand, she provides rationale for why she gives the feedback she does. She wants to affirm students' ideas and their work. On the other hand, she tempers her encouragement because she wants her LM students to do more than simply manage. She also wants them to exert themselves as writers. Accordingly, as the instructor she must balance being supportive with being directive as well. This attitude is related to Lana's belief about the importance and purpose of feedback.

STANZA 6: Feedback (reprise) (A, B, PE)

70. I think they want to know /
71. That they have good thoughts //

72. I think they also want to know how they can /
73. And some of them don't want to know //
74. Some of them think /
75. "As long as I'm getting away with..." /
76. "As long as they can sort of understand me..." //
77. I try to explain to them /
78. That all those stupid little articles are important to understanding exactly what you are saying //

Summary: In Lana's first narrative she clearly states the priorities she has for her LM students. Starting from line one she establishes that she expects them "to work harder at it" (line 4). Her job, then, is "to really imbed in them a good skill set so that they have the tools to be able to persist" (lines 6-7). She envisions a dichotomy between her LM students and "the other students" (line 11) where the former are faced with unique challenges that they must endeavor to overcome. For Lana this is not necessarily a judgment about ability; rather, "That's just a reality if they want to be successful" (lines 12-13). Concomitant with perseverance is pride (lines 14-15). While LM students have distinct challenges, they also have notable skills, namely their capacity to learn and write in another language. Lana hopes this will help her LM students "trust in their instincts and allow [them] to make mistakes" (lines 21-22) although she understands that culture may also be a source of doubt (lines 23-26). Lana relies on an experience she had with a LM student to illustrate how diligence and confidence can pay off in composition (Stanza 3). She credits this student's progress with him taking her advice. "It was sort of amazing how much he's got in control of his writing because he did what I told him, which is you have to work harder than everybody else, and you have to get yourself to the Writing Center" (lines 38-41). In Stanza 4 Lana explains that the feedback she gives her LM students is intended to build their confidence. She does not discount her students' depth of thought but realizes that expressing

those thoughts appropriately may be difficult. Consequently, the tone of her feedback is encouraging and supportive (cf. lines 51-53) because “That’s what I think is helpful to them” (line 54). Nevertheless, Lana expresses surprise that her students are not too discouraged by her feedback to continue (lines 57-61). She refers to an experience with one LM student who continually plagiarized his work but who persisted nonetheless each time she gave him feedback (lines 63-69). The final stanza of the narrative returns to the notion of feedback—Lana’s intentions behind it and her LM students’ perceptions of it. She reiterates that her goal is to affirm her LM students’ ideas and abilities (lines 70-72), but she is also aware that not all students are willing to accept her feedback (lines 73-76). In that case Lana’s response is to make apparent the rationale behind her commentary. “I try to explain to them that all those stupid little articles are important to understanding exactly what you are saying” (lines 77-78).

4.2.3.2 Lana: Narrative 2

Table 4-6: Categories seen in Lana, Narrative 2

	Attitudes (A)	Beliefs (B)	Knowledge (K)	Prior experiences (PE)
Stanza 1	X	X		
Stanza 2	X	X		
Stanza 3	X	X		
Stanza 4	X	X		X
Stanza 5	X	X		
Stanza 6	X	X		X
Stanza 7	X			
Stanza 8	X	X	X	

Similar to the narratives of Amelia and Brad, Lana’s second narrative shows she is a strong proponent of one-on-one work with students. The theme of establishing and maintaining individual relationships is raised in the first and third interviews, and is illustrated by specific interactions Lana has had with LM students. Lana argues that working with LM students on an individual basis helps build their confidence, which is key to success in her view (Stanzas 1 and

2). In order to encourage students to meet with her on a regular basis outside of class, Lana begins by working with them individually in class. Once she makes that initial contact, Lana finds students begin seeking out her help of their own accord. Interestingly, in comparison to her attitude toward her teaching role in the first narrative, the position Lana undertakes here is less one of a director and more often one of a facilitator. This attitude is apparent in Stanza 1 in her emphasis on encouragement rather than requirement. Her belief that confidence is built through personal interactions with LM students is evident as she makes it a point to initiate those interactions on an individual basis in class.

STANZA 1: Building confidence through relationships (A, B)

Interview 1

1. LR: How do you build that kind of confidence? //
2. LP: A lot of one-on-one //
3. A lot of one-on-one //
4. LR: Is that something you require of your LM students? //
5. LP: No /
6. But I encourage it //
7. I make the connection in class //
8. They're always working /
9. So I work with them /
10. Or I will talk to them a lot //
11. I will encourage them to come in //
12. Once they start coming in /
13. They come in all the time /
14. Because they see progress /
15. And they see that it's helpful //

STANZA 2: Establishing individual relationships (A, B)

16. LR: How do you articulate that desire for your [LM] students to [them]? //
17. LP: I make personal connections with them //

18. Not in general /
19. To everybody //
20. I talk to them individually /
21. And usually start with /
22. “That’s a fabulous idea //
23. Let’s explore that //
24. Wouldn’t you like that to be grammatically correct? //
25. Let’s go over” //
26. Or “Wouldn’t you like this to be more organized so people can follow your” //
27. You know //

In Stanza 3 Lana asserts that the personal nature of establishing individual relationships with students is rooted in her teaching philosophy. She demonstrates that she cares for her students through an interest and willingness to pursue close connections with them. In turn, the LM students are more inclined to see her as a resource to aid them in the composition course. Her attitude toward her role here is more deeply explained through her belief about the value of one-on-one work with LM students.

STANZA 3: Teaching philosophy (A, B)

28. It’s sort of my teaching philosophy /
29. That it has to be more personalized /
30. And that if they see that you care about them /
31. They’re more likely to see you out /
32. And ask for help //

In Stanza 4 Lana provides an example of a LM student with whom she made it a point to work closely. The student referred to here is the same one mentioned in Lana’s first narrative, the serial plagiarizer. In this stanza it becomes clear that not only did the student persist in the class, but he also took Lana’s feedback to heart. Consequently, he is deemed a successful student because he worked hard, followed Lana’s direction, and persevered. Through her description of

this experience Lana provides a more complex picture of her teacher self. The attitudes she has toward her role are multiple—she is supportive and caring while also being directive and, at times, authoritative. She balances these different facets of her role depending on the individual while maintaining a constant presence with the student. Thus she upholds her belief that building personal relationships with LM students is essential to their success.

STANZA 4: Individual relationship (example) (A, B, PE)

33. I had a student last semester /
34. Who constantly plagiarized /
35. And constantly turned in nonsensical writing //
36. Like /
37. It was just horrible //
38. And it's hard /
39. Because you have to capture them /
40. And get them in /
41. And get them to work //
42. He had a tendency to be a little bit lazy //
43. I just hammered him every time //
44. Well he tried really hard //
45. I just would not give him the benefit of the doubt //
46. Sometimes a student like that will walk away /
47. But I made sure that I kept close contact with him every single time //
48. I would grade his essay online /
49. And then he would access it online //
50. There's always that danger /
51. He's seeing your comments /
52. And just saying /
53. "I just can't do this //
54. Forget this" //
55. But they submit to turnitin.com /

56. So I grade them in turnitin.com //

57. So the danger of him opening it /

58. Without me being there /

59. Is that he's going to get discouraged /

60. Or get angry /

61. Or get whatever //

62. And so the next class period /

63. I would always start in the hallways with him //

64. "Did you open it?" //

65. And reiterate verbally that this is going to be okay //

66. We just need to work on it /

67. And that kind of thing //

68. He really /

69. He stuck with it //

70. I thought for sure /

71. At one point /

72. He was just gonna /

73. Because he kept making the same mistakes /

74. And bad mistakes /

75. And cheating //

76. You know /

77. "Come on! //

78. What are you cheating for? //

79. You know that I'm gonna find it" //

80. He stayed with me the whole time /

81. And he really did make progress //

82. Was he an A or B student? //

83. No //

84. He got his C /

85. But man /

86. He worked for that C //

87. And that /
88. To me /
89. Is a success //

Lana further details the importance of individual relationships in Stanza 5. She clearly states that students who are unwilling to work with her one-on-one will face difficulties in her class. Multiple writing conferences occur throughout the semester for all students in Lana's class, not just those who are multilingual. (This contradicts somewhat her statement in Stanza 1 that individual meetings are not compulsory.) Lana implies here that some students do not meet this requirement, which is problematic for her. In Lana's eyes students should be open to speaking with her face-to-face outside of the classroom and to considering her feedback. The attitude she adopts toward her students, then, is once more one of taking direction, and she is again in a more authoritative than caring position. Her belief in the value of forming individual relationships is maintained.

STANZA 5: Willingness to work individually (A, B)

90. A refusal to want to work /
91. Or a refusal to come in and talk to me /
92. Even if I set up writing conferences //
93. We have at least three per semester /
94. For all my students /
95. And if you're not coming in to that /
96. And you're not willing to re-do something /
97. And you're not willing to talk to me /
98. Then we're gonna have a hard time //

In the final interview Lana again provides an example of an interaction to illustrate how she was able to help a LM student through this kind of working relationship (Stanza 6). She explains that she and a LM student worked together through his first essay for the composition

class, an experience she describes as rewarding, presumably because he was able to write a better paper with her help. Subsequently, the student was able to produce a well-written essay without as much assistance, which Lana takes as a sign of progress. Similar to the experience described in Stanza 4, the student here is considered successful because he worked closely with Lana. However, the student in this example eventually relies less on her aid. Rather, what is emphasized here is the reciprocal nature of the teacher-student relationship and Lana's role as a facilitator.

STANZA 6: Relationship/feedback (example) (A, B, PE)

Interview 3

99. So his first essay and my feedback //
100. He was super long /
101. Like way longer than it was supposed to be /
102. And way off track /
103. And grammatical mistakes all over the place //
104. So we worked on that one //
105. It was a great experience //
106. He wrote a great essay at the end /
107. That I did not help him with much at all /
108. And it was terrific //
109. So he really made progress /
110. And it was fun to see //

Stanzas 7 and 8 highlight Lana's willingness to get to know her LM students better.

Acquainting herself with her LM students at the start of the semester is not new to Lana, but she intends to go about it in a different way in the hopes of being better prepared to meet the needs of her LM students. She is aware that being multilingual entails a wide range of possibilities and feels that she would do better to differentiate as much as possible between these students by getting to know them on an individual basis in a personal setting (i.e. the conference). Lana

displays a new attitude toward her role here, that of learner. Even though she is the teacher and a figure of authority, within that frame she also demonstrates a willingness to grow and change. She alludes to the category of knowledge as she explains that she got the idea to implement a new student survey after reading a book on teaching composition to LM learners. Completing the survey in conference with her LM students underscores her belief that establishing personal relationships and working individually with LM students is necessary for success.

STANZA 7: Survey (A)

- 111. I don't know if I told you /
- 112. That I have a survey form that I'm going to /
- 113. When I first conference with my students //
- 114. But I'm going to sit down /
- 115. And fill it out with my non-native speakers /
- 116. So that I ask those kinds of questions /
- 117. Like 'Where did you go to high school?' //

STANZA 8: Survey (reprise) (A, B, K)

- 118. LR: How have you known in the past about your students? //
- 119. LP: I have them fill out a survey /
- 120. But I don't ask specific questions /
- 121. Mainly because I don't want them to feel like they're being singled out //
- 122. So I'm going to do something specifically with them /
- 123. So that I get a better feel for them //
- 124. Because within non-native speakers /
- 125. You have a whole variety of /
- 126. You're an international student /
- 127. You're born in America /
- 128. But your parents raised you /
- 129. You've got the whole gamut //
- 130. So to find out what /
- 131. Specifically /

132. What their background is so I can address their issues would be helpful //
133. And reading //
134. I got a book on teaching writing to non-native speakers //
135. It just had some tips /
136. And one of them was that survey /
137. And I thought “Yes /
138. I need to know more” /
139. And so being able to note that
140. And have that down
141. So that I can address those issues /
142. Because that influences my feedback //
143. I need to get more specific with figuring out who they are //

Summary: Lana’s second narrative, which is predicated on the importance of building personal connections with students, expands on the notion of confidence that is brought up in her first narrative. Specifically, LM students should be proud of their ability to learn and write in a language that is not necessarily their (only) mother tongue. To that end, Lana aims to help develop her LM students’ confidence through the individual relationships she establishes with them (lines 2 and 3). She claims that she does not require LM students to meet with her although she ‘encourages’ it (lines 5 and 6), and this formula seems to work for her because she has seen positive results. “Once they start coming in, they come in all the time because they see the progress, and they see that it’s helpful” (lines 12-15). Lana makes it a point to touch base with each LM student individually in class and to speak to them in an encouraging manner (Stanza 2). Accordingly, she demonstrates that she is interested in helping each student do well in the composition course and, in such a way, compels LM students to see her as a resource for their success. These actions are grounded her teaching philosophy, which emphasizes the personal (lines 28-29). “[I]f they see that you care about them, they’re more likely to seek you out and ask

for help” (lines 30-32). In Stanza 4 Lana illustrates her working method by calling on an experience with a LM student in a prior semester. This student, who is discussed in Lana’s first narrative as well, regularly turned in unacceptable work that Lana describes as “horrible” (line 37). She goes on to explain that this student necessitated a stricter approach than some because “he had a tendency to be a little bit lazy” (line 42). Lana alludes to other experiences she has had with similar students to justify the directive tack she adopted in this case (cf. lines 38-41 & 46). She states that “I just hammered him” (line 43) and “I just would not give him the benefit of the doubt” (line 45). Keeping in close contact with this student both in and out of the classroom demonstrated Lana’s commitment to helping him persist and succeed (lines 47-67). Though Lana was aware of the risk of taking such a firm line (lines 68-75), the student was responsive to the support Lana provided and, as a result, he worked very hard and persevered to earn a passing grade in the course (lines 80-89).

4.2.4 Graham

Graham is a Caucasian male whose first language is English. He holds a M.A. in English and a Ph.D. in Education with a focus on TESOL and Composition. Graham has between 11-20 years of teaching experience and is currently a full-time instructor in the English department, where he typically teaches at least one section of Composition I. He also teaches sometimes in the English for Academic Purposes (EAP) program.

Although Graham only completed two interviews of the series of three, three distinct but related thematic strands appear in his narratives. Graham’s first narrative, like Brad’s, revolves around the idea of institutional barriers to agency. Institutional constraints are designated a separate narrative although his discussion of them is undoubtedly related to culture, the theme apparent in his second narrative. He speaks of culture in the sense of country but also in terms of

the community college. The idea of connections, both personal and with organizational entities, runs through each of Graham’s narratives. Similar to Lana, Graham considers relationships as fundamental to strengthening students’ confidence; however, his definition of relationships is somewhat different. Graham’s third narrative illustrates these points. The categories evident in each of his narratives are primarily attitudes, beliefs, and experiences.

4.2.4.1 Graham: Narrative 1

Table 4-7: Categories seen in Graham, Narrative 1

	Attitudes (A)	Beliefs (B)	Knowledge (K)	Prior experiences (PE)
Stanza 1	X			X
Stanza 2	X	X		X
Stanza 3	X			X
Stanza 4	X	X		
Stanza 5	X			X
Stanza 6	X	X		X
Stanza 7	X	X		

Graham’s first narrative spans his first and second interviews, and revolves around the notion of constraints. Both Brad and Graham speak about constraints in terms of their inability to adequately meet LM students’ needs. Whereas Brad spoke about constraints in the sense of being bound by curricular content, though, in Graham’s narrative the feeling of being limited has more to do with issues of assessment, specifically the institution’s lack of appropriate measures to gauge LM students’ skills and to place them in corresponding course levels. In each case the instructor’s agency is challenged by forces outside of his control. In Stanza 1 Graham describes his experiences with a Korean student, Lee, whom Graham feels is incorrectly placed based on a lack of appropriate assessment. That is not to say that is he not a good student; rather, his good test-taking skills and knowledge of grammar mask more fundamental problems with his language ability. The primary category seen in this stanza is related to prior experiences—

Graham's interactions with this particular student over the course of two semesters as well as Graham's general experience as a qualified teacher of LM students. Graham draws on his expertise to detail his attitude toward this individual student as someone who has been improperly placed.

STANZA 1: Individual student (example) (A, PE)

Interview 1

1. I've got a student /
2. Korean student //
3. We'll call him Lee //
4. Great with grammar /
5. Hard-working kid //
6. I like him //
7. He works really hard /
8. And he's always there on time //
9. He actually is like many Koreans //
10. Really good at grammar /
11. Sitting down /
12. Multiple choice tests /
13. The things we assess in our Compass test //
14. He's good at that /
15. But can't speak or understand a damn thing //
16. He should be in level II //
17. In my 20+ years' experience teaching ESL and EFL /
18. I would call him a level II based on my interactions over two classes I've had with
him //

In Stanza 2 Graham clarifies why he feels Lee has been placed at too high a level. Lee is currently in Graham's composition class because he earned a passing grade in the prerequisite writing course for LM students, which he was placed in based on his score on the institution's

placement test, which measures only grammar skills in isolation. Though Lee demonstrates the habits of a successful student, Graham finds his comprehension and production skills to be inadequate for a student at his current level. As a result, Graham feels Lee will struggle unnecessarily to become a competent writer in English. Moreover, he laments the lost opportunity to sufficiently meet this student's needs. As in Stanza 1 Graham relies on his experience and expertise as a teacher of LM students to explain why he feels that Lee has been underserved by the institution. Graham's attitudes toward not only Lee but also other LM students he has taught are thus apparent, as is his attitude about the institution's responsibility to these students. Accordingly, he adopts the role of champion for LM students. As he continues to describe his experience with Lee, Graham displays his beliefs about the importance of instituting an appropriate placement mechanism for LM students and the value of helping these students meet the maximum potential of their postsecondary language learning experiences.

STANZA 2: Inadequate assessment (A, B, PE)

19. He took me level IV /

20. And he's in Comp I right now //

21. LR: Why is he level II? //

22. GD: Because he can't understand what people are saying to him /

23. And he can't articulate his thoughts to get his basic needs met //

24. We don't have an assessment for me to say /

25. So this is pretty much based on my [authority] /

26. But he gets put in [English for Academic Purposes] level IV speaking/pronunciation
last year with his writing class //

27. And he goes to class //

28. He does his homework //

29. He's not the only one //

30. About once a year I've found someone /

31. Who has really been disserved by putting him automatically in level IV instead of level II //
32. He needed /
33. And he would be happy to take level II speaking and pronunciation /
34. But it's not a possibility because his multiple choice grammar test scores are too good //
35. I really think he's missing /
36. We're all missing an opportunity here //
37. I think he'll eventually succeed //
38. It's going to be tough //
39. He passes his class //
40. He's successful //
41. But I don't think we're meeting the full potential of what we could be accomplishing /
42. In terms of his language acquisition //

Graham notes that learning an additional language, in particular in an immersive context, is complicated by factors outside of the classroom, factors over which he has little to no control (Stanza 3). Culture shock, specifically, is named as an issue that may have an influence on Lee's language acquisition. Graham uses his discussion of culture shock to further express what he believes to be the institution's inability or unwillingness to effectively address LM students' many needs. In terms of his attitude Graham continues to position himself as a defender of LM students. Graham references his own experiences living and learning abroad to identify culture shock as a noteworthy problem for LM students.

STANZA 3: Culture shock (A, PE)

43. To be honest we may want him to speak language better /
44. To understand better /
45. But there's a lot of things that are involved in living in a language immersion environment /

46. In another country //
47. There's culture shock /
48. Which we don't get to talk about enough /
49. I don't think /
50. Which is an experience I had living five years abroad //
51. It's not something that happens /
52. Once you get over it you're fine //
53. It's something that's recurrent over time //
54. I don't want to stigmatize it by making some pretty apt comparisons /
55. But I think that we could do a better job //

Graham's discussion of culture shock in Stanza 3 provides a perfect segue for his continued argument about the institution's shortcomings in Stanza 4. Earlier in the narrative Graham notes the problematic assessment and placement of LM students; here, he turns his focus on the Counseling department. He contends that LM students are unable to receive proper help from student support services for a variety of reasons ranging from institutional policy guiding how students are matched with counselors to language and culture issues. Thus, in addition to lacking appropriate assessment measures and not adequately helping students address culture shock, Graham feels the college also falls short in its academic advising and counseling to students. Graham maintains the same attitudes here as in previous stanzas. He continues to be disappointed by the institution's incapacity to help LM students. He feels that his LM students deserve more attention and aid from the college. His role, therefore, is to advocate for and, if possible, guide his LM students so that they are able to reap the most benefit from their time at the community college. These attitudes are in sync with Graham's beliefs about the value of his course and higher education in general, as well as the importance of acknowledging how LM students' cultures shape their relationships with the institution.

STANZA 4: Counseling (A, B)

56. I think there are some people who understand some things in Counseling /
57. But we could definitely do a better job /
58. Because there is a policy the school has involving counseling international students /
59. And it's particularly damaging for international students in that they're afraid to track /
60. Which I think is an excuse for not assigning particular students with particular counselors //
61. So it's walk-in /
62. You get a random /
63. They have a couple people who are good at international //
64. We only have Spanish speakers over there //
65. I don't think anybody in Counseling speaks anything else //
66. There might be five people that actually have specific /
67. Know the answers to questions involved with the brass tacks /
68. Of getting involved, getting enrolled, getting financial aid, F1 visas //
69. I mean they all know the words /
70. But I think it's really disturbing for someone who's not been raised to talk about personal problems /
71. And to keep a lot of information to yourself, private /
72. To walk in there and tell another, a fellow college student, what your problem is /
73. To get put with the right counselor /
74. And then you're not going to get one unless you ask for one of those five people //
75. I try to share that with my students when I have them //
76. They're going to get dissatisfied /
77. And they're not going to get help /
78. And they're going to feel stigmatized //
79. I really think that we need to have /
80. Make it more clear that /
81. International students need to get with advisors/counselors that are the most likely to help them /

82. Not the one who happens to be available coincidentally //

83. I think that there's some changes that could be made to Counseling that would help //

In the second interview, Graham again raises the example of Lee to illustrate his dissatisfaction with the institution's support mechanisms for LM students (Stanzas 5 and 6). In Stanza 5 Graham reiterates the ways in which Lee is a successful student in the composition course in spite of comprehension issues; however, in Stanza 6 Graham speaks strongly about how Lee's current linguistic challenges are the direct result of being under-evaluated and misplaced from the start. For the first time in this narrative Graham lays blame directly on the department to appropriately assess Lee's language skills and place Lee accordingly. Meanwhile, Graham is careful to not reproach Lee, who has proven himself to be studious and dedicated, and therefore deserving of a passing grade based on his work. Graham clearly relies on his experience in this narrative. His feelings about the student, Graham's role as the teacher, and the department's shortcomings are apparent as is Graham's belief about the value of serving LM students fairly, in this case as it relates to appropriate evaluative measures.

STANZA 5: Individual student example (reprise) (A, PE)

Interview 2

84. Lee, who does real good on the standardized tests, multiple choice /

85. Can't speak or won't //

86. Not sure if he's understanding what's spoken /

87. But I put everything in writing //

88. Lesson plans, type them up, share them //

89. So he does fine with me //

90. He turns stuff in, comes to class everyday //

91. He tries //

92. He's doing quite well //

STANZA 6: Inadequate assessment (reprise) (A, B, PE)

93. I wonder though /

94. I really think it was an injustice of our department /
95. That we don't have an oral placement exam /
96. Because while his reading and writing /
97. Multiple choice tests anyway /
98. Is quite good //
99. They study grammar over there /
100. He can't understand what I'm saying //
101. He's lost /
102. And it's an injustice to have put him in level IV listening and speaking
103. Because I'm sure he went to class everyday and tried real hard /
104. And worked real hard on his homework //
105. And I think it was justified in passing him because of his hard work /
106. But he needed to be in level II to start with //

In the final stanza of this narrative Graham sums up his perspective on the institution's duty to its LM students. As in the previous stanza Graham speaks here of departmental deficiencies in terms of evaluation and placement mechanisms, and explains how a problem at one level may have unintended, longstanding effects on other entities. Specifically, an inability to sufficiently satisfy students' needs in regards to proper course placement may result in less accomplished and/or dissatisfied students, which may ultimately translate to loss of revenue for the college as a whole. Graham's attitude toward institutional responsibility is clearly stated in this stanza. His feeling of dismay with the department is tied to his belief in the value of effectively educating LM students.

STANZA 7: Institutional responsibility (A, B)

107. It would've been much better for him //
108. School would've made more money //
109. He would've been happier //
110. It saddens me that we can't get our act together long enough to put together a meaningful placement test /

- 111. In both authentic writing and listening and speaking //
- 112. Just don't get it //
- 113. Yes, I did say it saddens me //
- 114. That's my official statement //

Summary: Graham's first narrative spans both of his interviews and is based on notions of institutional responsibility and constraints on agency. He relies on his experiences with a specific student, Lee, to illustrate his view that the college is not doing all it can or should do for its LM students. Graham has worked with Lee over the course of two semesters in two different writing classes (lines 16-20). Although Graham finds Lee to be "hard-working" (line 5), "always there on time" (line 9), and "really good at grammar" (line 10), Graham appears frustrated that Lee "can't speak or understand a damn thing" (line 15). Based on "20+ years' experience teaching ESL and EFL" (line 17) as well as two semesters' worth of experience with Lee in particular, Graham asserts that Lee has been inadequately assessed and, as a result, improperly placed. Lee "can't understand what people are saying to him, and he can't articulate his thoughts to get his basic needs met" (lines 22-23). Nevertheless, because there is no appropriate tool to assess his communicative production skills (lines 24-25), Lee is placed according to his grammar test scores (line 34) and because he demonstrates the traits of a good student—e.g. "he goes to class; he does his homework" (lines 27-28)—he succeeds. Graham laments this situation as a lost opportunity for both the student and the institution (lines 35-36 and lines 41-42), and refers to comparable situations for other similarly misplaced LM students. "About once a year I've found someone who has really been disserved by putting him automatically in level IV instead of level II" (line 30-31). It is not that a misplaced student will be ultimately unsuccessful, but he may encounter additional, avoidable challenges to becoming an accomplished user of academic English (lines 37-38). The idea that LM students are being underserved is a theme that runs

throughout this entire narrative and is not necessarily limited to the topic of assessment. In Stanza 3 Graham addresses culture shock as another impediment to language learning, and this becomes a springboard for discussion in Stanza 4 of the ways that the institution's student support services do not do enough to meet LM students' counseling and advising needs. Students are randomly assigned with counselors who may or may not speak a second language (lines 58-65), and even if counselors have the required knowledge to help students, cultural barriers may inhibit students from effectively working with counselors (lines 66-74). This depiction of counseling services supports Graham's conviction that the institution is not doing enough to support LM students. In Stanza 5 Graham returns to the example of Lee to reiterate that the college could and/or should be doing more for students like him. In Stanza 6, as in earlier stanzas, Graham seems to take umbrage at the inadequate assessment measures used to evaluate LM students' academic abilities. "I really think it was an injustice of our department that we don't have an oral placement exam" (lines 94-95). (Interestingly, this is the first time in the narrative that Graham names a particular entity at fault. Up to this point he has relied on the ambiguous pronoun 'we' to discuss what he considers to be institutional shortcomings. In several other places in the narrative 'we' can be interpreted in different ways—as the department, the teachers, or the whole institution.) Graham repeats the word 'injustice' in line 102 as he enumerates the ways that Lee has been done a disservice in his learning. If, as Graham suggests in line 106, Lee had been placed initially in level II, "[i]t would've been much better for him. School would've made more money. He would've been happier" (lines 107-109). Graham's first narrative concludes with unequivocal statements revealing his disappointment in 'our' (presumably the department's) inability to produce a meaningful placement test (lines 110-114).

4.2.4.2 Graham: Narrative 2

Table 4-8: Categories seen in Graham, Narrative 2

	Attitudes (A)	Beliefs (B)	Knowledge (K)	Prior experiences (PE)
Stanza 1	X			X
Stanza 2	X	X		
Stanza 3				X
Stanza 4	X	X		
Stanza 5	X	X		
Stanza 6	X			X
Stanza 7	X			X
Stanza 8	X	X		
Stanza 9	X			
Stanza 10	X	X		X

In Narrative 1 Graham refers to culture briefly in regards to how a student’s culture may hinder her from getting appropriate help from student services (c.f. Stanza 4, line 70-73). In the current narrative, which also covers both interviews, Graham focuses more on culture as a theme unto itself. The culture he refers to here is not only the student’s culture of origin but also the culture of American higher education. Narrative 2 overlaps to some degree with the first narrative; similar themes emerge. However, Graham speaks in the main about culture in the sense of students’ acculturation to American academic norms and teachers’ need to be culturally aware when interacting with LM students. In Stanza 1 Graham introduces the topic of Generation 1.5³ students. He claims that these students tend to select him as an instructor based on previous experiences they have had with him in English for Academic Purposes (EAP) classes. He also acknowledges that this scenario is likely to repeat itself given the anticipated rise of Generation 1.5 students. Graham’s attitude toward his teaching here reflects his experiences with Generation 1.5 and other LM students. He is aware that his students require the support of

³ The term Generation 1.5 is attributed to Rumbaut and Ima (1988), and refers to “immigrant students who complete parts of their education both in the United States and in other countries” (Matsuda et al., 2011, p. 80). Generation 1.5 students are characterized by high levels of aural comprehension and oral fluency although their English language skills retain typically non-native-like errors.

written content for his class. His role, therefore, is to teach with this particular population of students in mind.

STANZA 1: Generation 1.5 students (A, PE)

Interview 1

1. The 1.5s /
2. In particular from [EAP] level IV /
3. Like to stick with me //
4. LR: Why do you think that is? //
5. GD: They know what to expect //
6. I get some of the non-1.5s as well /
7. The ones who really struggle with listening and speaking //
8. I put so much content up written down /
9. That they can make it through
10. Without understanding what I say /
11. Because I know I talk too fast in class //
12. A couple times it's been around 11 /
13. For 50 students total //
14. That's like 20% almost //
15. There's a lot of Gen 1.5 students /
16. And we're supposed to get more //

In Stanza 2 Graham continues to speak about Generation 1.5 students. He raises again the issue from Narrative 1 of students being misplaced because of faulty assessment and reiterates his feeling of powerlessness to change it. His attitude toward the institution in this stanza remains one of frustration and disappointment that students' needs are not being fully met. As in the previous narrative he sustains his belief that appropriate assessment is paramount to properly serving LM students.

STANZA 2: Invisible students (A, B)

17. It's almost like the invisible students in some ways /

18. And they're getting stuck in level IV speaking and pronunciation /
19. Based on the fact that they can't take their placement test /
20. And multiple choice grammar tests //
21. And you don't learn grammar in American high schools //
22. The Chinese people in China learn grammar //
23. It's total BS /
24. And it would be so easy to fix /
25. But it would require effort and cooperation //

In Stanza 3 Graham relies on a personal example to further illustrate his view of Generation 1.5 students. He explains that his own wife, who is Taiwanese, experiences some of the same problems as Generation 1.5 students. That is, she is from a different country of origin but currently lives in an English-speaking country and speaks native-like English; however, she is at times challenged by idiomatic language use, which can lead to confusing, difficult interactions with native speakers.

STANZA 3: Biculturalism (example) (PE)

26. LR: Why do you call them invisible students? //
27. GD: Because people //
28. My wife is Chinese //
29. Taiwanese //
30. Her English is too good //
31. She runs into problems sometimes //
32. People get real upset with her /
33. When she doesn't follow them /
34. Because her pronunciation is so good //
35. They assume she's a native speaker //
36. That doesn't happen all the time /
37. But people lose patience with her //
38. Well, don't you understand? //
39. They're using a word /

- 40. A term that she's never had to use before //
- 41. It doesn't make sense //
- 42. It's idiomatic //
- 43. It would happen with teachers sometimes //

Graham likens his wife's experiences as a bicultural individual to those Generation 1.5 students face in community college (Stanza 4). Since they regularly display native-like qualities, assumptions are made about students' facility with language and understanding of American higher education. These assumptions create unique problems when students are unable to operate naturally, and they are therefore identified as being non-native when in reality they are bi- or multicultural. For Graham this means Generation 1.5 students are not seen for who they really are. As a result, there needs to be an understanding of the ways in which Generation 1.5 students are distinct. Graham's attitude toward these students is one of empathy. Based on his observations of his wife's biculturalism, Graham portrays himself as a compassionate individual whose personal experience puts him in a position to appreciate the particular situation of Generation 1.5 students. His belief about the importance of cultural understanding extends to the culture of American postsecondary education and is linked to his belief from Narrative 1 about the value of appropriately educating LM students.

STANZA 4: Invisible students / Biculturalism (reprise) (A, B)

- 44. I think sometimes this stuff happens to Gen 1.5 students as well //
- 45. And they're invariably first generation college students //
- 46. They don't know those things that everyone else /
- 47. We assume everyone else knows /
- 48. About how college works /
- 49. About how to get student loans /
- 50. Pell grants //
- 51. A lot of them are American citizens /

52. But they have no idea /
53. Because no one's told them how to work the college system in America //
54. Invisible children //
55. We don't realize /
56. I guess we only see one /
57. Maybe people project what they want to see on them //
58. They're either foreigners /
59. Or they're American /
60. But the truth is they're bicultural //
61. But unless you have a framework to understand something like that /
62. It doesn't make any sense //
63. It's like if you heard a language you never heard before /
64. You're not going to hear it the way someone who understands it hears it //

In Stanza 5 Graham speaks about Generation 1.5 students from the perspective of a teacher. He explains that there is a lack of information on this population that can only be breached if instructors take it upon themselves to learn more about their students' origins. Graham argues that doing so would allow Generation 1.5 students to become more visible, which would in turn lead to them being more effectively taught in the classroom. Graham continues to demonstrate an understanding attitude here as he presents himself as a champion for Generation 1.5 students. His role as an instructor of these students requires that he delve into students' backgrounds in order to better know and teach them. This role is associated with his belief about the importance of educating LM students. Further, it raises the value of making connections with students, a belief that is referred to by other participants (e.g. Amelia, Lana, Brad) and that will come up again in Graham's Narrative 3.

STANZA 5: Generation 1.5 students (reprise) (A, B)

65. We don't know /
66. And I think with Gen 1.5 students /

67. There's just so much that we don't know about them //
68. And you don't find out /
69. Unless you happen to do a literacy narrative /
70. And make them really talk about all their language backgrounds /
71. And you really pry on that //
72. I was a bit dramatic //
73. We need a better term than invisible students //
74. We see what we want to see /
75. Might be something more clever //
76. To project on them //

In Stanza 6 Graham extends the subject of culture to his teaching. Earlier references to culture are based on Graham's personal experiences with family as a way of better understanding LM students' cultures of origin and their impact on the academic experience. Here Graham discusses how he uses culture as an approach to teaching writing and grammar. He continues on the theme of teaching grammar as culture in Stanza 7 although he also speaks more broadly about the need to be open-minded when it comes to observing and interacting with other cultures. Graham's attitudes in these stanzas continue to reflect his impulse to stand up for LM students and to influence his role as a teacher of this population. In addition, it becomes clear that culture largely affects his pedagogy. This signals Graham's belief that coming to terms with the pervasive influence of culture is imperative to helping LM students navigate higher education.

STANZA 6: Culture and teaching of grammar (A, PE)

77. With my LM students /
78. I kind of approach [teaching grammar] as culture //
79. You know /
80. The thing about culture /
81. Or even grammar sometimes /

82. They're very similar /
83. In that sometimes there is no why //
84. It just is //
85. And we don't like thinking that way /
86. But okay //
87. You want to talk about transformative grammar /
88. Chomsky? //
89. That's that deep grammar that we can't always explain /
90. But you get from point A to point B /
91. And we all understand it //
92. There's a bit of intuition //
STANZA 7: Culture and teaching of grammar (reprise) (A, PE)
93. With culture sometimes /
94. It's too easy for a novice of interculturalism to truly understand it /
95. It's too easy to judge other cultures by your own //
96. You really have to suspend judgment for a while /
97. And that's hard to learn //
98. It takes a while //
99. That's one of those lessons that
100. If you don't learn the hard way /
101. Do you ever really learn it //
102. Sometimes it just is /
103. And it's not always a satisfying answer //
104. But I think that's helped a lot with my grammar teaching //

In Stanza 8 Graham reveals the objectives he has for his LM students. Namely, he wants them to become accustomed to how American colleges work so that they can develop strategies to succeed in his class and beyond. Graham details his expectations about peer feedback and explains how academic support mechanisms such as the Writing Center can aid LM composition students. Graham's goal of acquainting LM students with the resources available to them speaks

to his desire for them to make connections not only with people but also with institutional entities that can provide aid while they attend college. Graham's role, therefore, is to instruct LM students in such aspects of American postsecondary culture—to introduce and encourage them to take advantage of resources that will further their academic achievement. This attitude is supported by Graham's belief that cultural aspects of teaching and learning should not be ignored and that LM students will benefit in the long term from becoming acculturated to U.S. higher education.

STANZA 8: Goal for students (A, B)

105. With my LM students /
106. I stress the importance of the Writing Center /
107. And how to use peer feedback //
108. I think that I might be unique in that //
109. I'm a little bit meta in my teaching /
110. In the sense that a lot of it's about learning //
111. If I get them to figure out what works for them /
112. And strategies in the long run /
113. And to not just to understand college culture /
114. But what's going to help them be successful /
115. That's really my goal //
116. I want them to learn how to use places like the Writing Center /
117. Where they have trained /
118. A lot of people there tend to have training in the /
119. But non-native speakers don't compose the same way as native speakers do /
120. Until they get maybe to a very advanced level //

In Stanza 9 Graham highlights what he considers a fundamental difference between LM writers and their native-speaking counterparts. LM writers are strong in their ability to organize their writing because they are working through their ideas in another language; what they lack is

the facility with the language to make their writing flow naturally. Relying on translation makes their writing sound irregular and stilted. Following Graham's statements in the previous stanza about the importance of institutional resources, it becomes clear that Graham thinks LM students would benefit from getting help in the Writing Center where they can take advantage of tools and people to help develop their composition skills. Graham's attitudes in this stanza reflect his professional and personal experiences with multiculturalism. Accordingly, as a teacher he is familiar with the ways that culture affects his LM composition students.

STANZA 9: LM students vs. native speaking students (A)

121. All that stuff that we want to force our native /
122. The Comp I students to do /
123. The organizing /
124. The outlining /
125. Which I don't really do that well with Comp I /
126. Well you don't have to do that with international students /
127. Because they're writing it in their head and on paper in another language //
128. Their organization is usually really good //
129. It's the translating /
130. Or sometimes it's even a literal transcription from Google translator /
131. Or their head //
132. They're translating //
133. They need access /
134. They need someone to say "That's not how you say it" //

Graham returns to the topic of culture in the second interview as he provides an example of what he considers to have been a successful experience with a LM student. Stanza 10 is an extended account of an interaction Graham had with a female composition student, Belle, from the Philippines. Although the interaction was uncomfortable for him and does not appear on the surface to have been successful, Graham deems it so for two reasons: 1) Belle demonstrates that

she is confident enough to speak up against an authority figure, and 2) Graham comes to the realization that his unconscious stereotyping of Belle may be the product of his own personal cultural experiences. Graham's attitude toward his role here is one of teacher-as-learner. This experience makes him feel as though he has something to learn from his student, and, like Lana in Narrative 2 (Stanzas 7 and 8), he displays a willingness to step back from his role as an authority in order to gain knowledge from the experience. This example also exhibits Graham's belief that cultural awareness is a mainstay of effective instruction for LM students.

STANZA 10: Interaction with student (example/evaluation) (A, B, PE)

Interview 2

135. The examples I can think of don't always make me look good //
136. For example I'll tell you a story //
137. Belle /
138. From the Philippines //
139. I remember we were doing show and tell one day /
140. And she was asking me /
141. What do you bring for show and tell? //
142. And I said "Anything //
143. It doesn't have to be valuable //
144. I don't know //
145. Seashells" //
146. "Oh! Seashells" //
147. And the way she said it /
148. I realized that I'd screwed up //
149. Picking seashells off the beach /
150. That's not really an insult to anybody else /
151. But I think that might be something of a stereotype /
152. At least people in southeast Asia /
153. Might have about people from the Philippines /
154. I had a feeling like I might have brushed up against a stereotype or something //

155. It wasn't impolite //
156. It wasn't rude /
157. But there was enough of a reaction from her /
158. That I realized maybe I might have brushed up against a culturally insensitive
remark /
159. Unintentionally //
160. But I don't think I'll ever make a comment about seashells to a Filipino again //
161. But I think that there was enough of that /
162. I think she gave me a little bit of attitude //
163. It was enough that I could have ignored it /
164. But I'm pretty sensitive to attitude //
165. I think that was fair //
166. But as soon as she said that
167. It was like
168. Oh okay //
169. It was a bit of resistance //
170. It was a bit of pushing back /
171. And that made me think /
172. Where did I hear about Filipinos and seashells? //
173. Oh somebody from Taiwan //
174. Oooh //
175. It's funny//
176. It's different there //
177. I'm not saying it's good either //
178. But even though that was embarrassing for me /
179. And I think that I made a mistake /
180. I think in a way I was happy that she was confident enough of herself /
181. And her place in our class
182. That she gave me a little bit of pushback //
183. And maybe it's all in my head /
184. But I think that when they stand up and say what they authentically believe /

185. That's huge //

Summary: Culture in a broad sense is the central theme of Graham's second narrative. He begins the narrative by introducing the topic of Generation 1.5 learners, a population with whom he claims to have significant experience. He explains that these students are comfortable with his teaching methods because they have taken other courses with him; therefore, "The 1.5s...like to stick with me" (lines 1 and 3). It is not only Generation 1.5 students who opt to take Graham's composition class but also other LM students whose listening and speaking skills may not be proficient (lines 6-7). He predicts that the number of LM students in his class will increase in the future based on his outlook that "There's a lot of Gen 1.5 students, and we're supposed to get more" (lines 15-16). At the start of Stanza 2 Graham describes Generation 1.5 students as "invisible" (line 19), a term he repeats and explains throughout the next few stanzas. His initial explanation is based on their underassessment and misplacement in appropriate courses (see Narrative 1). Graham reiterates his dissatisfaction with his seeming lack of agency in lines 23-25. Eventually it is revealed that Graham's portrayal of Generation 1.5 students as invisible is based on his feeling that their multicultural nature obscures them from being fully seen. In Stanza 3 Graham provides a personal example of the problems his wife has experienced as a bicultural individual. In Stanza 4 he likens his wife's situation to that of Generation 1.5 students—native-like traits mask non-native-like traits, which sometimes puts them in a precarious position of being misunderstood and having their issues go un- or undertreated. Graham explains that the difficulties that Generation 1.5 students face are not limited to language but extend to their understanding of the culture of higher education. "They don't know those things that everyone else, we assume everyone else, knows about how college works...A lot of them are American citizens, but they have no idea because no one's told them how to work the college system in

America” (lines 46-48, 51-53). Graham goes on to clarify that what he means by “invisible children” (line 54) is those students who are perceived by others as being *either* foreign *or* native but are in reality multicultural (lines 55-60). Lacking “a framework to understand something like that” (line 61), Generation 1.5 students as a group are often overlooked. In Stanza 5 Graham states, “there’s just so much that we don’t know about [Generation 1.5 students]” (line 67). Though it is not entirely clear who is meant by Graham’s use of the pronoun ‘we,’ it may be implied that he is referring to composition teachers as he subsequently suggests that the way to learn more about Generation 1.5 students is “to do a literacy narrative and make them really talk about all their language backgrounds and...really pry on that” (lines 69-71). At the end of Stanza 5 Graham backpedals from his depiction of Generation 1.5 students as invisible, claiming the term may be an exaggeration (lines 72-76). As he tries to clarify what he means, he goes on in Stanza 6 to discuss his approach to teaching grammar in composition courses. It seems he has shifted topics entirely (from Generation 1.5 students to pedagogy of grammar), but it becomes clearer how the two are linked in his mind. He explains, “The thing about culture or even grammar sometimes, they’re very similar in that sometimes there is no why. It just is” (lines 80-84). Like some aspects of grammar, then, some aspects of culture also require “a bit of intuition” (line 92). In Stanza 7 Graham explains that reaching a point of acceptance or understanding of students’ multiculturalism does not necessarily come easily or even at all. “It’s too easy to judge other cultures by your own. You really have to suspend judgment for a while, and that’s hard to learn” (lines 95-97). However, making efforts to learn more about Generation 1.5 students (e.g. doing a literacy narrative) and avoid pigeonholing them as either/or may be helpful to that end. Graham explains in Stanza 8 how he uses his course to familiarize LM students with the culture of American colleges and help them develop long-term learning strategies. “If I get them to

figure out what works for them and strategies in the long run, and to not just to understand college culture but what’s going to help them be successful, that’s really my goal” (lines 111-115). In order to realize this goal, he advocates the use of peer feedback and acquaints students with institutional resources such as the Writing Center. The benefits of the support LM students can receive in the Writing Center are detailed in Stanza 9. Namely, they can gain access to people who are trained to help writers whose challenges may differ from those of monolingual English speakers. Graham’s narrative about culture wraps up in Stanza 10. Although this final stanza appears to veer off-topic, it eventually becomes evident that Graham is speaking again of his goal for his students to become acculturated to American postsecondary classrooms. As he details a memorable interaction with a LM student, he reveals that he may have inadvertently offended her by raising a stereotype about her culture. In spite of it being a difficult and uncomfortable situation, “I think in a way I was happy that she was confident enough of herself and her place in our class that she gave me a little bit of pushback...I think that when they stand up and say what they authentically believe, that’s huge” (lines 179-182 and 184-185). In a roundabout way, then, Graham’s example of Belle illustrates a successfully acculturated student.

4.2.4.3 Graham: Narrative 3

Table 4-9: Categories seen in Graham, Narrative 3

	Attitudes (A)	Beliefs (B)	Knowledge (K)	Prior experiences (PE)
Stanza 1	X	X		X
Stanza 2	X	X		
Stanza 3	X	X		
Stanza 4	X	X		
Stanza 5	X	X		

Graham’s third narrative comes entirely from the second interview and concerns the idea that LM students need to establish relationships in order to build their confidence and succeed.

The types of relationships discussed here are also alluded to in the previous narrative—they include both personal associations (e.g. teacher-student, student-student) as well as connections with institutional resources and tools that can help students while they are in college. In the first stanza Graham explains how he uses his own experiences as a first generation college student to relate to and engage with students. He presents himself as a role model and attempts to create a rapport with those students who share similar experiences. In this position Graham displays the attitude that one of his responsibilities as a teacher is to make personal connections with students. This reflects his belief that the course, and the skills and confidence students gain from it, are invaluable to helping LM students succeed well beyond the composition classroom.

STANZA 1: First generation experience (A, B, PE)

Interview 2

1. I tell them stories about what it was like being a first generation college student //
2. And that learning how to follow directions /
3. And I tell them that I never got an A on a college English paper /
4. Or out of an English class /
5. Until I was a junior at least /
6. And that was when a professor took me aside and said “Listen //
7. You’re never going to get an A until you do MLA format for your heading” //
8. And he made me buy the MLA Handbook //
9. The truth is /
10. And I tell them /
11. I never learned /
12. No one learns MLA format //
13. But I could write //
14. It didn’t matter how many papers I wrote /
15. [MLA format] wasn’t easy to remember //
16. But what you need to learn is to look it up //
17. That’s what format is //

18. When you need to know how to cite a source /
19. You look it up //
20. No one learns MLA format //
21. That's not what I teach //
22. What I teach is how to look things up /
23. How to find information //

In Stanza 2 Graham describes the central part he plays in giving LM students' words and ideas their proper due. He speaks earnestly about the ways that his position as a reader and listener affords him the opportunity to build LM students' confidence and confirm the importance and worth of what they have to say. In this instance Graham does not occupy an active teaching role; that is, he does not describe how he instructs LM students to perform a particular composition task. Rather, he draws attention to a less prominent responsibility of his teaching—that of a passive communicator. Graham hears what LM students say by interacting with their written texts. He considers this is an intimate and honest form of communication, and a tool he can use to strengthen the foundation of his relationships with students. It also reinforces his belief that LM students benefit in significant ways from his composition course.

STANZA 2: Value of writing and reading (A, B)

24. I spend a lot of time reading //
25. And sometimes /
26. It may be cynical /
27. But in a way I think it /
28. We get paid to communicate with people that other people won't communicate with //
29. I mean we read papers //
30. We actually read what people write //
31. Writing is thoughts and dreams and problems and ideas all fixed /
32. And we actually /
33. We communicate in a meaningful way /

34. In a deeper way than almost anyone else //
35. Reading is work /
36. And mostly as a writing teacher what I do is read //
37. I'm reading students' work /
38. And I'm actually taking them /
39. Treating them like an adult /
40. Treating their ideas as if they have weight and matter //
41. And they do have weight to me /
42. And they do matter //
43. But they're young /
44. Or they're disenfranchised /
45. Or they're starting over again //
46. They're voices that are often really easy or easier to ignore //
47. So a lot of what I do is I listen //
48. I read //

In Stanza 3 Graham expands on the topic of valuing LM students' words and ideas.

Where in Stanza 2 he discussed the time he invests in reading student work, here he explains his process of giving feedback. It appears that a lot of thought goes in to providing appropriate and useful comments to LM students' writing. Nevertheless, regarding grammar he has the same expectations for LM students as for native speakers. His intention in giving feedback is to correct inaccuracies but also to help students build on their own ideas. Graham's awareness of the way his written feedback may affect LM students is connected to his attitude about the role faculty play in establishing relationships with LM students. Providing supportive and encouraging feedback is one way for Graham to nurture his relationship with LM students. The more trustworthy and productive the student-teacher relationship, the more likely LM students will value what he has to offer and the more likely they will see him as a resource for their success

(see Lana Narrative 2). This supports Graham's belief that an essential function of his course is to equip LM students so that they can do well in any college classroom.

STANZA 3: Feedback (A, B)

49. I offer feedback /

50. Though to be honest /

51. Feedback is something I think about a lot /

52. Because the more is not always the better //

53. It's often I write something /

54. And I realize that was stupid /

55. And I erase it //

56. But quite often I'll say something and realize "Ooh, that could be taken the wrong way" //

57. Or I want to say things in a way that doesn't shut down communication //

58. Sometimes you don't realize how curt something can seem when you're just trying to get the point across //

59. I don't want to be curt //

60. I think probably too much about what I write down //

61. I hold them accountable to the same level of grammar //

62. I don't think I hassle them over articles /

63. Unless there's confusion or something inaccurate /

64. But I will if there's something inaccurate //

65. I do expect the word choices to make sense /

66. To not challenge a native speaker //

In the previous two stanzas Graham occupies a central role in facilitating his LM students' success. In Stanza 4, he noticeably steps away from being such a main character as he discusses the need for LM students to become more self-reliant. Like Amelia in her narratives, Graham contends that LM students should learn to help themselves by learning to rely less on their relationships with their current composition teachers and more on their connections with

other people and institutional resources such as the Writing Center. This is a presumably gradual shift toward autonomy that Graham considers to be a sign of accomplishment for LM students, but it is also a mark of achievement for himself. While the stanza is primarily about what LM students themselves need to be able to do in order to succeed, it clearly suggests that Graham has an essential function in facilitating their academic independence. Again, it is apparent that he feels a fruitful relationship with LM students is key to their ongoing success. This attitude toward both his role and the importance of establishing strong connections with LM students supports his conviction that his composition classroom is instrumental in preparing LM students to thrive in higher education.

STANZA 4: Learning to help oneself (A, B)

67. I tell them “If you really want to be successful /
68. Learn about the Writing Center” //
69. Get feedback from a native speaker //
70. And if they do /
71. That’s a huge success for me //
72. They’re reaching out //
73. They’re learning how to help themselves //
74. Learning to accept help from the Writing Center and other sources /
75. Finding other native speakers /
76. That’s ironically enough /
77. It seems counterintuitive /
78. But that’s a sign of independence /
79. Not relying on everything from a teacher //

In the final stanza Graham returns to the idea raised in Stanza 3 of holding all students accountable to the same level of grammar. This is related to his broader argument that students, regardless if they are LM or not, are expected to work toward the same standard of composition. Graham explains that he determines grades through the use of detailed rubrics and notes that his

expectations are based largely on students' abilities to follow directions and respond to teacher feedback. Graham's attitude is that all of his students should be able to attain passing grades because he as the teacher provides them with clear instructions and explanations. The emphasis he places on students earning, not just being given, grades is related to his belief that the teacher-student relationship is fundamental to academic achievement and that the course prepares LM students with skills that will serve them well while they are in college.

STANZA 5: Grades (A, B)

80. But I don't give grades //
81. You earn grades //
82. And I'm not fudging things /
83. And I get quite belligerent about that //
84. Everybody's getting the same grades figured the same way //
85. And I try and make things as /
86. With the rubrics they can be silly sometimes as MLA format /
87. The heading's got to be in the right order //
88. And I put numbers according to everything /
89. And I've had people laugh at some of my instructions /
90. But it's in writing //
91. They either follow directions or they don't //
92. Attaching points to everything makes things quantifiable //
93. Grades don't reflect intelligence or learning 100% //
94. They reflect the ability to follow directions in class and cooperation with your
instructor //
95. I think that's mostly what they reflect //
96. Beyond that there is to an extent the performance as well /
97. But it's really more about following directions /
98. Participating /
99. Doing what you're asked //

Summary: Narrative 3, which comes exclusively from the second interview, delves into the topic of making connections. These connections include the relationships between LM students and others (e.g. teachers, tutors, peers) as well as relationships between LM students and institutional entities (e.g. the Writing Center). The narrative begins with Graham recounting how he attempts to build a rapport with his LM students. By detailing his own experiences as a college student, he seeks commonalities that he hopes help his LM students see him more as an ally and less as an authority. “I tell them stories about what it was like being a first generation college student...and I tell them that I never got an A on a college English paper or out of an English class until I was a junior at least” (lines 1, 3-5). He explains that he became a more successful student when he realized he needed to do a better job of following directions and learning to be self-sufficient. Once one of his teachers made it a point to tell him explicitly how to do well in class (lines 6-8), Graham became aware that his academic success depended not only on having adequate writing ability but also on developing skills to search for necessary information. This lesson continues to guide Graham’s teaching. “No one learns MLA format. That’s not what I teach. What I teach is how to look things up, how to find information” (lines 20-23). His goal is to make students more self-reliant, a point that is reiterated in a later stanza. In Stanza 2 Graham continues to talk about making connections, in this case describing at length his relationship with LM students through their writing. He explains that reading LM students’ work necessitates an abundance of time and effort on his part because through the process of reading he is giving LM students’ ideas the attention and respect they deserve. “Reading is work, and mostly as a writing teacher what I do is read. I’m reading students’ work, and I’m actually taking them, treating them like an adult, treating their ideas as if they have weight and matter” (lines 35-40). For Graham this the basis of ‘meaningful communication’ (line 33), and the

characteristics of honesty and openness are hallmarks of the authentic relationship he seeks to achieve with LM students. Where in Stanza 2 Graham speaks about reading LM student writing, in Stanza 3 he speaks about reacting to it. He explains that a significant amount of thought goes in to the feedback he gives LM students about their writing because he wants to provide commentary that is useful and promotes uptake. “Feedback is something I think about a lot because the more is not always the better...I want to say things in a way that doesn’t shut down communication” (lines 51-52, 57). He wants to help LM students become more accomplished academic writers, but he does not want to be the sole authority on their writing. In Stanza 4 it becomes clear that the relationship Graham has with his LM students is intended to serve as a springboard for students to seek out other productive connections in the college, whether it be with other people or resources. “I tell them, ‘If you really want to be successful, learn about the Writing Center. Get feedback from a native speaker” (lines 67-69). Establishing connections with entities beyond Graham as their composition teacher is a sign of progress. “They’re reaching out. They’re learning to help themselves” (lines 72-73). Here at the end of Stanza 4 Graham returns to the notion raised in Stanza 1 that LM students’ success is dependent on them becoming more autonomous. In the final stanza, Graham reiterates that grades are based in part on students’ ability to follow directions. Like the personal experience Graham relates in Stanza 1, “Grades don’t reflect intelligence or learning 100%. They reflect the ability to follow directions in class and cooperation with your instructor” (lines 93-94). For Graham, then, an integral part of having meaningful connections with LM students is their willingness to heed his guidance.

4.2.5 Noah

Noah is a Caucasian male whose first language is English. He holds a M.A. in both English and TESOL. He also has a Ed.D. in Education and at the time of the interviews was pursuing a Ph.D. in Composition. Noah has between 11-20 years of teaching experience and is currently a full-time instructor in the English department, where he typically teaches at least one section of Composition I. He began his tenure at the institution where this study took place as an adjunct instructor in the EAP program.

Both of Noah's narratives are anchored in talk of relationships, both personal and professional. In the first narrative Noah speaks about how a particular relationship from his childhood led him to pursue a career in teaching and how that relationship bears on the kind of connections he seeks to forge with students. Noah recounts another personal experience in his second narrative, which revolves more around matters such as compassion, pride, humility, and confidence. The second narrative also touches on notions of acculturation and socialization. For Noah, acculturation within the composition classroom and community college in general is equivalent to broader socialization outside the realm of higher education. In both narratives Noah brings an awareness of how his past personal relationships and experiences have become touchstones for his present professional life. The categories of attitudes and beliefs are seen throughout both of Noah's narratives, which also rely heavily on his prior personal experiences.

4.2.5.1 Noah: Narrative 1

Table 4-10: Categories seen in Noah, Narrative 1

	Attitudes (A)	Beliefs (B)	Knowledge (K)	Prior experiences (PE)
Stanza 1				X
Stanza 2				X
Stanza 3	X	X		
Stanza 4	X	X		
Stanza 5	X	X		X
Stanza 6	X	X		
Stanza 7	X	X		

Noah’s first narrative spans all three interviews and deals with the topic of relationships, in particular how his past experiences affect his current view of his role as a teacher and the connections he attempts to establish with students. The narrative begins with an extended background of a relationship he had as a child with an adult neighbor, Mrs. Naguchi. The purpose of this story is to explain her impact on his decision to become a teacher and how his memories of his relationship with her remain relevant to his professional career. The first stanza provides a brief explanation of how he came to know Mrs. Naguchi. In Stanza 2 Noah describes what he learned about Mrs. Naguchi’s own experiences with adversity and how her nurturing presence in his childhood impacted his adult decisions to pursue Asian studies and become a community college instructor. Both of these stanzas display the category of prior experiences.

STANZA 1: Interaction with neighbor (background) (PE)

Interview 1

1. A long time ago there was this really sweet lady who lived across the street from us /
2. My family /
3. In Los Angeles /
4. We lived there for a couple of years /
5. And my family was very dysfunctional on a lot of levels /
6. But Mrs. Naguchi was really sweet //

7. She used to give us kids rides to our elementary school on her way to take her daughter to her junior high //

STANZA 2: Interaction with neighbor (evaluation) (PE)

8. I remember Mrs. Naguchi was really interesting //
9. She was the type of person who would ask you how is your day going /
10. What activities do you have at school /
11. And just a very loving type of person //
12. And to make a long story short /
13. She had a huge impact on me /
14. Because at that time she was one of the few adults I knew /
15. Who actually gave a damn about me as a person //
16. Later when I went to college /
17. I discovered that Mrs. Naguchi had been one of the Japanese internees after World War II //
18. She had been at that camp //
19. I just felt horrible about that //
20. I often thought that /
21. How is it that someone who was treated so badly as a young girl /
22. Could still have so much love for other people /
23. And treat them with decency and respect //
24. And so I just became fascinated with a lot of things that were Asian //
25. So I majored in Chinese studies /
26. And I went to Taiwan //
27. I lived there for 15 years //
28. I married a woman from Taiwan //
29. I have to say that it goes back to that early childhood experience /
30. That was kind of born out of a trauma //
31. Somebody came in and was kind to me and just happened to be from that culture //
32. I was able to identify with that ethic really //
33. Honestly I think [the choice to teach at community college] kind of goes back to Mrs. Naguchi /

34. Because she was very kind to me at a time when I was very vulnerable /
35. As a child going through a really tough time //
36. She became kind of a mentor and role model //

In the third stanza Noah begins to detail the ways that his relationship with Mrs. Naguchi influences his perspective on the students he encounters. He strives to embody the compassion he experienced in his friendship with Mrs. Naguchi by being a supportive, caring presence. Even though their time in his composition class is transitory, Noah wants students to leave his classroom feeling good about themselves and the work they do. The attitude he displays toward his teaching role is that of both a model and a mentor. He feels that by demonstrating the qualities he observed in his own role model, Mrs. Naguchi, he can be an example to the students in his class. To that end, for Noah there is value in establishing positive, genuine relationships with students, even if those relationships are fleeting.

STANZA 3: Application of Mrs. Naguchi's influence (A, B)

37. When I work with these people here /
38. Whether young or old /
39. I realize that I am also touching somebody who is probably going through a pretty tough time too //
40. They may be moving here from another country /
41. Or they may be going through a divorce and legal proceedings /
42. Or going through bankruptcy /
43. Or they lost their job somehow /
44. So they're here //
45. I think as a teacher /
46. Even though I'm not teaching a course they're gonna major in /
47. At least I can try to help them have a better day //
48. That sounds kind of cheesy /
49. But I really do believe that //
50. If I can get them through Comp I and II /

51. And give them some dignity as they are going through that process /
52. I feel I've accomplished quite a bit //

Noah talks more specifically about establishing individual relationships with students in Stanza 4. As above, he demonstrates an awareness that his students come from different backgrounds, experiences, and expectations. On that basis Noah's interactions with students are intentional—he wants them to recognize that they are of their place in the college. One way to do that is to let students know he is eager to work with them on an individual basis. Noah's attitude toward his teaching role here remains one of mentorship. Based on his own past personal experiences, he endeavors to present himself to students as a person whom they can trust and with whom they can have a positive dynamic. Noah believes that by creating such a relationship, students will benefit beyond the composition classroom.

STANZA 4: Individual relationships (A, B)

53. I think that one of the challenges that they have is that /
54. They feel that they don't really have any merit to be able to sit down /
55. And be seriously considered by somebody who's a teacher or professor //
56. A lot of students are at the community college /
57. Because they weren't able to get into [a state university] for whatever reason /
58. Maybe financial /
59. Maybe academic //
60. I try to spend time with them individually one-on-one //
61. I think for a lot of them it's really the first time /
62. Where a faculty member has taken the initiative to do that with them //

In Stanza 5 Noah relates a noteworthy experience he had in the past with a LM student. After providing some background about the student, he explains how he came to learn more details about her as an individual and the difficulties she was facing at the time. As Noah tells the story, it becomes clear that he feels his personal interactions with her had a lasting impact on her

academic and professional trajectory. The stanza ends with him reiterating his desire to have good relationships with his students. The category of attitudes is evident here in Noah's retelling of his interactions with this Mexican-American student. He assumes that part of his responsibility as a teacher is to establish the type of relationships with his students that will help them to succeed—both in and out of his class. He has seen that the consequences of such relationships can be significant to students' immediate and long-term futures, and for that reason he finds value in seeking out those kinds of connections.

STANZA 5: Interaction with student (example) (A, B, PE)

63. I had a Mexican-American student in one of my classes //
64. She had grown up in pretty much a Mexican area /
65. So Spanish was her dominant language //
66. Her Mexican identity was very, very strong //
67. So she missed a few days of class //
68. In fact she missed about 3 weeks of class //
69. I was really pissed //
70. So finally she came back in /
71. And I was like "Okay //
72. What the hell has been going on?" //
73. So I talked with her a little bit about it /
74. And I said "I have the right to throw you out //
75. I could give you an F //
76. I'm gonna give you a second chance with it" //
77. We talked //
78. I found out that she was having some issues at home with family and parents and
boyfriend /
79. And all this stuff just basically caught up with her //
80. And then I talked with her /
81. And I say "What it is that you would like to do?" //
82. She says "Well, I'd like to go into the medical field" //

83. And I said “That’s a great goal //
84. Why don’t you pursue it?” //
85. And then she said something to me that really bothered me //
86. She says “Well, you know, I’m Mexican /
87. And we Mexicans aren’t usually very good in math” //
88. And I said “Oh, is that right?” //
89. Are you aware of the fact that your ancestors invented their own mathematics? //
90. And you know that the geometry of the Aztecs, the Incans, and the Mayans was
unsurpassed by anybody else /
91. And that you guys has the concept of absolute zero /
92. Which shows the sophistication of mathematics /
93. Which is highly developed?” //
94. Anyway we had this conversation for a while /
95. And I worked it out so that I forgave her her missing three weeks //
96. I kept her in the class //
97. She actually did quite well /
98. And she got an A in the course //
99. I didn’t hear from her for about three years //
100. One day my wife was going in for surgery for cancer //
101. The nurse came in to prep my wife for the surgery /
102. And I looked up and I thought *OMG* /
103. My former Mexican student working over there as a nurse /
104. And she came in to prep my wife in surgery //
105. It was a strange moment //
106. I just felt conflicted all over the place //
107. I’d like to think I had a little of an impact on her //
108. Again, it’s this idea of not just being a language teacher /
109. But actually trying to help people find a better place //
110. That’s a true story //
111. So I share that story with my students sometimes in class /
112. And I say that I just want you all to have a good relationship with me and try to

move on //

113. 'Cause you never know what may happen //

In Stanza 6, which comes from the second interview, Noah discusses his perspective on writing conferences. The apparent shift in topic here is actually less drastic than it seems; he is simply speaking about another mode of one-on-one work with students. For Noah, writing conferences are an expedient means of reaching students individually. As he explains the details of his approach to writing conferences, it becomes clear that the time and effort involved in working with students on an individual basis is not insignificant. However, by dedicating a portion of time for students to meet and speak with him, whether about writing or other concerns, Noah feels he is able to connect with students in a way that is meaningful. Again here Noah, as the teacher, occupies the position of an adult invested in a novice individual. Conferences, while obligatory, demonstrate to students that they are deserving of an instructor's time, energy, and interest. This attitude toward his role underscores his belief that one-on-one relationships with students are necessary and valuable.

STANZA 6: Conferences (A, B)

Interview 2

114. I feel that [conferences are] the most effective way [to ensure student comprehension] //

115. Just sit down individually and talk to you about your paper /

116. And deal with your concerns and your fears and your paranoias /

117. And listen to the stories about the kids and jobs and try to work with them on that
//

118. I find it so helpful //

119. If they skip a conference that's not a good thing with me //

120. I usually schedule the week out /

121. So we'll start conferences probably at 8:00 in the morning on Monday /

122. And then I'll have the scheduled all the way out until Friday 5pm //

123. So I have everybody sign up for a 20, 30 minute period of time //

124. It's pretty exhausting by the end of it //

In Stanza 7 Noah explains that he genuinely enjoys getting to know students on an individual basis. This final stanza, which comes from the third interview, conveys yet again Noah's understanding that students enter his class with distinct experiences and expectations. It communicates as well his willingness to spend time acquainting himself with individual students. The genuine interest he displays in wanting to learn about students as people and being a positive influence is related to his attitude toward his teaching role and his belief that investing in relationships with students will facilitate their success while they are in college and beyond.

STANZA 7: Relationships with students (A, B)

Interview 3

125. I like the students //

126. I like talking with them //

127. I sit down and talk with them quite a bit //

128. I usually conference with them every semester //

129. Obviously there's some students I like better than others //

130. Some are really hard /

131. But overall it's really interesting to talk with people from different walks of life /

132. And different challenges that they're dealing with //

133. It could be the single mom who's got a couple of kids at home /

134. And she's trying to make ends meet //

135. It could just be some teenager coming in here /

136. Doesn't know what he wants to do with his life /

137. And I just try to help him get started in a good way //

138. I really enjoy talking with people //

Summary: Noah's first narrative is infused with references to past experiences he has had and explanations of how those experiences influence him in personal and professional ways. He

begins by relating an influential childhood relationship in Stanzas 1 and 2. Noah claims he came from a family that was “very dysfunctional on a lot of levels” (line 5). His neighbor, Mrs. Naguchi, had a significant impact on him “because at that time she was one of the few adults I knew who actually gave a damn about me as a person” (lines 14-15). Upon learning that Mrs. Naguchi had been held at a Japanese internment camp during World War II, Noah began to wonder how “someone who was treated so badly as a young girl could still have so much love for other people and treat them with decency and respect” (lines 21-23). Noah credits her with his interest in pursuing Asian studies (lines 24-32) and for being an important role model for him when he was at an impressionable age (lines 33-36). In Stanza 3 Noah applies the impact of this experience to his teaching. “When I work with these people here...I realize that I am also touching somebody who is probably going through a pretty tough time, too” (line 37-39). Acknowledging some of the disparate experiences of his own students, Noah asserts that one of his goals as a teacher is simply to be a caring person and to serve as a positive influence to students in his class (lines 40-52). In Stanza 4 he goes on to explain his view that students, because of their past experiences, may have difficulty assuming their rightful place in the college. “They feel that they don’t really have any merit to be able to sit down and be seriously considered by somebody who’s a teacher or professor” (lines 54-55). As a result, Noah believes it is important to make students feel welcome, and to demonstrate a willingness to meet with them and get to know them as individuals. Stanza 5 is an extended account of such a meeting with a former LM student. Noah “was really pissed” (line 69) at this student’s persistent absences. After expressing his frustration to the student, he probes to find the reasons for her poor performance. Noah then asks about her professional plans and is surprised when he hears that the student is not confident she will be able to succeed. “She said something to me that

really bothered me. She says, ‘Well, you know, I’m Mexican, and we Mexicans aren’t usually very good in math’” (lines 85-87). Noah argues strongly against this statement (lines 88-93), and in the end she stays in the class and passes it (lines 94-98). Several years later the student and Noah meet again in entirely different circumstances—she is the nurse for his wife’s surgery. Even though for Noah the encounter “was a strange moment” (line 105), it reinforced the point that his influence on students can reach beyond his class. “I’d like to think I had a little of an impact on her. Again, it’s this idea of not just being a language teacher but actually trying to help people find a better place” (lines 107-109). Noah continues to refer to this particular experience in his current teaching as a way to illustrate the potential impact of his interactions with students (lines 111-113). Noah continues to talk about the importance of building relationships with students in Stanza 6 as he discusses his approach to writing conferences. Conferences in his view are not only an effective means of working collaboratively on composition skills but also another way to get to know students and to strengthen existing ties. Conferences provide a space to “just sit down individually and talk to you about your paper, and deal with your concerns and your fears and your paranoias, and listen to the stories about the kids and jobs, and try to work with them on that” (lines 115-117). In the final stanza of the narrative Noah summarizes his position on the value of establishing relationships with students. He expects students to meet with him regularly with the purpose of nurturing a productive partnership (lines 127-128). Though each student presents particular challenges, for Noah it is both necessary and rewarding to work together. His main intention remains “just [trying] to help [students] get started in a good way” (line 137).

4.2.5.2 Noah: Narrative 2

Table 4-11: Categories seen in Noah, Narrative 2

	Attitudes (A)	Beliefs (B)	Knowledge (K)	Prior experiences (PE)
Stanza 1				X
Stanza 2	X	X		
Stanza 3	X	X		
Stanza 4	X	X		
Stanza 5	X	X		
Stanza 6	X	X		X
Stanza 7	X	X		
Stanza 8	X			X
Stanza 9	X			X
Stanza 10				X
Stanza 11	X	X		
Stanza 12	X	X		X
Stanza 13	X	X		
Stanza 14	X	X		
Stanza 15	X	X	X	X
Stanza 16	X	X		X

Like Noah’s first narrative, Narrative 2 relies on references to prior personal and professional experiences as they pertain to relationships. It also builds on themes of encouragement, compassion, and confidence. This narrative, however, introduces a new thread to the discussion—socialization. Noah, like Graham before him, does talk about the notion of culture but speaks more explicitly about how acculturation to norms of American postsecondary institutions relates to broader socialization outside of academia. Stanza 1 begins with Noah recounting his own experiences as a linguistic and cultural novice in a foreign country. He provides this background for his discussion in Stanza 2 about how his time abroad helps him now as a teacher of LM students. He approaches LM students with an awareness of the challenges he faced being an outsider and attempts to make his classroom a place where LM students feel accepted. The category of prior experiences is apparent here as are Noah’s attitudes and beliefs. In regards to his teaching role he continues to present himself as a model of empathy

and compassion. His intention is to create a supportive environment in which LM students feel safe enough to take chances with their growing language and academic skills. This attitude is linked to Noah's belief that the teacher-student relationship serves as a central tool for students' future success and should thus be positive and constructive.

STANZA 1: Experience abroad (PE)

Interview 1

1. I think having struggled with Chinese for 15 years /
2. It has given me a good sensitivity to what it feels like to have to struggle to learn a new language /
3. And to go out there and be a racial minority /
4. Because I was very definitely that way in Taiwan //
5. People would just stare at you /
6. And you'd see people snicker and stuff like that //
7. Sometimes you don't mind /
8. But other times it's kind of hurtful //

STANZA 2: Impact (A, B)

9. When I look at students from Africa or Asia or wherever /
10. Who sit in my class /
11. I know that they've had some positive and also negative experiences here //
12. I try to make class a warm and accepting place for them //
13. It's okay to make mistakes //
14. You can say something and screw it all up /
15. And it's not a big deal //
16. I encourage that actually //
17. If they can't take a risk in the classroom /
18. Where else are they gonna do it? //
19. If you take a risk at work /
20. You might get fired //
21. So in our classroom you can say something really stupid /
22. And it's not going to haunt you later on //

23. You learn by making mistakes //
24. If you're not making mistakes /
25. You're not really trying //

In Stanza 3 Noah states his goal for LM students in his class. Through his instruction on academic writing, he hopes more broadly to help LM students become better communicators. This, in turn, will help them while they are in college but also beyond. As seen in Narrative 1, Noah's ultimate aim is connected to his belief that he, through the composition course, can and should be a positive force in students' lives in general. In order to realize that belief, he assumes the role of a facilitator who guides students through processes of academic and social growth.

STANZA 3: Goal for students (A, B)

26. I would say [my goal] is probably trying to help people get to a better place //
27. My job is to help people who are going through transitions in life /
28. And my thing is all about communication skills //
29. I am trying to help work with them to become better writers in the English language /
30. But also to help them connect with the college and find something they want to move
into //

Similar to Graham in Narrative 3, here in Stanza 4 Noah explains that a significant aspect of his teaching position is for him to promote open, meaningful communication with students. As he discussed in the preceding narrative, Noah seeks to work collaboratively with LM students both in class and through conferences so that they improve their writing skills. Meanwhile, he hopes to engender their interest in pursuing their education for a better future. In this instance Noah foregrounds his position as a partner to LM students. He downplays his authority on writing in order to be seen as more of a mentor to LM students, someone who can help them as they navigate postsecondary education while in his composition class. He feels that better writing should not be the end goal but rather that it should serve as a means by which LM students can

communicate more effectively and grow as individuals. He believes that students should take what they learn from Noah and apply it to their future academic and professional lives.

STANZA 4: Relationship as means to an end (A, B)

31. I spend a lot of my time just talking to people /
32. Like we're having this conversation //
33. Instead of them asking me /
34. I'm usually asking them and then try to give them other suggestions //
35. I hope more than anything that they take away from it /
36. A desire to continue in college and to continue learning //
37. I hope they see writing as a tool /
38. That is going to help them pursue their own individual goals //

In Stanza 5 Noah reiterates his goal of having a positive influence on LM students, both in his composition class and in general. Where in previous stanzas he focuses on his intention to support students in their future academic and professional pursuits, here he underscores the part he plays in broadly promoting students' self-esteem. Again, the confidence he hopes to engender extends beyond LM students' writing abilities although that is where he concentrates his energy. By teaching LM students to become more accomplished writers, he hopes to help them become more assured people. Accordingly, Noah assumes the responsibility of helping LM students develop their composition skills as a way of gaining confidence in other arenas. He displays the belief that his course is valuable because it promotes aptitude in writing. Such communication is not only essential, but it can also be empowering.

STANZA 5: Building confidence (A, B)

39. I don't feel that my job is to necessarily recruit English majors or anything like that /
40. But it's just actually to give people a good day /
41. A good experience
42. And maybe boost their self-esteem //
43. A lot of people really don't have a lot of confidence in their ability to write /

- 44. Even the native speakers of English /
- 45. Which just really blows me away //
- 46. I'm trying to erase a lot of that //
- 47. Hopefully instill some positive feelings and some self-worth //

In Stanza 6 Noah raises the idea that part of the purpose of teaching is to socialize students not only to academic norms but also to professional ones. Patience, a recurring theme in coming stanzas, is key to this process. Noah discusses the process of socialization through the lens of teaching students to communicate effectively through writing. The example he uses to illustrate his point makes reference to an online interaction with a student in which the student fails to respect basic rules of grammar (e.g. capitalization, punctuation) as well as standards of pragmatic appropriateness. For Noah this becomes a teachable moment to convey to the student the consequence of respectful and correct communication. He likens teaching composition to socializing students to the conventions of academic and professional interactions. The notions of socialization and patience are further explored in Stanza 7. While Noah accepts that patience is essential to instructing students as he does, he also admits that there are some students who resist operating in ways acceptable or expected in postsecondary settings. His feeling, then, is that college is not necessarily an appropriate path for everyone. In these stanzas Noah's attitude toward his position as a teacher takes on a slightly more authoritarian tone. Though he seeks to exhibit patience in his teaching, he assumes a more directive role with those who are ignorant of or reluctant to heed his instruction of acceptable norms of interaction and communication in a higher education context. Noah continues to display similar beliefs to those in previous stanzas about the import of writing as a skill and the value of his composition course.

STANZA 6: Socialization (A, B, PE)

Interview 3

- 48. It's kind of a socialization process, right? //

49. This is how we write //
50. This is how we communicate //
51. I actually got on somebody not too long ago because of the way she wrote me an e-mail //
52. It's like "Hey" //
53. There was no capitalization /
54. No punctuation //
55. It was just really demanding //
56. I said "Okay, now first of all, let's talk about your tone in this e-mail" //
57. And after I corrected that then I went back /
58. And I gave her the information /
59. But yeah //
60. It takes a lot of patience to teach //
61. And they need to understand that because not everybody is patient and polite //
62. Some people will go off /
63. And then what's worse is some people get offended /
64. And they don't show it /
65. But then it will come back at you later on in other ways /
66. You have to be careful //
- STANZA 7: Socialization (reprise) (A, B)
67. This is a socialization process /
68. And some people just will not be socialized //
69. And if that's the case /
70. My feeling is maybe higher ed isn't the right place for them //
71. Maybe they should be working construction some place /
72. Or driving a truck /
73. Or I don't know what //
74. Most people are willing to learn /
75. But god it takes a lot of patience //

In Stanza 8 Noah continues to talk about the need for patience with students, but this time he approaches it from a different, more personal angle. He associates being a teacher with being a parent in regards to the need to be considerate of the time needed for some to overcome seemingly simple obstacles. He explains that the approach he takes with certain students is similar to that he used with his own child when she was younger. Here, as in later stanzas, Noah calls on his own experiences as the father of a daughter to explain his teaching method. In this instance he views his teaching role like that of a caretaker—to be nurturing and compassionate. Adopting the tone of a parent with students who are experiencing difficulties is a way for him to demonstrate patience. This attitude is in keeping with the outlook Noah has about the need to support and guide LM students as they navigate college. As in previous stanzas, he displays a desire to bolster students while they are in his class so that they feel they can succeed further on.

STANZA 8: Patience and parenthood (A, PE)

76. I think a lot of times /

77. When we're teaching somebody how to do something for the very first time /

78. It's a little like teaching your kid how to tie her shoes //

79. You look at that task and you go /

80. Well that's really simple, so why aren't you getting it? //

81. But you can't /

82. Yelling at somebody is not going to help them to learn //

83. Getting impatient //

84. You've got to show them again and again and again //

85. I often find that when I talk /

86. I will often talk to them the same way that I used to talk to my kid when she was
really small //

87. So it's not really kind of like /

88. It's not a supervisor-employee type of a tone or anything //

89. It's just kind of more of a solicitous 'how are you doing?' //

90. Is everything okay? //
91. Can I help you for a minute?' //
92. And kind of be sort of perky and optimistic and cheerful about it /
93. And I think that's the way I was when I talked to her //
94. I find that the students actually respond to that quite well //

In Stanza 9 Noah returns to themes he has raised previously, namely the impact his own past experiences have on his teaching self. He explains that humility is a powerful influence on the way he enacts his role as a composition instructor. Rather than assert himself as a faultless moral authority, Noah tries to remain open and modest when interacting with students by reminding himself of times in his past when he was not his best self. This position is in keeping with Noah's attitude about being empathetic and understanding in the ways he relates to students.

STANZA 9: Humility (A, PE)

95. When I walk through here I'm constantly thinking about my own limitations
96. And mistakes I've made in the past /
97. Things I've done or said that may have hurt other people //
98. I look back on that and think *Gee* /
99. *Why did I have to come down on that person so hard* /
100. That kind of stuff constantly rolls through my mind //
101. So when I get somebody in here from access services /
102. Or somebody who's just acting like a jackass /
103. I try to bite my tongue and think *If I really vent my spleen right now* /
104. *Am I going to regret this 5 or 10 years later?* //
105. I've got enough regrets //
106. I don't need to add any more to that //
107. So I try to make humility one of the things //

Noah revisits the theme of patience as it relates to humility in Stanza 10. He presents an extended account of his experience as the parent of a young child facing academic difficulties in

China. In Stanza 11 he applies this experience to his current teaching. Noah views his daughter's teacher, who took it upon herself to extend extra effort to help Noah's daughter learn to read, as someone who embodies patience and thus serves as a model for him to follow when he works with his own composition students. He attempts to emulate the same sort of manner and to remain cognizant of the fact that he, as a teacher, affects students in unforeseen ways. In the same respect that students' difficulties may not be readily apparent, the impact of teachers' actions and words are not necessarily immediately evident. This is demonstrative of Noah's attitude that patience is an integral part of being an effective teacher as well as his belief that the teacher-student relationship is an asset and should thus be cultivated as it has bearing on students' academic and personal futures.

STANZA 10: Interaction with child (reprise) (PE)

108. I suppose probably related to that is patience //
109. I think of my kid when she was growing up and some of the struggles she went through //
110. I had a situation with my daughter //
111. We were living in Taiwan /
112. And so my daughter was bilingual //
113. I spoke to her only in English /
114. My wife spoke to her only in Mandarin //
115. And that worked out fine until it was time for her to go to school /
116. And we wanted her to go to what was called a bilingual school /
117. Well my daughter went in there /
118. And she passed because her conversation skills were good /
119. But the parents there were just extremely competitive /
120. But in any event a lot of these kids went into first grade already knowing how to read and knowing basic arithmetic //
121. My philosophy was really different //
122. We sent my daughter off to pre-school /

123. And I really didn't give a damn if she learned her ABCs or not //
124. I figured that's /
125. You're little like that //
126. Just enjoy your life and later on you can sweat through school //
127. Well anyway she got into first grade and couldn't read /
128. And so immediately she was identified and put into the little reading groups //
129. They have the Orioles and the Owls and the Crows /
130. And my daughter was put in with the Crows //
131. Of course my wife is /
132. My kid has to be competitive /
133. And she was really upset that our daughter was in with the Crows /
134. And I'm like "Well she'll work her way out of it" //
135. There was a lot of unhappiness about that /
136. And my daughter was under this pressure at home to hurry up and learn how to read /
137. And she was having trouble with it //
138. To make a long story short I told my kid /
139. I said "Hey, look //
140. If you can move up one group /
141. Out of the crows /
142. By the end of your first year" /
143. I said "Papa will go down and get you a puppy" //
144. So I made that promise to her /
145. And we told /
146. Just at a party we had her teacher over at our house /
147. She was really nice /
148. And she heard that //
149. I get a little choked up //
150. But Mrs. Stewart made it a point to set aside some time to work with my kid to teach her how to read //
151. So eventually she got the dog //

STANZA 11: Application of Mrs. Stewart's influence (A, B)

152. When I work with my students in here /
153. I keep that in mind /
154. That I sometimes need to be like that Mrs. Stewart for them //
155. It's very important because when you get somebody here in college /
156. You only see the surface //
157. You don't see all the stuff that's going on //
158. It doesn't matter if it's first grade or all the way in through to graduate school //
159. There's so much that's impacting on that //
160. And just spending some time with somebody can have a huge impact on them
later on //
161. I think a lot of times we touch people /
162. In terms of our profession /
163. In ways that we may not understand the impact it's going to have on them or is
having on them //
164. The people may feel reluctant to come forward to express and share /
165. But I just think back on some of the people who had an impact on me //
166. I haven't always gone back and said thank you to everybody /
167. But still in my mind I think about it and appreciate it //

In Stanza 12 Noah reprises the influence of parenting on his teaching. He reiterates the need to serve as a person who can help students find a path through challenging times while they are in college. Noah perceives his role as one of mentoring students and facilitating significant change. Likewise, he seeks to develop an important albeit temporary relationship with students.

STANZA 12: Parenting (reprise) (A, B, PE)

168. As a parent /
169. I work with these kids /
170. I say kids because they're younger than I am /
171. And most of them are usually /
172. The oldest one I have I think is in her 30s //

173. They're all going through change and struggle /
174. So I guess my job is to try and make that happen /
175. Make it as palatable as possible //

In Stanza 13 Noah talks about the need to be intuitive as a teacher. Similar to Lana in Narrative 2, Noah explains that part of being an effective instructor is knowing how to approach LM students on an individual basis. This is reminiscent of Noah's first narrative when he describes his experience with his Mexican-American student. Although he was frustrated with the situation, he realized that he needed to take a particular tack with her in order to help her succeed in his class. Here Noah makes reference to a similar attitude described above in Stanza 11—that it is not necessarily clear the difficulties a student may be facing, so the teacher's role should be one of understanding, support, and helpfulness. This is in standing with Noah's belief that relationships with students should be fostered.

STANZA 13: Intuition (A, B)

176. You have to work with people at their level /
177. Their level of need //
178. Try to be able to identify what's going to work with this person may not work
well with this other person //
179. I've had people come in /
180. They're missing assignments //
181. Sometimes I know I've really got to come down hard on this person or ride them
like a drill sergeant /
182. But somebody else, they don't need that //
183. They've been ridden hard enough as it is //
184. They need a little bit of compassion //
185. It's kind of like you develop maybe an intuition //
186. A good teacher /
187. I think /
188. Is able to apply that //

189. It doesn't always work /
190. But you become better at it as time goes by //

Noah discusses the need for authenticity in teaching in Stanza 14. He expresses his view that an individual's personality strongly influences the kind of teacher one portrays oneself to be in the classroom. In Stanza 15 he extends this discussion to explain that the person behind the teaching is perhaps more important than the formal pedagogical approach. Noah repeats themes from previous stanzas here, namely the influence of his own past personal experiences on his teaching, the importance of being a positive model for students, and the need to be able to read people on an individual basis in order to provide appropriate support. Noah briefly references the category of knowledge as he makes a case for the overriding importance of personality in effective teaching. He refers to his own unfavorable experience as a sixth-grade student with a disagreeable teacher as a way to illustrate the importance of teachers' longstanding impact and the need to build productive relationships with students. To that end, Noah emphasizes the necessity of showing one's genuine self when interacting with students and being aware of how past experiences affect one's teaching self.

STANZA 14: Personality (A, B)

191. I don't know that I can really separate myself as a person and as a teacher //
192. When I'm up there in front of a class /
193. I try to be real //
194. Whether I share a story from my personal life or whatever /
195. I think that's what makes teaching so relevant /
196. So much fun is that you are actually up there in front of them //
197. I mean it's the subject matter but also your personality //
198. A lot of this is all tied together //
199. If you've had a class in the past that you just hated that class /
200. Is it because you hated the subject matter or because of the personality of the

- person introducing it? //
201. In sixth grade I absolutely hated it /
202. And that was because the woman I had in that sixth grade class was just horrible /
203. But I think it was because she was a very unhappy person //
204. It was reflected in her attitude toward students /
205. Especially toward students she didn't like //
206. I was one of those //
207. I'm hoping that I can strive to be the best person I can /
208. And that gets reflected through my teaching //
209. I think it would be really strange to say that while I'm this way in the classroom /
210. I'm totally different when I'm at home //
211. I would feel very uncomfortable with that //

STANZA 15: Personality (reprise) (A, B, K, PE)

212. We talk about it as being like this craft or this science of teaching /
213. But I really feel so much of it is just more based on human connections,
relationships /
214. And the personality, the psychology of it //
215. Trying to motivate people /
216. Make them feel better about themselves /
217. Give them encouragement //
218. Give them a kick in the butt /
219. If that's what they need //
220. I know in education they have all these different articles /
221. Saying this approach is demonstrated to be so much better than this approach /
222. But what about the person behind the approach? //
223. I think if they had [my sixth grade teacher] behind any of those approaches /
224. It probably wouldn't work for some students //
225. She was awful //

In the final stanza of the narrative Noah summarizes his perspective on the influence of being a parent on his teaching. More than his formal education to become a teacher, Noah's

experiences as a father affect his instructional approach. For him, teaching is less about imparting knowledge about academic composition and more about being an open communicator and supportive presence for individuals undergoing change. He again reiterates the value of patience when helping students navigate struggles they encounter as well as the belief that establishing quality relationships with students is necessary to help them succeed beyond his classroom.

STANZA 16: Parenthood (reprise) (A, B, PE)

226. I think the best education I got for teaching was actually becoming a dad /
227. Especially with my kid //
228. I saw the struggles that she went through /
229. And it just really helped give me some pause about the need to be patient and be flexible /
230. And not take yourself so seriously all the time //
231. To be forgiving when they screw up /
232. And to expect a lot of mistakes /
233. Socially inappropriate behavior from time to time //

Summary: Like Narrative 1, Noah's second narrative reveals his reliance on and awareness of the ways some of his past experiences shape his current teaching practice. Stanza 1 begins with a brief account of Noah's time abroad and the challenges he faced as a cultural, linguistic, and racial minority (lines 1-3). He applies the lessons he learned while he was in Taiwan in the approach he adopts with the LM students in his class (Stanzas 1 and 2). "When I look at students from Africa or Asia or wherever who sit in my class, I know that they've had some positive and also negative experiences here. I try to make class a warm and accepting place for them" (lines 9-12). He wants students to feel free to experiment and take risks in a non-threatening context so that they can grow (lines 13-22). Given that Noah is a composition instructor, it is safe to imply that the growth he encourages is likely academic. However, in

Stanza 3 he clarifies that academic progress is not his sole aim. “I am trying to help them to become better writers in the English language but also to help them connect with the college and find something that they want to move into” (lines 29-30). Noah conceives of his role as a teacher of communication skills and writing as a means by which to “help people who are going through transitions in life” (line 27). To that end he strives to be a positive influence on students and to forge relationships that will benefit them in the long run (Stanzas 3 and 4). “I hope more than anything that they take away from it a desire to continue in college and to continue learning. I hope they see writing as a tool that is going to help them pursue their own individual goals” (lines 35-38). Noah aspires to bolster students’ feelings of self-worth by training them to become more confident writers of academic English and, in so doing, prepare them for life beyond the composition classroom (Stanza 5). Accordingly, in Stanza 6 Noah argues that teaching composition as he does is a means of familiarizing students with expected societal norms and providing them with the necessary tools to participate in the public sphere in pragmatically appropriate ways. “It’s kind of a process of socialization, right? This is how we write. This is how we communicate” (lines 48-50). For students who find this process difficult or who are unwilling to accept it, Noah argues that higher education may not be the most suitable path (Stanza 7). In Stanza 8 Noah likens his approach to teaching to being a parent. “I think a lot of times when we’re teaching somebody how to do something for the very first time, it’s a little like teaching your kid how to tie her shoes” (lines 76-78). Although a task may appear simple to the expert teacher, it may be challenging to the novice student. As a result, patience is paramount to helping students surmount any difficulties they face in the classroom. Noah refers to his own experiences as a father to inform his interactions with LM students. “I will often talk to them in the same way that I used to talk to my kid when she was really small... It’s not a supervisor-

employee type of a tone or anything. It's just kind of a more solicitous 'how are you doing?'" (lines 86-89). This kind of dynamic emphasizes being a mentor over being an authority, which Noah finds useful when working with students (line 94). Alongside patience, humility is also a notable influence on his teaching. "When I walk through here, I'm constantly thinking about my own limitations and mistakes I've made in the past" (lines 95-96). In both Stanzas 9 and 10 Noah makes reference to past personal experiences as they impact the way he relates with students. In particular, Stanza 10 brings together the themes of patience, humility, and parenthood as revealed in previous stanzas. In Stanza 10 Noah relates at length the story of his daughter's struggles with learning to read as a child. He identifies her teacher, Mrs. Stewart, as an individual who embodies patience and who serves as a reminder for him to remain humble in his own practice. "When I work with my students in here, I keep that in mind, that sometimes I need to be like that Mrs. Stewart for them" (lines 152-154). Noah is cognizant of the fact that efforts he makes as a teacher now, which may seem minor or inconsequential, may in fact have a profound effect on students in the long run (Stanza 11). "I think a lot of times we touch people, in terms of our profession, in ways that we may not understand the impact it's going to have on them or is having on them" (lines 161-163). In Stanza 12 Noah reiterates his position that parenthood influences his teaching and that his job is to help pilot his students through processes of change. As a result, he as the instructor must develop instincts to provide appropriate support to individual students (Stanza 13). "You have to work with people at their level, their level of need. Try to be able to identify what's going to work with this person may not work well with this other person" (lines 176-178). In addition to intuition, Noah considers genuineness an important characteristic to have as a teacher (Stanzas 14 and 15). This is the human aspect of teaching. "We talk about [teaching] as being like this craft or this science of teaching, but I really feel so

much of it is just more based on human connections, relationships, and the personality, the psychology of it” (lines 212-214). For Noah, what is most important is “the person behind the approach” (line 222). In the final stanza of the narrative Noah returns to the notion of parenthood and its effect on his teaching. “I think the best education I got for teaching was actually becoming a dad” (line 226). He reveals the qualities that being a father taught him and that he feels are necessary to being a teacher: patience, adaptability, compassion, and humor.

4.3 Summary

The narratives presented above reveal prevalent topics from each participant’s narratives. Generally speaking, three broad themes become apparent— confidence, connections, and constraints. More specifically, teachers need to build students’ confidence in their composition and communication skills. One way to go about doing that is to foster students’ connections with people as well as institutional entities. The ultimate purpose is for students to become full participants in the postsecondary community and to develop tools that will help them succeed once they leave the composition classroom; however, this goal must be achieved within the confines of the community college itself. Not all participants address these notions in the same way or with the same weight. While each narrative presents different perspectives, the significant categories throughout all of the narratives are attitudes, beliefs, and prior experiences. Experiences provide essential background for some participants to discuss their approach to teaching and interacting with students. They help to illustrate how participants enact their teaching identities in the classroom. The attitudes evident in the narratives relate primarily to participants’ feelings about their roles as teachers as well as their feelings about students, whether as individuals or as a collective whole. Participants’ attitudes toward their profession, program, and institution are also made apparent. The beliefs that become relevant in the

narratives emphasize participants' opinions regarding the worth of writing as a skill and of higher education in general as well as their potential impact on students' future success in the community college and beyond. The next chapter will further explain the significance of these focal categories and synthesize their relationship to the constructs of teacher investment and identity.

Chapter 5: Discussion

5.1 Introduction

This dissertation is an investigation of the professional identities of community college composition teachers' using narrative research and discourse analysis to explore these teachers' investment in language minority (LM) students. As a preface to the discussion of results in this chapter, it is helpful to restate the research questions that guided the study. The research questions are:

- How do community college mainstream writing teachers construct their professional identities in relation to LM students, with regard to:
 - a. Attitudes?
 - b. Beliefs?
 - c. Knowledge?
 - d. Prior experiences?
- How do these professional identities influence their communication with and behavior towards LM students?

As seen in Chapter 4, participants' narratives are permeated by a variety of focal categories. Here, I will speak about these in relation to the broader notions of investment and teacher identity. Given the length and detail of the previous chapter, the first section of the Discussion chapter presents a more global summary of the narratives by focal category. Following these summaries, I will go on to explain the significance of the three main focal categories evident in participants' narratives, breaking down each by its most prominent themes. In particular, I will relate how an awareness of these focal categories in teachers' narratives can help to provide a clearer picture of who community college writing teachers claim to be in the classroom and what

a deeper understanding of these focal categories implies for the teaching of writing to community college LM students. An acknowledgment of the weaknesses of the current study will precede a brief discussion of the future directions of this type of inquiry.

5.2 Summary of Results

As mentioned in the previous chapter's summary, the overarching themes that emerge from all eleven narratives are confidence, connections, and constraints. These themes are interrelated insofar as confidence is built primarily through the establishment of LM student connections; however, participants' abilities to engender confidence in LM students and to help them foster valuable connections are subject to constraints over which participants feel they have minimal control. More specifically, confidence is related to the idea that participants endeavor to strengthen LM students' confidence not only in their academic skills, including writing, but also in the kinds of skills that will be useful to them once they have moved out of the composition classroom. One of the most important ways to build that sort of confidence is to help LM students make various connections, or relationships. It is evident from the narratives that participants feel individual teacher-LM student relationships are of great importance, but different types of relationships are also necessary—whether with other students through the act of giving and receiving peer feedback, or with institutional entities such as the Writing Center or Counseling/Advising. Nevertheless, participants indicate that they feel restricted in what they are able to do for LM students, particularly outside of the classroom. These same themes are reframed in the following section through the focal categories identified as indicative of investment and presented in the research questions.

5.2.1 Focal Categories in General

5.2.1.1 Attitudes

The most prominent focal category overall is attitudes. To recap, attitudes in this study are defined as teachers' feelings toward particular aspects of the academic enterprise. This includes how teachers feel about their position, their course, their program, their department, and the institution at large. In addition, this focal category encompasses how teachers feel about their LM students, whether as individuals or as a group. As such, the attitudes most present in the narratives relate to how participants perceive and enact their role as instructors of composition and how they exhibit their feelings about their LM composition students.

Attitudes are displayed in the ways participants portray themselves in relation to LM students. Throughout the narratives it is made clear that participants feel they are stewards of academic and personal success (cf. Amelia Narrative 2, Stanzas 1-2; Graham Narrative 2, Stanzas 1 & 8; Noah Narrative 2, Stanza 4). Accordingly, they express the duties of their position as instilling LM students with confidence and pride—in their work, in their abilities, and in who they are, and providing them with encouragement and support (Amelia Narrative 2, Stanza 3; Lana Narrative 2, Stanzas 1-2; Graham Narrative 3, Stanza 2; Noah Narrative 1, Stanza 3; Noah Narrative 2, Stanzas 2 & 5). It is implied that intuition plays a part in determining how participants should interact with LM students, whether as gentle guides or as more persistent leaders (cf. Lana Narrative 2, Stanza 4; Noah Narrative 2, Stanza 13). Even so, occupying such a role is not without conflict. Participants struggle to reconcile what they should do to help LM students with what they want to do to and what they are able to do (cf. Amelia Narrative 1, Stanza 4; Brad Narrative 1, Stanza 3). Nevertheless, most participants accept that their responsibilities are not limited to instruction, and they readily adopt additional roles including

advocate or learner (cf. Lana Narrative 2, Stanzas 7 and 8; Graham Narrative 1, Stanza 2; Graham Narrative 2, Stanza 10).

Attitudes are also revealed when participants describe who they think their LM students are, and how their LM students should respond to and interact with them. LM students are represented in some instances as diligent, successful, and open to participants' overtures (cf. Amelia Narrative 2, Stanza 4; Brad Narrative 2, Stanza 2; Lana Narrative 1, Stanzas 3 & 5); in other cases, LM students are characterized as reticent, unproductive, and closed off to participants' suggestions (cf. Amelia Narrative 1, Stanzas 1 & 7; Noah, Narrative 2, Stanzas 6-7). Regardless, LM students are seen as in need of differing levels of leadership (cf. Noah Narrative 2, Stanza 15). Participants intimate that the key to LM students' ultimate success lies in their willingness to work in concert with their instructors, to accept the advice that is offered, and then to act on that help (cf. Lana Narrative 2, Stanza 5; Graham Narrative 3, Stanza 5; Noah Narrative 1, Stanza 6).

Attitudes appear in every narrative without exception and in nearly every stanza. The focal category's ubiquity attests to its usefulness as a way of analyzing teacher investment. As defined in the study, attitudes pertain to the immediate academic venture, so it makes sense to investigate how teachers conceive of their role and how they see the students in their classes. Through their narratives, participants reveal that they presume to have certain responsibilities toward their LM students, and that fulfillment of those responsibilities in a variety of ways demonstrates their readiness to help LM students succeed. Likewise, participants indicate that they feel LM students also have certain obligations, and that by meeting those obligations, LM students will be successful by participants' standards. The relationship between teachers and LM students, then, is reciprocal. Teachers' efforts are rewarded by LM students acting as expected;

LM students enacting their perceived role validates teachers' investment. When LM students challenge teachers' assumptions about how to achieve academic success or are not sustained by teachers' efforts, teachers' investment is called into question.

5.2.1.2 Beliefs

Beliefs is the second-most common focal category. It is defined as teachers' value-based thoughts and future-oriented goals. The former are suggestive of the underlying influences that drive teachers to acquit themselves as they do whereas the latter are indicative of what teachers envision as possible for themselves and for their LM students. The beliefs on display in the narratives are demonstrated primarily by what participants say about how they can best meet LM students' needs. While meeting LM students' needs clearly includes instruction in writing skills, it is also comprised of myriad methods of attending to LM students' success beyond the immediate community college composition classroom.

Beliefs are associated with the deeper convictions that prompt participants' actions. One belief in particular is shared to varying degrees amongst all participants—the establishment and maintenance of meaningful student-teacher interactions. Participants emphasize the positive impact of regularly meeting and working one-on-one with LM students. It is considered a useful tool to boost LM students' confidence in their academic skills (cf. Amelia Narrative 2, Stanzas 1-2; Lana Narrative 2, Stanzas 1-2). At the same time, participants are able to demonstrate to LM students that they are seen and valued as unique individuals (cf. Lana Narrative 2, Stanza 3; Noah Narrative 1, Stanza 4; Noah Narrative 2, Stanzas 4-5 and 11). These interpersonal relationships span face-to-face meetings and written communication. For example, participants consider providing honest and productive feedback on LM student writing as a different but equally constructive way to improve LM students' writing while also building trust and

bolstering their self-esteem (cf. Amelia Narrative 1, Stanzas 2-3; Lana Narrative 1, Stanzas 4 & 6; Graham Narrative 3, Stanzas 2-3).

Attending to LM students' needs through productive student-teacher relationships works in cooperation with another belief that is shared across participants—the value of effectively educating LM students. This includes the impact of being able to write well (cf. Amelia Narrative 2, Stanza 5; Noah Narrative 2, Stanza 4), but it also encompasses more than instruction in composition. Participants feel responsible for preparing LM students to successfully navigate the American higher education system (cf. Amelia Narrative 2, Stanza 3; Brad Narrative 2, Stanza 2; Graham Narrative 3, Stanza 4) and for enabling them to take best advantage of the academic context (cf. Graham Narrative 2, Stanza 8; Noah Narrative 2, Stanzas 6 & 7). For some participants the belief also implies sufficient and appropriate institutional support (cf. Graham Narrative 1, Stanzas 2 & 7; Graham Narrative 2, Stanza 2) and an awareness of how culture impacts LM students' academic experiences (cf. Lana Narrative 2, Stanza 8; Graham Narrative 2, Stanza 4; Noah Narrative 2, Stanza 2). Regardless, participants consider the knowledge and skills imparted in their courses to be useful to LM students throughout their academic careers and possibly beyond into their professional lives.

Based on the data, beliefs appear to be contingent upon attitudes. The former does not appear without the latter in any of the narratives. This may be because the two focal categories are so closely intertwined. For example, belief in establishing individual relationships with LM students leads teachers to emphasize conferences as a way to improve LM students' writing, which is reflective of teachers' attitude about their role and what LM students should do to become better writers. In other words, beliefs inform teachers' pedagogy and their interactions with LM students, and are related to teachers' feelings about their responsibilities toward their

LM students. Beliefs, as defined in the study, are not centered only on the academic enterprise; they are also linked to what teachers consider to be generally important and worthy of effort and attention. Some actions that come from beliefs may fall outside the immediate responsibilities of a composition teacher (e.g. acquainting LM students with advising/counseling norms, listening to them talk about their lives) and thus may be associated with the achievement of LM students' and teachers' lives beyond the classroom. As a way of investigating teacher investment, then, beliefs are informative because they are so closely connected with attitudes but also because they suggest other areas outside of composition itself that are part and parcel of investment.

5.2.1.3 Knowledge

The focal category of knowledge is the least present in any of the narratives. It is also the most narrowly defined in the entire study. Knowledge refers to information gained specifically in relation to the act of teaching through formal education or professional training. Knowledge should be the most easily identifiable focal category because of its narrow definition. That said, evidence of knowledge as an influence on teachers' investment is scant.

Although all participants have advanced degrees (two of which are terminal) and numerous years of experience between them, some of it specifically related to teaching LM students, knowledge acquired through schooling or professional development does not appear to play a significant part in their investment in LM students. Nor do references to knowledge seem to reflect any common attributes between the participants who do mention it. The references to knowledge that do occur in the narratives are brief and not very detailed. In Brad's narratives, the instances where he appeals to knowledge are related to generally feeling competent enough to meet the requirements of his assigned teaching duties (cf. Brad Narrative 1, Stanza 2; Narrative 2, Stanza 3). In Noah's narratives, he acknowledges a broad awareness that there exists a certain

base of knowledge in education (cf. Noah Narrative 2, Stanza 15). Interestingly, though, Noah brings up knowledge in order to discount its importance in comparison to other more innate pedagogical qualities that cannot be taught or learned, such as intuition and personality. Only Lana makes specific mention of a time when she undertook self-initiated professional development in order to better meet the needs of her LM students (cf. Lana Narrative 2, Stanzas 8-9).

What is perhaps most noteworthy, then, is the absence of the focal category of knowledge in seven of the 11 narratives. All participants hold advanced degrees in the subjects of English and/or Education. The two full-time participants hold terminal degrees: one in Education with a focus on TESOL and Composition, and the other in Composition with a focus on language teaching. Nevertheless, knowledge is not referenced frequently in their narratives. The reason for this may be that, since the participants are all seasoned teachers, they rely little on the knowledge learned in their initial teacher training to inform their current teaching selves. Rather, any references to knowledge in the narratives stem primarily from self-initiated professional development or general awareness of research in the teaching field. The fact that knowledge from other in-service training opportunities such as conferences is not mentioned suggests that professional development may be insufficient and/or ineffective as a motivating influence for teacher growth. As a means for explaining teacher investment, then, knowledge is not beneficial because it does not seem to have a meaningful impact on why teachers do what they do.

This finding runs counter to studies arguing that specialized pedagogical knowledge is necessary to effectively educate LM students. Specifically, de Jong and Harper (2005); Galguera (2011); Lucas and Villegas (2010); Lucas (2011); Bunch (2013); and de Jong, Harper, and Coady (2013) are among those who contend that mainstream teachers of LM students require

increased knowledge about second language acquisition processes, linguistic theories, the structure of English, and first and second language literacy development. It should be noted, however, that researchers making these assertions focus in the main on teachers of LM students in primary and secondary education contexts. It may be that community college composition teachers, because of their disciplinary knowledge, have different pedagogical knowledge needs over instructors of younger LM students who teach more general education. Studies in this vein also emphasize increased pedagogical linguistic knowledge *in conjunction with* other types of knowledge, skills, and experiences, such as content knowledge (c.f. Bunch (2013); Galguera, 2011); sociocultural awareness (c.f. Lucas & Villegas, 2010, 2013); and language experiences (c.f. García, Arias, Murri, & Serna, 2010; Lucas, Villegas, & Freedson-Gonzales, 2008; Lucas & Grinberg, 2008), as well as generally positive inclinations toward LM students and their needs. Arguably, these approaches to forming more linguistically and culturally responsive teachers may lead to more effective education of LM students although they do make use of a broader definition of knowledge than was applied in this dissertation.

5.2.1.4 Prior Experiences

The focal category of prior experiences recurs regularly in the narratives albeit with less frequency than the focal categories of attitudes or beliefs. It is defined rather generally as past formal and informal educative experiences. This focal category covers a wide range of possible encounters, from personal relationships with friends or family to professional interactions with students or colleagues. Prior experiences may have occurred in childhood or as an adult; likewise, experiences that happened later in life may or may not be recent. The experiences featured in the narratives relate to both general and specific interactions that have an effect on participants' understandings of how they are or how they should be in the classroom, for

example, how they conceive of their responsibilities toward LM students and why they feel drawn to act in particular ways.

The focal category of prior experiences is closely linked with the focal categories of attitudes and beliefs. Whether consciously or not, participants relate throughout their narratives memorable past experiences that reinforce their feelings about their role and their LM students as well as the value-based thoughts that guide their actions. For instance, a direct connection can be made between the prior experience Amelia recounts in Narrative 2, Stanza 5 with the belief she holds about the importance of being able to write well. Similarly, Noah explains in Narrative 1, Stanzas 1-2 that his childhood experiences with a neighbor actively influence his attitude about being a compassionate and supportive teacher. Participants make frequent references to specific encounters with individual LM students, which help to reinforce the common belief in the value of student-teacher relationships (cf. Lana Narrative 1, Stanzas 3 & 5; Lana Narrative 2, Stanzas 4 & 6; Graham Narrative 2, Stanza 10; Noah Narrative 1, Stanza 5). Brad (Narrative 1, Stanza 3; Narrative 2, Stanza 2), Graham (Narrative 2, Stanzas 1, 4 & 5), and Noah (Narrative 1, Stanza 7; Narrative 2, Stanza 6) also refer to interactions with LM students as a collective whole or through textual media that reflect attitudes about teachers' and LM students' roles and responsibilities, and beliefs about effective education of LM students.

While many of the prior experiences referred to in the data set are relatively recent interactions between participants and LM students, there are also some powerful remembrances from participants' childhoods and young(er) adulthoods. Participants refer to their past personal experiences as students or as cultural outsiders to establish common ground with the students they teach (cf. Graham Narrative 3, Stanza 1; Noah Narrative 2, Stanza 1). Participants also tell stories of experiences they have observed at a distance (e.g. through a spouse or child) to

illustrate how they try to come to terms with the challenges and changes their LM students may be undergoing (cf. Graham Narrative 2, Stanza 3; Noah Narrative 2, Stanzas 10 & 11). The prior experiences referred to in the data set may serve as the basis for an entire narrative or as a repeated feature throughout a single narrative (cf. Amelia, Narrative 1; Graham, Narrative 1; Noah, Narrative 2).

Like attitudes, the focal category of prior experiences appears in every narrative. That it recurs regularly in the narratives regardless of participant and that it arises quite often in the narratives of certain participants suggests the focal category is helpful in investigations of teacher investment. Not only does it help to exemplify what and why teachers do what they do in relation to LM students, but it also illustrates the broad swath of life occasions from which teachers learn and evolve. Some participants readily explain how they are affected by past experiences; others may be less conscious of a direct influence on their teaching personae. Prior experiences give a glimpse into how participants make sense of their personal and professional worlds, and this is connected to other focal categories associated with investment, namely attitudes and beliefs.

In sum, of the focal categories identified as demonstrative of investment, attitudes is the most evident, followed in order by beliefs, prior experiences, and knowledge. Attitudes, beliefs, and prior experiences make for useful indicators of the degree of teachers' investment whereas knowledge appears to be less informative. It may be that because the study participants are well into their teaching careers, knowledge gained from discipline- or degree-specific instruction is no longer drawn on as readily as are prior educative experiences, and personal attitudes and beliefs. Likewise, participants' narratives indicate that subsequent professional development is sporadic and self-directed, which effectively renders it less pedagogically influential in comparison to the

other three focal categories. As a result, the focal categories that seem to have the most explanatory power are those that are also the most instinctive and organic. That is, they are aspects of teachers' identity that accumulate naturally over time and are not necessarily acquired in any prescribed or formal manner.

5.3 Significance of Findings

Beijaard et al. (2000) suggest that “Teachers' perceptions of their own professional identity affect their efficacy and professional development as well as their ability and willingness to cope with educational change and to implement innovations in their own teaching practice” (p. 750). In brief, who teachers claim to be has a considerable impact on how they go about performing their praxis. In the narratives presented in this study, evidence was found of three prominent focal categories—attitudes, beliefs, and prior experiences. Within each of these categories, different themes and subthemes are apparent. Consideration of these areas can help to illuminate participants' identities as invested teachers in relation to LM students.

5.3.1 Attitudes

The focal category of attitudes is affiliated primarily with participants' views of roles and responsibilities, whether they be in relation to themselves, LM students, or the institution. Following (Reeves, 2002, 2006), attitudes implies teachers' feelings toward the endeavor of instructing LM students. Accordingly, attitudes inform teachers' interactions with and around LM students—what they say and what they do both in and out of the classroom are related to what they consider appropriate to their position. It would seem that participants are positively inclined to working with LM students based on their willingness to volunteer for in the study in the first instance and the experience of two of the five participants teaching in the institution's

EAP program. This assumption is borne out in the data as participants tell of their intentions and interactions teaching LM students.

5.3.1.1 Toward the Teaching Role

At a most basic level, participants envision their roles as composition teachers of LM students as engendering success in academic writing. Although success is defined differently by each participant, it becomes clear that receiving a passing grade is not of primary importance. Rather, success seems to have more to do with promoting qualities and skills that will serve LM students beyond the composition classroom. (This attitude is closely intertwined with the belief of effectively instructing LM students, which will be discussed below.) Participants speak of the need to build LM students' confidence and to instill pride in their abilities. To that end, teachers embody a range of roles from gently mentoring and supporting to more actively managing and directing.

5.3.1.2 Toward Language Minority Students

Reciprocity is inherent in participants' attitudes toward LM students. While participants feel they have particular roles to fulfill as teachers of LM students, they also imply that LM students have their own set of responsibilities to meet if they want to be considered successful in their teachers' eyes. LM students are expected to be diligent, to display openness to teachers' overtures, and to be willing to act on teachers' advice. LM students who evince effort and drive reinforce participants' views of themselves while failure to exhibit these qualities leads participants to question their efficacy and investment as composition teachers of LM students.

5.3.1.3 Toward the Institution

Participants consider themselves intermediaries between LM students and the institution at large. (Again, this is linked to the belief of effective education of LM students.) Accordingly,

they hold the attitude that part of their role as composition teachers is to facilitate the interface between students and the institutional resources at their disposal. Implied in this attitude is that the institution also has an essential role to play—in the success of LM students and the effectiveness of LM students’ teachers. So, when the institution falls short of participants’ expectations, it causes participants to question the bounds of their teaching role. Some participants wonder whether or not to operate outside the proscribed limits of their position; others take it upon themselves to broaden their role to include negotiation and advocacy.

5.3.2 Beliefs

The focal category of beliefs applies to participants’ vision for LM students’ prospects and the means participants consider necessary to realize those expectations. Whether the futures participants imagine for their LM students are true or not, they help to compel participants to do what they do. Similar to attitudes, beliefs influence participants’ actions; however, beliefs are more deep-seated and evaluative in nature (Pajares, 1992). They are “based on judgment, evaluation, and values, and do not require evidence to back them up” (Rimm-Kaufman, Storm, Sawyer, Pianta, & La Paro, 2006, p. 143). The underlying belief that becomes apparent in the narratives is related to participants’ convictions about educating LM students in a long-lasting and meaningful manner. As they speak about their attitudes toward teaching LM students (see above), they provide insight into what motivates them to action.

5.3.2.1 About Educating Language Minority Students

It becomes clear in the narratives that participants’ do not believe that academic achievement necessarily begins and ends in the composition classroom. However, they do express that their course and their teaching can play an integral part in setting LM students on a successful path. Participants indicate that LM students’ needs may fall beyond the scope of

learning how to write; they may need help navigating the system in general. To that end, participants make use of the tools at their disposal—the act of writing and the process of building relationships—to equip LM students to address pressures external to the composition classroom and thus advocate for LM students to become full-fledged members of the community college (and beyond).

5.3.2.2 About Writing and Giving Feedback

Clearly, as composition teachers, participants place high importance on the ability to express oneself well in writing. In relation to participants' belief about effectively educating LM students, writing becomes a vital means for LM students to achieve future academic and professional success. Participants value the act of writing because they see it as a venue with potential for LM students to express themselves wholly as individuals with original, complex, and powerful thoughts. Meanwhile, the process of providing feedback permits participants a space to build trust with LM students, and to speak openly and honestly about expressing oneself effectively and appropriately through writing. Through the practice of writing and giving feedback, whether written or spoken, participants aim to build meaningful, productive relationships with LM students.

5.3.2.3 About Establishing Relationships

Establishing relationships is another way for participants to realize their belief about effectively educating LM students. Although participants are aware that their personal interactions with students may be short-lived, they work in the time they have to foster relationships that will result in demonstrable progress in composition and, more broadly, communication. Participants suggest that these relationships are best maintained on a regular, individual, and temporary basis. Although Umbach and Wawrzynski (2005) call into question

the impact of out-of-class interactions, participants demonstrate that these are in fact the kinds of interactions that are the most significant to them. This subtheme extends to the cultivation of relationships between LM students and institutional resources as well. Participants seek to facilitate these types of connections to serve LM students in the long-term, once they have matriculated from the composition course. Whether the relationships LM students make are with teachers or with others in the institution, the purpose of initiating and maintaining them is to illustrate to LM students the benefits of these types of relationships while they are in college.

5.3.3 Prior Experiences

The focal category of prior experiences can be separated into two areas: personal and professional. The former are those that occurred outside of work, whether directly to participants or to people closely associated with them, such as family or friends. Professional experiences are those that occurred when participants were fulfilling their capacities as teachers, whether with students or colleagues. Teachers' experiences and their interpretation of those experiences inform teachers' professional activity (Fenstermacher, 1994; Meijer, Verloop, & Beijaard, 2001). Participants' narratives are replete with recountings of past personal and professional interactions that are directly linked to their teaching identity and practice. The frequency with which prior experiences are relied on by participants suggests that, although these experiences may be unanticipated and unpredictable, their effect on shaping teachers' investment should not be underestimated.

Interestingly, however, the prior experiences that participants relate in their narratives are quite often personal in nature. This runs counter to the findings of Meijer et al. (2001) who, in their study on the underlying influences that guide language teachers' instruction of reading comprehension, determined that there are certain characteristics common to teachers' practical

knowledge (that which, according to Fenstermacher (1994), is associated with experiences). Among them, the claim that “teachers’ practical knowledge] is based on (reflection on) experience, indicating that it originates in, and develops through, *experiences in teaching*” (Meijer et al., 2001, p. 171, emphasis added) does not necessarily play out in the present data. Although participants do refer regularly to prior experiences in a professional capacity, there are notably several personal encounters that participants draw on in their narratives. This seems to indicate that past personal experiences, at least in the case of the participants in this study, hold as much weight as past professional experiences in developing participants’ identities as composition teachers of LM students.

Gaining greater understanding about what contributes to the identity of an invested teacher can provide important information about how best to develop and support effective community college writing teachers of LM students. As such, this study set out to investigate teachers’ attitudes, beliefs, knowledge, and prior experiences as a means by which to explore teacher investment in relation to teacher identity. That attitudes, beliefs, and prior experiences were found to be the most salient focal categories in participants’ narratives suggests that one’s identity as an invested teacher is shaped greatly by gradually acquired traits and informal, unplanned events. If this is so, then these are the types of attributes and experiences that need to be cultivated to spur and/or sustain teachers’ investment. Accordingly, there are three levels of implications that need to be addressed—pedagogy, policy, and professional development.

5.4 Implications

5.4.1 Pedagogical Implications

The participants in this study demonstrated their investment by acknowledging the necessity of operating beyond their prescribed institutional duty of developing LM students’

writing skills in a classroom setting. Every participant revealed this awareness although the actions they took as a result varied by degree. Some of the qualities that participants exhibited were: the expectation of hard work and high achievement; the importance of working individually with LM students with the intent to establish and maintain meaningful, productive relationships; and the willingness to devote extra time and energy to ensure LM students' success. These qualities echo those found in Levin et al. (2010) and Schreiner et al. (2011), whose research showed that increased student outcomes and persistence are linked to staff and faculty whose interactions with students are characterized by clear communication of high standards, high levels of student-teacher interaction, desire to impact students, willingness to invest time and energy, establishment of genuine and authentic connections, and passion for work. Evidence of each of these characteristics can be found throughout the study participants' narratives.

In addition to corroborating the findings of Levin et al. (2010) and Schreiner et al. (2011), this study also finds evidence for an additional trait that is characteristic of invested teachers, namely that they are open to growth and actively pursue it as a result of being challenged in their interactions with LM students. Amelia, for example, found herself in a difficult situation with a LM student who appeared willing to work but refused to act on any of her suggestions. As a result, she found herself questioning whether she was doing enough to aid this student, or if there was something more she could or should do. In another case, Lana became aware that it was necessary to do something more to help her better address the needs of her LM students. Consequently, she actively sought out information about LM student writers and developed a survey to learn more about those who enroll in her class. Similarly, Graham had an uncomfortable encounter with a LM student whom he inadvertently offended. Looking back, he

was able to consider the origins of what he said and accepted the interaction as a learning experience and an opportunity to evolve. The examples presented above illustrate how each participant displayed openness to growth at some point in his/her narratives, even though this desire was instantiated in different ways.

Of the characteristics noted here as indicative of investment, some, such as regular and frequent student-teacher interactions, can be promoted through departmental and institutional initiatives. (Specific examples will be discussed in the following sections on policy and professional development implications.) Others, however, like willingness to engage with LM students outside of class and passion for work, are more internally motivated and may be more difficult to stimulate through top-down ventures. Given that identity as an invested teacher appears to develop naturally over time and to come in part from unanticipated encounters, it is undeniable that devising occasions to facilitate teacher change will be challenging, in particular because those opportunities will undoubtedly be somewhat artificial. Nevertheless, it is possible that those attributes that are more innate might unintentionally or unexpectedly arise as a result of participation in departmental/institutional programs and projects.

5.4.2 Policy Implications

Through their narratives, the participants reveal that they at times feel inhibited in their abilities to wholly invest in LM students. Every participant alluded to the notion of constrained capacity to act although the reasons and explanations they provide for these impressions differed. Some participants suggested that LM students have a responsibility to fulfill their own role as conscientious, proactive learners in order to take full advantage of student-teacher interactions. More often than not, though, participants referred to departmental and institutional barriers to their agency. Graham, for example, lamented that inadequate assessment and ill-informed

advisors hamper his ability to serve LM students effectively. Brad indicated that a restrictive curriculum requires that he take on responsibilities outside of his teaching, responsibilities for which he may or may not be sufficiently trained or compensated. For each of these situations, there are steps that can be taken to initiate and support policies that alleviate restrictions on teachers, and positively affect LM students and the broader institution.

5.4.2.1 Orientation

Participants indicated that they have certain expectations of LM students, and that to be successful in their eyes, LM students should satisfy their obligations to be receptive to teacher feedback and outreach. If teachers expect LM students to be willing to meet outside of class time and to seek assistance beyond what teachers provide in class (i.e. going to the Writing Center), then it makes sense to explicitly train LM students accordingly. To that end, institutionally mandated and supported orientation can take some of the burden off of teachers in the classroom by introducing LM students to teachers' expectations before they enter into the composition classroom. It can also help to acquaint LM students with the institutional resources at their disposal. In effect, orientation is preparation for LM students to become more successful learners.

To be most effective, orientation should include all people involved in the teaching and support of LM students. This includes representatives from the academic branch such as instructors, chairs, and deans, but also representatives from support services such as advisors, Writing Center staff, and even members of tech support. If LM students see all of these people face-to-face, it makes orientation more personal and demonstrates that the institution at large is invested in their success. Just as teachers may need to be trained in how to demonstrate investment through the characteristics noted by Levin et al. (2010) and Schreiner et al. (2011),

LM students may also benefit from pre-semester instruction in how to demonstrate engagement in their learning. Although orientation requires considerable time, effort, and money, the advantages for all would be substantial.

5.4.2.2 Assessment and Placement

One participant in particular, Graham, indicated that LM students are disserved by inadequate assessment and inappropriate course placement. His frustration is borne namely of the fact that the placement exam currently used by the institution evaluates grammar knowledge but not LM students' writing ability. This highlights a consequential disconnect between the Testing Center and the English department; however, as an individual composition instructor, even a full-time one, Graham does not have the traction to institute an overhaul of the pre-semester evaluative procedures that directly affect the LM students he teaches. A potential solution to this problem would be a (cross-) departmental initiative to create an in-house assessment/placement mechanism for LM students.

Beyond the fact that such an initiative would result in more appropriately placed LM students, it would also be a worthwhile endeavor for the department. Development at the local level would take advantage of composition teachers' expertise, demonstrate confidence in the value of what teachers do, and reinforce teachers' dedication to students' academic interests while also raising the profile of the department as instrumental to the institution as a whole. Working across departments would build on the knowledge and practices of other vested parties, strengthen collegial ties, and enhance the working and learning experiences of those involved. Lacking an improved system of assessing and placing LM students, the concern is that they will become disillusioned because they are not progressing apace. Ultimately, there is a risk that they may drop out or stop out. Not only is that problematic for students, but it does not reflect well on

teacher efficacy or institutional retention/completion rates. On the whole, the in-house development of evaluative tools to ensure appropriate assessment and placement of LM students reflects positively on the institution as a whole.

5.4.2.3 Mentoring

Participants revealed that knowledge gained in formal settings contributes little to their investment. As in-service teachers, it is logical that information learned in pre-service education carries less weight than more recent knowledge accrued in-field. However, the narratives also show minimal pedagogical gains from formal growth opportunities such as professional conferences, and this is worrisome. The lack of impactful or sustained professional development for practicing teachers suggests that professional development as it currently exists may not be working as planned. Participation at professional conferences, for example, often involves travel, which requires time and money. Presenting at such conferences necessitates time that may not be readily available or financially rewarding to all instructors, in particular those who work in an adjunct capacity. One way to attend to this concern would be the implementation of multi-level, in-house mentoring. Teachers and staff across the institution could thus spur or sustain their investment in LM students.

One level of mentoring that could take place follows the traditional model of novice-expert. Mentoring of this kind would respond most immediately to the issue of formal knowledge vs. in-field knowledge because it brings together those who are new to the profession and the institution with those who have a longer history of teaching. Novice teachers bring to the table awareness of more recent theoretical applications and pedagogical practices that could benefit expert teachers, especially those who may or may not be trained in the instruction of LM students. By the same token, expert teachers have experiential knowledge that they can share

with novice teachers that would help prepare them for the realities of a composition classroom with LM students. Finally, novice-expert mentoring might also encourage seasoned teachers to cultivate a more reflective practice that could reinforce their investment in LM students.

(Reflective practice will be discussed in more depth in the next section).

Another level of support could be peer-to-peer. Like novice-expert mentoring, this type of mentoring would be intradepartmental, with composition instructors working in concert with other composition instructors. Composition is a gatekeeping course that all degree-seeking students at the institution must take. As a result, there are several sections of the same course, both online and face-to-face, taught by a number of instructors, both adjunct and full-time. The wealth of knowledge that could be shared between all of those who teach composition would be valuable because it would build on the existing expertise and diverse experiences of those who are in regular contact with LM students. Moreover, such an initiative would promote cohesion between faculty members of the same department and bolster the value of composition courses as an integral part of LM students' community college education.

An additional level of mentoring is interdepartmental. Most participants indicated the hope that what LM students learn in their composition classes serves a broader purpose—to help them achieve further personal, academic, and professional success. As a course required of all degree-seeking students, it makes sense to explore how the knowledge and skills acquired in composition transfer, at a minimum, to other courses that LM students take at the institution. This includes interfacing with other academic departments as well as with pre-academic programs, such as English for Academic Purposes. The responsibility for educating LM students does not fall fully on the shoulders of composition instructors, but composition courses are a necessary prerequisite to LM students' full entry into other parts of the academic enterprise. As a

result, interdepartmental mentoring would encourage cohesion between faculty members of different departments while also promoting shared accountability in the effective education of LM students.

Finally, another kind of mentoring can also occur between composition instructors and institutional support networks. This includes academic entities such as writing centers, libraries, testing centers, and advising as well as non-academic services such as international student support, technical support, and counseling. This kind of cross-institution mentoring would help to alleviate concerns raised by participants about their abilities to satisfactorily aid LM students beyond classroom instruction. Composition teachers can use their knowledge and prior experiences to help raise awareness of cultural and linguistic aspects that LM students face and to educate those who are involved in supporting LM students outside of the composition classroom. In the same vein as interdepartmental mentoring described above, this type of mentoring would take some of the responsibility for educating LM students off of composition instructors' shoulders while reinforcing the institution's broader commitment to LM students' success.

All of the suggestions presented here are necessarily dependent on buy-in from the people and groups involved, and pay-off for the time and effort expended by those who participate. As shown by the data, composition instructors assume a critical role in LM students' education, but they should feel free to fulfill their responsibilities in a mutually supportive environment. If broader involvement is to become a priority, then the individuals that make up the institution at large need to understand the value of sharing in the responsibility of educating LM students. While participating in this kind of institution-wide investment undoubtedly adds to individuals' existing professional responsibilities, it also strengthens the organization as a whole

by appealing to the institutional mission of providing education for everyone in the surrounding community, regardless of language ability. Therefore, it is in the best interest of the institution to enact policies that support teachers and train staff whose actions affect LM students. Meanwhile, any policies that require individuals to dedicate more time and effort must provide appropriate compensation. This is particularly true for an organization that employs a significant number of part-time employees. In an ideal world, any or all of the proposals presented in this section would be fully funded, but the realities of institutional financial pressures render the likelihood of such an undertaking slim. Nevertheless, it is possible that smaller projects could be subsidized as an initial step toward more involved undertakings. For example, departmental grants could allow for instructors to commit to inter- or intra-departmental mentoring initiatives while minimizing the need for teachers, many of whom are adjunct, to go looking for outside funding. This would demonstrate an initial step toward attending to instructors' concerns about their ability to fully serve LM students and pave the way for more involved, institution-wide undertakings.

For the institution to appreciate the merit of advancing policies that support the education of LM students, it is necessary to frame the issue as integral to the community college mission and fundamental to the greater good of the institution. With the growing number of LM students in community college, it is imperative to have effective teachers of LM students. Accordingly, all levels of the higher education endeavor, from the institution to the state and nation, need to value and make this type of professional development worthwhile. LM students who take composition pay per credit hour like other degree-seeking students, and the institution has a responsibility to see that these students are set up for success from the outset. In essence, the suggestions described here are in-house professional development initiatives. It is good policy to

promote the engagement and professional development of those who instruct and support LM students. It is necessary to acknowledge, however, that institutional policy changes, however, may not lead to de facto investment in LM students. It may be a favorable by-product, but the data from this study indicate that a less directed and more organic method of professional development is more likely what engenders identity as an invested teacher.

5.4.3 Professional Development Implications

Participants' narratives disclose that investment evolves over time, and that it is linked frequently to unanticipated interactions and events. As a result, teachers must allow time to develop as professionals and take advantage of opportunities to cultivate investment as they arise. To that end, both pre-service and practicing composition teachers need to be attuned and receptive to experiences that have the potential to affect their professional growth (Pennington & Richards, 2016). This is easier said than done. Investment should not be forced, but it can be encouraged. For example, it is possible to educate teachers, in particular those who have yet to begin their careers, about the importance of investment in LM students and to heighten their awareness that change may be stimulated by unplanned occurrences. For practicing teachers, especially those who have considerable experience, it may be more of a challenge to promote such development unless there is some visible, tangible incentive or return.

Given that investment appears to develop gradually, teacher education programs are a logical place to start encouraging habits of teacher inquiry⁴, and beginning as early as possible would seem to hold the greatest advantage. For pre-service teachers, a prime way of establishing the importance of openness to growth and the value of sustained reflection is to make it part of the curriculum. When student teachers are still enrolled in formal education programs, activities

⁴ Working within the field of language teaching, Bailey (2018) defines teacher inquiry as “any systematic attempt by teachers to investigate or reflect upon their work” (p. 4377). Such inquiry may be long or short-term, formal or informal.

and projects that promote introspection can be assigned and assessed. Although this kind of mandatory inquiry is somewhat unnatural, it does provide teachers a safe environment to go through the act of examining their praxis and to discover the worth of critical contemplation. The hope is that if pre-service teachers get in the habit of reflecting on what they are doing and why they are doing it, this type of pedagogical engagement will become engrained and continue throughout their instructional careers.

Once teachers matriculate from formal teacher education programs and become practicing professionals in the community college setting, inducing them to willingly probe their established pedagogical practices becomes more difficult. For instance, it is not easy to devote time to teacher inquiry. In addition, those who have been teaching for a significant amount of time may feel threatened by having their expertise called into question. Even novice teachers may feel confident that they know what to do and no longer need to scrutinize their classroom custom. For that reason, any form of occupational self-reflection needs to be presented as an opportunity for positive, productive change and not necessarily as a critique. By the same token, any requirement that teachers engage in this type of professional development should be met with equivalent recompense to time and effort expended. Successfully framed as rewarding and worthwhile, it is possible that encouraging teachers to critically consider their classroom-based interactions with LM students could be a catalyst for increased teacher investment.

The question remains, though, whether it is possible for meaningful professional growth to be facilitated. After all, any prescribed type of teacher inquiry is a way of formalizing and imposing development in investment. The data from this study indicate that investment is voluntary and unforced, so perhaps training in and promotion of teacher inquiry runs counter to the notion that investment arises naturally through practice and experience. Nevertheless, there is

no reason to believe that investment would not be a viable by-product of directed teacher inquiry even that inquiry if it is not codified. “[C]ontemplation can be a precursor to more systematic and evidence-based reflective practice because it can help teachers become more aware of themselves as human beings first” (Farrell, 2015, p. 7). Participation in such awareness-raising activities could galvanize individuals to assume more sustained reflective habits. What is most promising about promoting teacher inquiry is the potential for increasing teachers’ receptiveness to occasions that permit them to analyze their practice, allowing them to see the benefits.

To summarize, this study demonstrates that identity as an invested community college composition teacher of LM students is dynamic and individual; the process to foster such an identity is incremental and often very personal. The implications presented above are practicable, but because of the nature of investment as ongoing and private, it is unlikely that increased investment will lead to any sudden groundswell of pedagogical change. Nevertheless, with a workforce trained in and attentive to the importance of investment in LM students, the reward for the institution could be considerable. For LM students, the observable commitment of individuals from across the institution to their academic success would be a significant motivator. For composition teachers as well as teachers from across the community college, encouragement to reflect on praxis could lead to more engaged and critical instruction, and possibly to more extra-institutional professional involvement and activity. For departments, supported collaboration on local projects such as developing assessment measures, implementing pre-semester orientation, and undertaking forms of teacher inquiry could lead to better instructional outcomes. For community colleges as a whole, promoting investment in LM students in any of the ways detailed above would be beneficial because the institution could have a greater impact on a greater number of students.

5.5 Study Limitations

As with any complex undertaking, it is impossible to anticipate all aspects of a study that may be potentially relevant or revealing. Although steps were taken before the research was conducted to minimize as many limitations as possible, there are three specific areas that could have been addressed more rigorously, which might have altered the outcomes of this study.

5.5.1 Focal Categories

As noted in Chapter 2, the distinction between attitudes and beliefs is blurry throughout the existing literature. In an attempt to more clearly delineate between these two focal categories in the current study, attitudes were defined more narrowly than beliefs. Attitudes are teachers' feelings toward particular aspects of the academic enterprise whereas beliefs are teachers' value-based thoughts and future-oriented goals; the idea was that the former pertained primarily to the realm of academia while the latter related more generally to notions of worth and the future. In the end, however, it seems that these two focal categories were not defined distinctly enough to exhibit any meaningful difference. In almost all cases, attitudes and beliefs appear concurrently in the narratives. An alternative explanation may be that attitudes and beliefs reflect differing aspects of a larger construct, and therefore cannot be separated in any significant way. Finally, as psychological concepts that may manifest themselves differently across individuals, any attempt on my part to apply the focal categories entails some degree of subjective interpretation and is therefore inherently subject to bias.

5.5.2 Participants

The number of participants in this study was limited. Although many people were invited to take part, only a few actually chose to participate. Initially, attempts were made to limit the study participants to include only adjunct instructors; however, the lack of involvement by

adjuncts alone rendered it necessary to seek the participation of full-time instructors as well. Even with a second, less restrictive round of participant-gathering, only five people ultimately volunteered to take part in the study. Moreover, the demographic backgrounds and professional experiences of those who elected to participate may not necessarily be indicative of the variety of community college composition instructors at this institution. These factors may restrict to some degree the generalizability of the study; however, the small number of participants allowed for a depth of analysis that may not have been possible had there been more participants.

5.5.3 Institution

In a similar way that the participants may not accurately reflect the breadth of composition instructors at the institution or overall, the institution itself is not necessarily representative of community colleges in general. The institution where this study took place is located in the Midwest and is classified as a very large, exclusively two-year public institution with majority part-time enrollment (Carnegie Classification, 2017). A search for institutions with the same characteristics yields only two comparable institutions in the region.

In hindsight, it could have been useful to consider these three areas differently. A reconception of focal categories might have revealed more nuance in the analysis of narratives. A longer or broader search for participants might have yielded a more diverse sample. The inclusion of an additional institution, whether similar or not, might have raised additional issues to consider. Any of these changes could have led to a more robust study with different results. While these potential limitations must be acknowledged, they also suggest avenues for further exploration.

5.6 Future Directions

The findings, implications, and limitations presented in this study lend themselves to numerous opportunities for future research. The next question, then, that needs to be addressed is how to build on this information in a constructive way to be beneficial and practical for community college composition teachers and the LM students they instruct. Three areas in particular seem potentially instructive.

5.6.1 Participants

It would be interesting to conduct this study again with a broader range of participants, from a variety of institutions, locations, and origins. Despite being of different genders, the participants in this study were all American, Caucasian, monolingual American English speakers who had been teaching at the same institution for several years. However, the narratives of community college composition teachers who more closely share racial, ethnic, and/or cultural backgrounds with LM students could be especially revealing. Above all, it would be worth exploring teacher identity and investment of community college writing teachers who are themselves speakers of English as an additional language.

5.6.2 Feedback

In addition to interview-initiated narratives, analysis of teachers' written feedback on student work may provide insight into how teachers' investment in LM students manifests itself in written discourse. Video and audio recordings of teachers' face-to-face interactions with LM students in conference may also enable further exploration of community college composition teachers' investment. It may be the case that there is a mismatch between the way teachers think of themselves, the way they talk about their identity and investment, and the way that is

portrayed in individual interactions with LM students. It is therefore apparent that varied data sources would hold promise for expanding the scope of this initial research.

5.6.3 What Is Absent

Finally, another direction future research direction could be to analyze the narratives for what is missing, whether it be completely absent or implicitly stated. For example, Brad's narratives are notable because there is no evidence of the focal category of beliefs. This appears anomalous based on the fact that this focal category is found in all other participants' narratives; however, there may be something telling about the reasons for this absence. Further, Brad alludes to the restrictive nature of his position as an adjunct instructor. Although he does not directly call for changes to his professional responsibilities, he does offer hypothetical solutions to the issue, including the possibility of broadening the course objectives and acknowledging a more inclusive definition of the adjunct role. To that end, it may be fruitful to delve into what is not manifest in participants' narratives.

In addition to the areas mentioned here, there are, of course, many other ways to continue to study this topic in future iterations. What is clear is that investigations into teacher identity and investment, because they involve individuals with distinct characteristics and experiences, are inherently complex undertakings and need to take into account a wide variety of factors if they are to be useful. Exploration of any of the points enumerated above may represent a sensible point of departure.

5.7 Conclusion

This study began with an interest in discovering how community college composition teachers negotiate their professional identities in relation to LM students. By collecting and analyzing the narratives of a small sample of self-selecting teachers, it was possible to glean

some insights into how and why these teachers invest in LM students. One of the most significant results of this research is the realization that investment is conceived of differently according to individuals, and that it develops gradually and organically over the course of one's career. In spite of the study's limitations, the findings contribute to a larger understanding of teacher identity as it pertains to the community college and LM students. Although this study has made certain aspects of teacher identity clearer, it has also opened up future avenues of research, the outcomes of which may have bearing not only on teachers and LM students in the classroom but also on the interface between these individuals and the institutions of which they are an integral part. Given the significant numbers of current and future LM students in community colleges across the nation, it is both opportune and imperative to continue pursuing research in these areas.

References

- Ahearn, L.M. (2001). Language and agency. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 30, 109-137.
- Akkerman, S.F., & Meijer, P.C. (2011). A dialogical approach to conceptualizing teacher identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(2), 308-319. doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2010.08.013
- Almon, C. (2010). English language learner engagement and retention in a community college setting. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertation and Thesis database. (Publication No. AAT 3408684)
- Almon, C. (2012). Retention of English learner students at a community college. In Y. Kanno & L. Harklau (Eds.), *Linguistic Minority Students Go to College: Preparation, Access, and Persistence* (pp. 184-200). New York: Routledge.
- Arvaja, M. (2016). Building teacher identity through the process of positioning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 59, 392-402.
- Atkinson, P.A., & Coffey, A. (2002). Revisiting the relationship between participant observation and interviewing. In J.F. Gubrium & J.A. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research: Context and method* (pp. 801-814). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bailey, K.M. (2018). Teacher inquiry. In J.I. Lontas (Ed.), *TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching* (pp. 4377-4382).
- Bailey, T.R., Jaggars, S.S., & Jenkins, D. (2015). *Redesigning America's community colleges: A clearer path to student success*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Bamberg, M. (2007). Stories: Big or small—Why do we care? In M. Bamberg (Ed.), *Narrative—State of the art* (pp. 165-174). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Barkhuizen, G. (2010). An extended positioning analysis of a pre-service teacher's *better life*

- small story. *Applied Linguistics*, 31(2), 282-300.
- Barkhuizen, G. (2011). Narrative knowledging in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 45(3), 391-414.
- Barnett, E.A. (2011). Validation experiences and persistence among community college students. *The Review of Higher Education*, 34(2), 193-230.
- Barr, S., & Clark, M.C. (2012). In pursuit of excellence in teaching: An ESL educator's narrative. *Journal of Educational Change*, 13(1), 41-66. doi: 10.1007/s10833-011-9168-8
- Beijaard, D., Meijer, P.C., & Verloop, N. (2004). Reconsidering research on teachers' professional identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20(2), 107-128. doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2003.07.001
- Beijaard, D., Verloop, N., & Vermunt, J.D. (2000). Teachers' perceptions of professional identity: An exploratory study from a personal knowledge perspective. *Teaching and teacher education*, 16, 749-764.
- Bell, J.S. (2002). Narrative inquiry: More than just telling stories. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(2), 207-213.
- Benesch, S. (1993). ESL, ideology, and the politics of pragmatism. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(4), 705-717.
- Benesch, S. (2001). *Critical English for academic purposes: Theory, politics, and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Benesch, S. (2008). "Generation 1.5" and its discourses of partiality: A critical analysis. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 7, 294-311.
- Benesch, S. (2009). Interrogating in-between-ness: A postmodern perspective on immigrant

- students. In M. Roberge, M. Siegal, and L. Harklau (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 in college composition: Teaching academic writing to US-educated learners of ESL* (pp. 65-72). New York: Routledge.
- Bers, T.H. (2007). Advancing research on the community college. *Community College Review*, 34(3), 170-183.
- Bjuland, R., Cestari, M.L., & Borgersen, H.E. (2012). Professional mathematics teacher identity: Analysis of reflective narratives from discourses and activities. *Journal of Math Teacher Education*, 15, 405-424.
- Block, D. (2007). The rise of identity in SLA research, post Firth and Wagner. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(1), 863-876.
- Blumenthal, A.J. (2002). English as a second language at the community college: An exploration of context and concerns. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 117, 45-53.
- Borg, M. (2001). Teachers' beliefs. *ELT Journal*, 55(2), 186-188.
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, 36, 81-109.
- Brown, R., & Heck, D. (2017). The construction of teacher identity in an alternative education context. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 76, 50-57.
- Bryce, N., Wilmes, S.E.D., & Bellino, M. (2016). Inquiry identity and science teacher professional development. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, 11(2), 235-251.
- Bunch, G.C. (2009). Immigrant students, English language proficiency and transitions from high school to community college. In T.G. Wiley, J.S. Lee, & R.W. Rumberger (Eds.), *The education of language minority immigrants in the United States* (pp. 263-294). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

- Bunch, G.C. (2013). Pedagogical language knowledge: Preparing mainstream teachers for English learners in the new standards era. *Review of Research in Education*, 37, 298-341.
- Bunch, G.C., & Endris, A.K. (2012). Navigating “open access” community colleges. In Y. Kanno & L. Harklau (Eds.), *Linguistic Minority Students Go To College: Preparation, Access, and Persistence* (pp. 165-183). New York: Routledge.
- The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. (2017). Classification description. Retrieved from <http://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/lookup/lookup.php>
- Case, R.E., Williams, G.M., & Xu, W. (2013). Instructors’ feedback among generation 1.5 students, international students, and basic writers. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 24(1), 85-103.
- CCSSE. (2012). Community college survey of student engagement. Retrieved from http://www.ccsse.org/survey/bench_sfi.cfm
- Chang, J.C. (2005). Faculty-student interaction at the community college: A focus on students of color. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(7), 769-802.
- Cheung, Y.L., Ben Said, S., & Park, K. (2015). *Advances and current trends in language teacher identity research*. London: Routledge.
- Chiang, Y-S. D., & Schmida, M. (1999). Language identity and language ownership: Linguistic conflicts of first-year university writing students. In L. Harklau, K.M. Losey, & M. Siegal (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 Meets College Composition: Issues in the Teaching of Writing to U.S.-Educated Learners of ESL* (pp. 81-96). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Chisman, F. P. (2008). *Findings in ESL: A quick reference to findings of CAAL research on ESL programs at community colleges*. New York: Council for Advancement of Adult Literacy.

- Christie, F. (2002). *Classroom discourse analysis: A functional perspective*. New York: Continuum.
- Clandinin, D.J., & Connelly, F.M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Clarke, M. (2009). The ethico-politics of teacher identity. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 41(2), 185-200. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-5812.2008.00420.x
- Coldron, J., & Smith, R. (1999). Active location in teachers' construction of their professional identities. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 31(6), 711-726.
- Connelly, F.M., & Clandinin, D.J. (1995). *Teachers' professional knowledge landscapes*. New York: Teachers' College Press.
- Connelly, F.M., Clandinin, D.J., & He, M.F. (1997). Teachers' personal practical knowledge on the professional knowledge landscape. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13(7), 665-674.
- Costino, K. & Hyon, S. (2007). "A class for students like me": Reconsidering relationships among identity labels, residency status, and students' preferences for mainstream or multilingual composition. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(2), 63-81.
- Crisp, G., & Mina, L. (2012). The community college: Retention trends and issues. In A. Seidman (Ed.), *College Student Retention* (pp. 147-165). Plymouth, UK: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Cross, R. (2011). Monolingual curriculum frameworks, multilingual literacy development: ESL teachers' beliefs. *Australian Journal of Language & Literacy*, 34(2), 166-180.
- Curry, M.J. (2003). Skills, access, and 'basic writing': A community college case study from the United States. *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 35(1), 5-18.
- Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (2015). Identity and a model of investment in applied linguistics.

- Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 36–56.
- Davis, K. (2009). Agentive youth research: Towards individual, collective, and policy transformations. In T.G. Wiley, J.S. Lee, and R. Rumberger (Eds.), *The Education of Language Minority Immigrants in the USA*. London: Multilingual Matters.
- De Jong, E.J., & Harper, C.A. (2005). Preparing mainstream teachers for English-language learners: Is being a good teacher good enough? *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 32(2), 101-124.
- De Jong, E.J., Harper, C.A., & Coady, M.R. (2013). Enhanced knowledge and skills for elementary mainstream teachers of English language learners. *Theory Into Practice*, 52, 89–97.
- Donato, R., Tucker, G.R., & Hendry, H. (2015). Developing professional identities in applied linguistics: From doctoral study to professional practice. In Y.L. Cheung, S. Ben Said, & K. Park. (Eds.), *Advances and current trends in language teacher identity research*. London: Routledge.
- Dougherty, K.J., & Townsend, B.K. (2006). Community college missions: A theoretical and historical perspective. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 136, 5-13.
- Dougherty, K.J., Lahr, H., & Morest, V.S. (2017). *Reforming the American Community College: Promising Changes and Their Challenges*. New York: Community College Research Center, Teachers College, Columbia University. CCRC Working Paper No. 98.
- Ewers, T.B. (2007). *The power of faculty, staff, and peer interactions: Impact on community college student retention*. *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, 89. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/304753178?accountid=14556>. (304753178).
- Farrell, T.S.C. & Lim, P.C.P. (2005). Conceptions of grammar teaching: A case study of

- teachers' beliefs and classroom practices. *TESL-EJ*, 9(2), 1-13.
- Farrell, T.S.C. (2011). Exploring the professional role identities of experienced ESL teachers through reflective practice. *System*, 39(1), 54-62. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2011.01.012
- Farrell, T.S.C. (2015). *Promoting teacher reflection in second-language education: A framework for TESOL professionals*. New York: Routledge.
- Fenstermacher, G.D. (1994). The knower and the known: The nature of knowledge in research on teaching. *Review of Research in Education*, 20, 3-56.
- Ferris, D.R. (1995). Student reactions to teacher response in multiple-draft composition classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 33-53.
- Ferris, D.R. (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 35-339.
- Ferris, D.R. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in Second Language Writing: Contexts and Issues* (pp. 81-104). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferris, D.R., Brown, J., Liu, H.S., & Stine, M.E.A. (2011). Responding to L2 students in college writing classes: Teacher perspectives. *TESOL Quarterly*, 45(2), 207-234.
- Freeman, M. (2007). Life "on holiday"? In defense of big stories. In M. Bamberg (Ed.), *Narrative—State of the Art* (pp. 155-164).
- Galda, D. (2009). "My words is big problem": The life and learning experiences of three elderly eastern European refugees studying ESL at a community college. In K.M. Bailey & M.G. Santos (Eds.), *Research on ESL in U.S. Community Colleges* (pp. 122-141).
- Galguera, T. (2011). Participant structures as professional learning tasks and the development of

- pedagogical language knowledge among preservice teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 38(1), 85-106.
- García, E., Arias, M.B., Murri, N.J.H., & Serna, C. (2010). Developing responsive teachers: A challenge for a demographic reality. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1-2), 132–142.
- Gee, J.P. (2014a). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (4th ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Gee, J.P. (2014b). *How to do discourse analysis: A toolkit* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Georgakopoulou, A. (2007a). *Small stories, interaction, and identities*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Georgakopoulou, A. (2007b.). Thinking big with small stories in narrative and identity analysis. In M. Bamberg (Ed.), *Narrative—State of the Art* (pp. 145-154).
- Goldrick-Rab, S. (2010). Challenges and opportunities for improving community college student success. *Review of Educational Research*, 80(3), 437-469.
- Golombek, P.R., & Johnson, K.E. (2004). Narrative inquiry as a mediational space: Examining emotional and cognitive dissonance in second-language teachers’ development. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 10(3), 307-327.
- Gubrium, J.F., & Holstein, J.A. (1997). *The new language of qualitative method*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Hagedorn, L.S. (2010). The pursuit of student success: The directions and challenges facing community colleges. In J.C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research* (vol. 25, pp. 181-218). Houten, Netherlands: Springer.
- Harklau, L. (2000). From the “good kids” to the “worst”: Representations of English language learners across educational settings. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34, 35-67.

- Harré, R., & van Langenhove, L. (1991). Varieties of positioning. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior*, 21, 393-407.
- Hedgcock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1994). Feedback on feedback: Assessing learner receptivity in second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3, 141-163.
- Hedgcock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1996). Some input on input: Two analyses of student response to expert feedback on L2 writing. *Modern Language Journal*, 80, 287-308.
- Henderson, P. A. (2009). Is everybody getting it: Sustained support for English as a second language students. *About Campus*, 14(4), 8-15.
- Huang, I. (2014). Contextualizing teacher identity of non-native-English speakers in U.S. secondary ESL classrooms: A Bakhtinian perspective. *Linguistics and Education*, 25, 119-128.
- Hyland, K. (1998). The impact of teacher-written feedback on individual writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7, 255-286.
- Hyland, K. (2007). Genre pedagogy: language, literacy and L2 writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(3), 148-164.
- Hyland, F., & Hyland, K. (2001). Sugaring the pill: Praise and criticism in written feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10, 185-212.
- Jenkins, D., & Cho, S-W. (2011/2012). *Get With the Program: Accelerating Community College Students' Entry into and Completion of Programs of Study*. New York: Community College Research Center, Teachers College, Columbia University. CCRC Working Paper No. 32.
- Jenlink, P.M. (2014). *Teacher identity and the struggle for recognition: Meeting the challenges of a diverse society*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

- Johnson, K.E. (1994). The emerging beliefs and instructional practices of preservice English as a second language teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 10(4), 439-452.
- Johnson, G.C. (2006). The discursive construction of teacher identities in a research interview. In A. De Fina, D. Schiffrin, & M. Bamberg (Eds.), *Discourse and Identity* (pp. 213-232). Cambridge.
- Johnstone, B. (2008). *Discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Kagan, D.M. (1992). Implications of research on teacher belief. *Educational Psychologist*, 27(1), 65-90.
- Kanno, Y., & Cromley, J.G. (2012). English language learners' access to and attainment in postsecondary education. *TESOL Quarterly*. doi: 10.1002/tesq.49
- Kanno, Y., & Harklau, L. (2012). Linguistic minority students go to college: Introduction. In Y. Kanno & L. Harklau (Eds.), *Linguistic Minority Students Go to College: Preparation, Access, and Persistence* (pp. 1-16). New York: Routledge.
- Kanno, Y., & Stuart, C. (2011). Learning to Become a Second Language Teacher: Identities-in-Practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(2), 236-252. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01178.x
- Kinzie, J., Gonyea, R., Shoup, R., & Kuh, G.D. (2008). Promoting persistence and success of underrepresented students: Lessons for teaching and learning. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 115, 21-38.
- Labov, W. & Waletzky, J. (1967). Narrative analysis: Oral versions of personal experience. In J. Helm (Ed.), *Essays on the verbal and visual arts* (pp. 12-44). Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Lee, I. (2013). Becoming a writing teacher: Using "identity" as an analytic lens to understand

- EFL writing teachers' development. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22, 330-345.
- Leki, I. (1992). *Understanding ESL writers: A guide for teachers*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Leki, I. (2006). Negotiating socioacademic relations: English learners' reception by and reaction to college faculty. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 5(2), 136-152.
- Leki, I., Cumming, A., & Silva, T. (2008). *A synthesis of research on second language writing in English*. New York: Routledge.
- Levin, J.S., Cox, E.M., Cerven, C., & Haberler, Z. (2010). The recipe for promising practices in community colleges. *Community College Review*, 38(1), 31-58.
- Lewis, M. J. (2009). "To triumph in my life": ESL students define success. In K. Bailey & M. G. Santos (Eds.), *Research on ESL in U.S. community colleges* (pp. 158-169). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Loughran, J., Mitchell, I., & Mitchell, J. (2003). Attempting to document teachers' professional knowledge. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 16(6), 853-873.
- Lucas, T. (2011). Language, schooling, and the preparation of teachers for linguistic diversity. In T. Lucas (Ed.), *Teacher Preparation for Linguistically Diverse Classrooms: A Resource for Teacher Educators* (pp. 3-17). New York: Routledge.
- Lucas, T., & Grinberg, J. (2008). Responding to the linguistic reality of mainstream classrooms: Preparing all teachers to teach English language learners. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, & D. J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education: Enduring Questions in Changing Contexts* (3rd ed., pp. 606-636). New York: Routledge.
- Lucas, T., & Villegas, A.M. (2010). The missing piece in teacher education: The preparation of

- linguistically responsive teachers. *National Society for the Study of Education*, 109(2), 297-318.
- Lucas, T., & Villegas, A.M. (2013). Preparing linguistically responsive teachers: Laying the foundation in preservice teacher education. *Theory Into Practice*, 52, 98–109.
- Lucas, T., Villegas, A. M., & Freedson-Gonzalez, M. F. (2008). Linguistically responsive teacher education: Preparing teachers to teach English language learners. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59, 361–373.
- Lundquist, C., Spalding, R.J., & Landrum, R.E. (2002/2003). College students' thoughts about leaving the university: The impact of faculty attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of College Student Retention*, 42(2), 123-133.
- Marshall, S. (2010). Re-becoming ESL: Multilingual university students and a deficit identity. *Language and Education*, 24(1), pp. 41-56.
- Matsuda, P.K. (2013). Response: What is second language writing—And why does it matter? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22, 448-450.
- Matsuda, P.K., Cox, M., Jordan, J., & Ortmeier-Hooper, C. (2011). *Second-language writing in the composition classroom: A critical sourcebook*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Matsuda, P.K., Ortmeier-Hooper, C., & You, X. (Eds.). (2006). *The politics of second language writing*. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press.
- McKay, S.L., & Wong, S.C. (1996). Multiple discourses, multiple identities: Investment and agency in second-language learning among Chinese adolescent immigrant students. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(3), 577-608.
- Meijer, P.C., Verloop, N., & Beijaard, D. (2001). Similarities and differences in teachers'

- practical knowledge about teaching reading comprehension. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 94(3), 171-184.
- Miele, C. (2003). Bergen community college meets generation 1.5. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 27, 603-612.
- Miller, E.R. (2010). Agency in the making: Adult immigrants' accounts of language learning and work. *TESOL Quarterly*, 44(3), 465-487.
- Miller, E.R., Morgan, B., & Medina, A.L. (2017). Exploring language teacher identity work as ethical self-formation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 101, 91-105.
- Mockler, N. (2011). Beyond 'what works': Understanding teacher identity as a practical and political tool. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 17(5), 517-528.
- Morgan, B. (2009). Fostering transformative practitioners for critical EAP: Possibilities and challenges. *Journal of English for academic purposes*, 8, 86-99.
- Morita, N. (2004). Negotiating participation and identity in second language academic communities. *TESOL Quarterly* 38(4), 573-603.
- Nieto, S. (2002). *Language, culture, and teaching: Critical perspectives for a new century*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. New York: Longman.
- Norton, B. (2013). *Identity and language learning: Extending the conversation* (2nd ed.). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Norton, B. & Toohey, K. (2011). Identity, language learning, and social change. *Language Teaching*, 44(4), 412-446.

- Norton Peirce, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 9-31.
- Núñez, A-M., & Sparks, P.J. (2012). Who are linguistic minority students in higher education? An analysis of the beginning postsecondary students study 2004. In Y. Kanno & L. Harklau (Eds.), *Linguistic Minority Students Go To College* (pp. 110-129). New York: Routledge.
- Ortmeier-Hooper, C. (2008). English may be my second language, but I'm not "ESL." *College Composition and Communication*, 59(3), 389-419.
- Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' Beliefs and Educational Research: Cleaning up a Messy Construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), 307-332.
- Pavlenko, A. (2007). Autobiographic narratives as data in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, 28(2), 163-188.
- Pavlenko, A., & Norton, B. (2007). Imagined communities, identity, and English language teaching. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 669-680). New York: Springer.
- Pennington, M.C., & Richards, J.C. (2016). Teacher identity in language teaching: Integrating personal, contextual, and professional factors. *RELC Journal*, 47(1), 5-23.
- Pettit, S.K. (2011). Teachers' beliefs about English language learners in the mainstream classroom: A review of the literature. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 5(2), 123-147.
- Razfar, A., & Simon, J. (2011). Course-taking patterns of Latino ESL students: Mobility and mainstreaming in urban community colleges in the United States. *TESOL Quarterly*, 45(4), 595-627.

- Reeves, J. (2002). Secondary teachers' attitudes and perceptions of the inclusion of ESL students in mainstream classes. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 2002).
Dissertation Abstracts International, 63, 8.
- Reeves, J. R. (2006). Secondary teacher attitudes toward including English-language learners in mainstream classrooms. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 99(3), 131-143.
- Reeves, J. (2009). Teacher investment in learner identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(1), 34-41. doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2008.06.003
- Riazantseva, A. (2012). "I ain't changing anything": A case-study of successful generation 1.5 immigrant college students' writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 11, 184-193.
- Riessman, C.K. (2008). *Narrative methods in the social sciences*. Thousand Oaks/London: SAGE Publications.
- Rimm-Kaufman, S.E., Storm, M.D., Sawyer, B.E., Pianta, R.C., & LaParo, K.M. (2006). The teacher belief Q-sort: A measure of teachers' priorities in relation to disciplinary practices, teaching practices, and beliefs about children. *Journal of School Psychology*, 44(2), 141-165.
- Rodriguez, T. L., & Cho, H. (2011). Eliciting critical literacy narratives of bi/multilingual teacher candidates across U.S. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(2011), 496-594.
- Rodriguez, G.M., & Cruz, L. (2009). The transition to college of English learner and undocumented immigrant students: Resource and policy implications. *Teachers College Record*, 111(10), 2385-2418.
- Ruecker, T. (2015). *Transiciones: Pathways of Latinas and Latinos writing in high school and college*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

- Ruecker, T., & Ortmeier-Hooper, C. (2017). Paying attention to resident multilingual students. In C. Ortmeier-Hooper & T. Ruecker (Eds.), *Linguistically Diverse Immigrant and Resident Writers: Transitions from High School to College*, pp. 1-16.
- Rumbaut, R.G., & Ima, K. (1988). *The adaptation of Southeast Asian refugee youth: A comparative study*. (Final report to the Office of Resettlement). San Diego, CA: San Diego State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 299 372).
- Ruohotie-Lyhty, M. (2013). Struggling for a professional identity: Two newly qualified language teachers' identity narratives during the first years at work. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 30, 120-129.
- Saka, Y., Southerland, S.E., Kittleson, J., & Hutner, T. (2013). Understanding the induction of a science teacher: The interaction of identity and context. *Research in Science Education*, 43(3), 1221-1244.
- Santiago, J. (2008). New beginnings for Latinas on welfare: An alternative ESL and job training program. In A. Blumenthal (Ed.), *Perspectives on Community College ESL: Students, Mission, and Advocacy*, pp. 39-51. Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.
- Schreiner, L.A., Noel, P., Anderson, E.C., & Cantwell, L. (2011). The impact of faculty and staff on high-risk college student persistence. *Journal of College Student Development*, 52(3), 321-338.
- Silva, T. (2011). On the ethical treatment of ESL writers. In P.K. Matsuda, M. Cox, J. Jordan, & C. Ortmeier-Hooper (Eds.) *Second-language writing in the composition classroom: A critical sourcebook* (pp. 160-164. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Skillen, B. & Vorholt-Alcorn, J. (2009). Unlocking the door: ESL instructors' diaries examining

- retention of migrant Hispanic students. In K. Bailey & M. G. Santos (Eds.), *Research on ESL in U.S. community colleges* (pp. 109-120). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Smith, B. (2007). The state of the art in narrative inquiry: Some reflections. *Narrative Inquiry*, 17(2), 391-398.
- Smith, B. & Sparkes, A. (2006) Narrative inquiry in psychology: Exploring the tensions within. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 1–25.
- Smith, B., & Sparkes, A.C. (2008). Contrasting perspectives on narrating selves and identities: An invitation to dialogue. *Qualitative Research*, 8(1), 5-35.
- Song, B. (2006). Failure in a college ESL course: Perspectives of instructors and students. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 30, 417-431.
- Song, J. (2016). Emotions and language teacher identity: Conflicts, vulnerability, and transformation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(3), 631-654.
- Spurling, S., Seymour, S., & Chisman, F. (2008). Pathways and outcomes: Tracking ESL student performance. A longitudinal study of ESL service at City College of San Francisco. New York, NY: Council for Advancement of Adult Literacy. Retrieved from <http://www.caalusa.org/pathways-outcomes/pathways-outcomesfull.pdf>
- Stone, Y. (2008). Conflicting or complementary agendas: Community colleges and ESL students. In A. Blumenthal (Ed.), *Perspectives on Community College ESL: Students, Mission, and Advocacy*, pp. 163-175. Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.
- Talmy, S. (2011). The interview as collaborative achievement: Interaction, identity, and ideology in a speech event. *Applied Linguistics*, 32(1), 25-42.
- Teranishi, R.T., Suárez-Orozco, C., & Suárez-Orozco, M. (2011). Immigrants in community

- colleges. *The Future of Children*, 21(1), 153-169.
- Thesen, L. (1997). Voice, discourse, and transition: In search of new categories of EAP. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3), 487-511.
- Townsend, B.K., Donaldson, J., & Wilson, T. (2009). Marginal or monumental? Visibility of community colleges in selected higher-education journals. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 33, 708-720.
- Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16, 225-272.
- Tsui, A.B.M. (2007). Complexities of identity formation: A narrative inquiry of an EFL teacher. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(4), 657-680.
- Umbach, P.D., & Wawrzynski, M.R. (2005). Faculty do matter: The role of college faculty in student learning and engagement. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(2), 153-184.
- Varghese, M. (2004). Professional development for bilingual teachers in the United States: Articulating and contesting professional roles. In J. Brutt-Griffler & M. Varghese (Eds.), *Re-writing bilingualism and the bilingual educator's knowledge base* (pp. 130-145). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Varghese, M., Morgan, B., Johnston, B., & Johnson, K. A. (2005). Theorizing language teacher identity: Three perspectives and beyond. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 4, 21-44.
- Vásquez, C. (2011). TESOL, teacher identity, and the need for "small story" research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 45(3), 535-545. doi: 10.5054/tq.2011.256800
- Watson, C. (2006). Narratives of practice and the construction of identity in teaching. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 12(5), 509-526.

- Watson, C. (2007). Small stories, positioning analysis, and the doing of professional identities in learning to teach. *Narrative Inquiry*, 17(2), 371-389.
- Widdicombe, S. (1998). Identity as an analysts' and a participants' resource. In C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe (Eds.), *Identities in Talk* (pp. 191-217). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Xu, S. & Connelly, F.M. (2009). Narrative inquiry for teacher education and development: Focus on English as a foreign language in China. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25, 219-227.
- Yagi, S., & Venenciano, L. (2017). Math “rules” prompt reflection on teachers' identity. *Mathematics Teaching in the Middle School*, 22(9), 555-557.
- Yoon, B. (2008). Uninvited guests: The influence of teachers' roles and pedagogies on the positioning of English language learners in the regular classroom. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(2), 495-522.
- Youngs, C.S., & Youngs, G.A. (2001). Predictors of mainstream teachers' attitudes toward ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(1), 97-120.
- Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 79-102.
- Zamel, V. (1995). Strangers in academia: The experiences of faculty and ESL students across the curriculum. *College Composition and Communication*, 46(4), 506-521.
- Zembylas, M. (2018). Rethinking the demands for ‘preferred’ teacher professional identities: Ethical and political implications. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 76, 78-85.