Spring 5-2022

Fragmentation in the Dual Enrollment Experience: The Importance of Students' Self-Perceptions in Dual Enrollment First-Year Composition Students

Sarah Crystal Johnson
Old Dominion University, sjohn021@odu.edu

FRAGMENTATION IN THE DUAL ENROLLMENT EXPERIENCE: THE

IMPORTANCE OF STUDENTS' SELF-PERCEPTIONS IN DUAL ENROLLMENT

FIRST-YEAR COMPOSITION STUDENTS

by

Sarah Crystal Johnson
B.A. December 2010, Tennessee Temple University
M.A. May 2013, The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of
Old Dominion University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ENGLISH

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY
May 2022

Approved by:

Daniel Richards (Director)

Michelle Fowler-Amato (Member)

Louise Phelps (Member)

Jori Beck (Member)

ABSTRACT

FRAGMENTATION IN THE DUAL ENROLLMENT EXPERIENCE: THE IMPORTANCE
OF STUDENTS' SELF-PERCEPTIONS IN DUAL ENROLLMENT FIRST-YEAR
COMPOSITION STUDENTS

Sarah Crystal Johnson
Old Dominion University, 2022
Director: Dr. Daniel P. Richards

Dual enrollment has become an embedded aspect of our writing programs yet is still an under-researched area within rhetoric and composition. One reason for this research gap is that many DE students experience their FYC courses on secondary campuses, liminal spaces that are more difficult to access for research. DE students within these spaces experience daily tensions between the collegiate expecations of FYC curriculum and the secondary social contexts in which their DE FYC courses are taught. These unique contextual experiences impact their perceptions of themselves as writers. This research is an attempt to step into this DE research gap and to give voice to the lived experiences of these students learning in liminal spaces of the neoliberal DE context.

This qualitative study employs ethnographic methods to look at how DE FYC students perceive of themselves as writers and how the DE context may evoke conflicts within these perceptions. Data from student surveys, focus groups, interviews, artifact samplings, and observational notes highlighted the DE participants' usage of metaphor to relay their lived experiences and to discuss abstract concepts like habits of mind. Results also showed a dualism between how these DE students perceived of their writing and of themselves as writers, a schism of "skills" and "mindset." The DE participants also demonstrated an awareness of ambiguity in teachers' expectations, so they used their lived experience as a form of cultural agency in seeking

out help from other students, past and present. Findings also highlighted the emphasis on neoliberalism as the backdrop for the DE context, as courses are commonly marketed as an expedient means to get through college coursework. This neoliberal context elevated grades as a primary motivator for the DE participants within this study.

These findings ultimately point to fragmentation in the DE experience. To lessen some of this fragmentation, this study calls for greater K-16 collaboration in professional learning; a more explicit unpacking of habits of mind as they relate to teacher expectations; and more time and space for reflective practice in DE FYC classrooms, as well as reflexivity in DE FYC instructors.

For Matt and Elliott,
my reason for writing

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A task such as this dissertation is the product of sacrifice on the part of many, but above all, it is the result of support and sacrifice by my family. Matt, thank you for supporting me from the moment we began discussing graduate programs. You are the reason I finished this project. You are an example of what it means to be a gracious and kind teacher-scholar: seeking to better yourself in order to serve our communities, while modeling a life-long love of learning with an attitude of humility. Elliott, thank you for reminding me what really matters and for demonstrating an inspiring curiosity. May you always use your talents and mind to serve others.

To my dissertation committee, thank you for all the many hours you have spent reading my drafts, providing feedback, and dialoguing about my work. Dr. Richards, your mentorship and patience have made my research experience meaningful in ways beyond the data. Thank you for teaching me how to better think, write, and dialogue as a teacher-scholar. Dr. Phelps, thank you for spending the time to not only provide feedback but also to dialogue on multiple occasions. Your commitment to excellence is truly inspiring. To Dr. Fowler-Amato and Dr. Beck, thank you both for your willingness to join my committee and provide an educational perspective. I have so appreciated the kindness in criticism and excitement you have shown towards my work.

To my parents, thank you for the sacrifices you made to prioritize my education and for instilling a love of reading within me at such a young age. You have always supported my academic efforts, even when they led me out of state and out of country at times. To Chrissy, thank you for your encouragement and support. As your own academic journey continues, I hope to always encourage and support you in turn.

To my ODU Cohort and Comps colleagues, you have made this experience enjoyable in so many ways. From our SDI dinners to our Facebook groups, you all have shown me the importance of collaboration and peer support. I am better as both a teacher and a scholar because of my interactions with you.

To my friends, thank you for your graciousness as I have had limited time throughout this process to spend with you. You have listened to me talk about my reseach process and struggles and have encouraged me to continue my research when it was difficult to balance both my professional and graduate work.

I am grateful to the secondary institution that allowed me access to do this research and to the DE participants who spent time engaging with me through focus groups, interviews, and surveys. To all my DE students throughout the years, your lived experiences in liminal spaces have inspired this research. May you always demonstrate a determination to succeed, no matter the context in which you find yourself.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter   Page

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

EXIGENCY

"I found it *gross"* — this comment, made almost in passing by an observer from our

Dual Enrollment (DE) partner institution, prompted an exchange with one of my DE seniors

about her class presentation, the situation that evoked the comment. This presentation is a newer

assignment in my DE First-Year Composition (FYC) class: Writing Studio Collaborative

Presentation. This assignment, tailored to our DE context, is in response to a new requirement for

all FYC sections being taught at our collegiate partner institution. For our DE class, I poll

students at the beginning of the fall semester to see what writing skills they would like to explore

in class that semester, and these usually wind up being concepts which require more review than

introduction (ie. writing a good hook or answering the "so what" question in a conclusion). So, I

compile a list of presentation topics that represents their suggested items for student pairs to

review with the class in an interactive way.

This particular day, the day that the observer from our DE partner institution was coming

to our class, began with a Writing Studio presentation by two of my stronger, more engaged

students. Their topic was "Writing the Conclusion" and they were to present some examples,

strategies, and a practice opportunity for their classmates. They had three examples, all student

samples, which they asked students to analyze and then discuss the different writing moves

made. The *gross* problem, however, was the fact that each sample conclusion was coupled with

the grade it earned. If each grade had merely been relayed and not discussed, perhaps the

situation would not have become quite so *gross.* However, the student responsible for this

section of the presentation continued to frame the analysis, in a rather derogatory tone, through

the lens of the grades earned. In short, the presentation moved quickly away from learning how to write a good conclusion and became a presentation on how to earn a higher grade.

Later that day, the student came into the Writing Center, which I direct, and asked, "Did we make you look good today?" She was beaming, confident of my response. We had a brief chat about both the positives of the presentation and the framing of the analysis, which left her indignant that anyone would take issue with the approach to their presentation: "But it is all about grades for us." For her and her partner, they had in fact done what was asked of them: prepare a presentation appropriate to the audience with the goal of reviewing the assigned writing topic. They had employed Aristotle's very definition for rhetoric, a definition arguably framed not as "an art of persuading but a habit of mind which realizes a capacity to find what in each particular case has the potential to gain accedence" (Hauser 14). These DE students are acutely aware of the rise of the grade as commodity in both educational worlds in which they live: secondary and collegiate. So, grades have come to define much of their student identities, making grades the perfect means for persuasion.

It took both encounters, the *gross* comment from the observer and the conversation with the DE student who presented, for me to realize that both were responding to the larger reality in which we find ourselves today: the commodification of education. The Director of Composition wasn't describing her reaction to the presentation assignment; she was speaking to the student's framing of her lesson around grades. The student wasn't being combative; she was speaking as an agent within a system that has consistently told her that grades are what matter most. The commodification of education has led to a type of "more bang for your buck" marketing of DE to students and parents across our country. Why spend two years doing what you could do in one? From secondary academic advisors and administration to collegiate recruiters, this is the

common rationale that is peddled to our students during course sign-ups and advising meetings because education has come to exalt "the convenience of the credit hour as common currency," which allows students to move through a bartering system rapidly and supposedly seamlessly (Shoenberg).

DE FYC credits are an ever-growing proof of this neo-liberalist trend of commodification. Within a single decade (2001-2012), DE saw an increase of roughly 75% as states with official DE legislative policies increased from 33 to 47, and public high schools offering DE courses rose from 71% to 82% (An and Taylor 4). The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) reported that in the 2017-2018 academic year, 82% of public high schools offered DE courses, a conservative number since private high schools are not factored in (Taie and Lewis). Yet, DE has not been a popular research site within rhetoric and composition for several reasons: complications accompanying minor-related research; layered politics of K-12 / higher education partnerships; state-mandated K-12 curriculum; and a general skepticism towards DE within the field of rhetoric and composition.

This combination of an increase in DE and barriers for research have ultimately led to an under researched and represented area within rhetoric and composition, leaving the agency of these students in jeopardy. In response, scholars such as Christine Denecker have been calling for rhetoric and composition researchers to occupy this "fertile ground" for research and to prioritize DE students' identities as writers: DE "combines issues of transition, place, and instruction in forming students' identities as writers [, but] current research has yet to examine student writerly identity in the various places of PSEO [DE] college composition instruction" (*Toward Seamless Transition* 19, 23). She specifically calls for more research into DE classrooms at private institutions, as this is a gap within even statistical knowledge, as the

previous NCES statistic highlights. My study is in answer to Denecker's call in focusing on DE composition students' self-perceptions as writers in a private secondary setting. While this study's approach may appear to paradoxically fall within the very ideological framework of neoliberal expediency, as it focuses on the transition into collegiate coursework, the study's aim was one of beneficence, in that I sought to elevate students' voices as a means of agency against the backdrop of a well-oiled educational machine. A potential by-product of qualitatively studying DE student experience may be to subvert the neoliberal agenda, even only slightly, by prioritizing student identity over any form of current currency, such as ACT scores or GPAs.

As recently as 2020, teacher-scholars within rhetoric and composition have been recognizing DE as a gap. In January of 2020, a representative collective of teacher-scholars from the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Two-Year College English Association, Writing Program Administration, and the National Council for Teachers of English put forth an executive summary, "Joint Position Statement on Dual Enrollment in Composition" (Johnson et al.). While this statement does not argue for more research, it does offer some guidance in the crucial areas of student readiness, curricular support, and assessment. This statement did, however, prompt a September 2020 special issue of *Teaching English in the Two Year College,* in which the editors called specifically for more research into the following areas:

1) assembling a picture of the dual credit experiences of students, teachers, and program administrators

2) offering best practices models that readers can use to assess or adjust their own institution's approach to dual credit programs

3) complicating and enriching the current scholarly conversation about dual credit writing courses, programs, instructors, and students within the larger field of writing studies and two-year college English studies. (Larracey and Hassel 5)

While this study was launched before these 2020 publications, it does fit within some of the goals and general awareness of DE issues. Firstly, this study is a picture of the dual credit experiences of students in a composition course on a private secondary campus. Secondly, I aim through this study to enrich our DE conversations that may be gaining some momentum through capturing student voices from within the oft-neglected "FERPA gray area" (McWain 414). It does not directly fit within the second goal as Larracey and Hassel have written it above, as "best practices" is a problematic term for DE because of the variability of each DE context. This study does, however, discuss praxis implications that can help in the assessment and adjustment of dual credit programs (see pgs. 182-188).

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

As with any research project, my research questions derived from a personal inquiry, one that has been evolving from my first year teaching DE composition in 2013. DE students embody several dualisms, but one continues to surface in my classes year after year: these students were existing both at the end of one academic chapter and the beginning of another. My DE students are at the top of the social and academic secondary student hierarchy as honors seniors; yet, as college students, they are basically not even on the social hierarchy and are essentially starting over with their academic reputation. And they are being asked to shift abruptly, within a five-minute bell window, between these identity positionalities. This daily shift seems to be connected to the students' frustrations and anxieties, as well as their defining of themselves as burgeoning college writers and more broadly as students.

My queries eventually landed upon a schism between novice and expert identity constructs within these DE students. While my hypothesis was based upon nothing more than personal and professional experience before this study, the shift between secondary and collegiate positionalities on these ambiguous social and academic hierarchies seemed to be a struggle for more than hierarchical positionality. It was what was being asked of them in terms of their assumed identity constructs. While they were perceived by their secondary communities as experts, they were falling short in their DE class(es), at least in terms of their usual markers for success: easy As, little time commitment outside of class, and the luxury of zoning out in classes with few repercussions. As far as their K-12 lives were concerned, they had learned the *rules* and were quite adept at navigating the academic world in which they had become accustomed. At our relatively small school, the DE students were commonly the Student Body Representatives, the Honors Society officers, the leads in school plays, and the athletic captains. They were the ones offering help to underclassmen as disciplinary tutors and as guides through the social minefield of secondary life.

Then came DE Composition in their senior year, the year in which they should be able to sail through with ease because of the years they had spent mastering the mores of their secondary culture. DE seemed to consistently break them. But why? They were academically equipped. They had the ACT score, the GPA, and the foundational skill set necessary to write well. Yet, something was obviously emerging in this academic environment that challenged them beyond their academic abilities. Yes, the academic jump was steep, but they had the work ethic and skill set to theoretically be successful. But year after year, these students were breaking down. This breakdown looked different in each student. Many cried. Some slowly became quiet in class and seemed ashamed to submit work. Others were outraged, as if they had been lied to. A few had

fits akin to a temper tantrum. One even curled up into a fetal position on the floor behind my desk in tears. Another student declared that she would be forced to be a "hobo on the streets" because this class would keep her from her dream of going to Stanford[1].

In short, the students largely considered the "best and brightest," at least by academic culture's metrics, in our school were falling apart in their DE classes in their senior year. And it seemed connected to this "repetition and… daily reinforcement" they experienced with each shift, from perceived expertise to novice status (Burke 26). Much has been studied and written about secondary student identity in terms of a traditional K-12 sequence and setting. Yet, DE creates a gap in the research: "While concerns about high school students' intellectual, social, and emotional maturity widely circulate, we contend that students' hybrid identities are also a critical facet of dual enrollment programming that have yet to be fully reconnoitered" (Wecker and Wilde 17). As rhetoric and composition as a field begins to find terminology for this phenomenon in labels such as "hybrid identities," it is clear that much more research is needed to better understand the realities of DE students' lived experiences. DE has been ever growing, and for a while, we in rhetoric and composition fought against its growth (see Schwalm[2]). This fight occupied our attention and stole much of our energies, which now need to be turned towards research agendas that seek to first of all hear from these students in the liminal academic and social spaces between secondary and collegiate campuses and then to find meaningful ways to alleviate the burden that comes with maintaining a largely undefined "hybrid identity."

The goals of this study are to step into this DE composition research gap. To echo Hart's goal for her dissertation focused on Dual Credit students, "I hope to help reframe the conversation about dual credit programs to include more than a celebration of saving time and,

[1] She wound up at NYU and is now a successful journalist in NYC.
[2] David E. Schwalm's 1991 article "High School/College Dual Enrollment" in *WPA: Writing Program Administators.*

especially, money" (18). While no single study can fulfill this lofty goal, the aim of this study is to add a qualitative layer to the exigency of DE through the utilization of the following research questions:

1) How do dual enrollment composition students perceive themselves as writers?

2) What conflicts do they experience in their self-perceptions as writers in the DE context?

These research questions are an attempt to answer Denecker's call for more DE research in the private educational sector and to further Larracey and Hassel's goals of creating a fuller disciplinary picture of DE student experiences, in turn, enriching the conversation about DE students.

These goals led to a focus on the participants' voices as they described their perceptions of themselves as writers and their lived experiences, which ultimately prompted a rewriting of my initial research questions. I originally focused my research on habits of mind as a possible heuristic for DE student identity constructs. So, as chapter three (see pgs. 61 & 80-86) and my appendices demonstrate, many of my data collection tools utilize the language of habits of mind. However, once I was able to focus on the participants' voices throughout the study, it became clear that habits of mind as a framework was not a good fit. As the DE student participants gave voice to their lived experiences and their self-perceptions, I realized that I needed to remove any presupposed frameworks, such as habits of mind, and terms, such as writerly identity. So, my revised questions, as they appear above, represent a truer alignment with my original inquiries, as well as the participants' representations of their DE experience and perceptions of themselves as writers.

Because my current position as a high school English teacher and an adjunct DE FYC instructor grants me access and a level of expertise to this tenuous area of DE research, I've chosen to design a qualitative study with ethnographic methods to look at the kairotic situatedness of DE students who are enrolled in a FYC course through a local university. This study analyzed students' perceptions of their identities as writers, as well as any conflicts evoked by the DE context. The honors high school seniors under study took their FYC course on a K-12 campus, which presents a unique context for entrance into their collegiate communities of practices and ultimately a kairotic moment for identity research.

PROBLEMATIC TERMINOLOGY

It is necessary at this point to briefly discuss the problematic nature of the term *writerly identity,* which I originally intended to use as a key term within my research questions. A myriad of definitions exist, but I shall proffer just a couple definitions here that represent the problematic nature of the term *writerly identity*. Leslie Pratt emphasizes defining writerly moves over identity: "Writing is an act of identity…[that] involves a series of complex writerly moves as well as nuanced and evolving understandings of writing as a representation of the self within specific social contexts" (232-233). This is similar to Denecker's definition: "...thesis development and support, audience awareness, an understanding of writing as contributing to the 'conversation', [sic] and the utilization of the full writing process all factor into this researcher's working definition of 'college-level writing', [sic] and by extension, a student's 'writerly identity' on the college level" (*Toward Seamless Transition* 28).

What these two representative definitions capture is the fact that there is "...no universal definition [that] clearly delineates what it means to be a 'college level writer' or what even constitutes 'college-level writing' for that matter" (Denecker *Toward Seamless Transition* 23).

While Denecker defines *writerly identity* largely along the lines of the adopted traits of college writing (ie. goes through a writing process), her broader definition is as follows: "one element of a student's writerly identity on the college level will be to exhibit the ability to think independently as well as critically and experientially and then translate those thoughts into written form" (24). Because of the divergent definitions for *writerly identity*, I stripped the term from my research questions and created a goal for this study to draw attention to the problematic nature of this term *writerly identity,* specifically as it relates to the DE student's context.

OVERVIEW OF DISSERTATION

In this introductory chapter, I have provided the exigency for this research project, mainly as it evolved from my own encounters with DE students and their lived experiences and conflicted identity constructs, specifically as they relate to the clashing of secondary and collegiate expectations for writers. I provided my scope of inquiry through my research questions, which focus on DE students' self-perceptions of both their conflicts and identities as writers within the DE context. Finally, I challenged the clarity and therefore the usability of the term *writerly identity*, as it has "no universal definition" (Denecker *Toward Seamless Transition* 23).

In chapter two, I provide my review of the literature with a focus on the topics of DE and identity. I provide a snapshot of the historical influences that impact our current DE composition classrooms, as well as an overview of the terminology most readily used within these conversations. Then, I contextualize the issues associated with DE through tracing significant aspects of the college readiness debate. The identity discussion begins with an overview of scholarly voices from rhetoric and composition's interdisciplinary heritage and then moves into habits of mind as it relates to identity and ultimately the composition classroom. Lastly, I

connect the topics of DE and identity by looking at identity conversations that highlight hybrid environments, like those common to DE contexts.

In chapter three, I outline the ethnographic methods of this qualitative study. After a brief overview of the study as it was enacted in fall of 2020, I present the changes made after a condensed pilot study, performed at the beginning of the COVID lockdown in April and May of that same year. Then, I present the interpretive framework for the study, mainly rooted in a social constructivist approach that prioritizes the social context of the DE participants, as seen in my second research question. After an account for my selection of ethnographic methods, I unpack the study's design, from settings and participants to data collection timeline and methods. Lastly, I detail the data analysis process of coding and the correlating metadata activities, such as defining coding terms.

Chapter four is an extension of the results, connecting my methods and results. I provide a deeper ethnographic look at the institutional culture of Harville Academy[3], the location of the study, complete with location, history, and a snapshot of the daily life and its ideological and political influences. Then, I discuss the participants broadly, mainly the collective trends of competition as an academic motivation and the most common rationales given for choosing to take DE Composition in their senior year. I end the chapter with an overview of each participant, categorizing them as they represented themselves with the classroom community context: as Honors and Non-Honors students.

In chapter five, I present the results of the coding processes throughout my data analysis. Five major codes emerged and are discussed in the following order: grades, teacher expectations, metaphor, writing vs. writer, and experience. I present *Grades* as a contextual code pointing to neoliberalism as the backdrop for DE. *Teacher expectations* is discussed as an external

---

[3] pseudonym

motivating factor for DE students, as well as a source of conflict within their self-perceptions. I highlight *metaphor* as an embedded aspect of DE students' language and then discuss the difference in the participants' perceptions of themselves as *writers vs. writing*. Lastly, I present *experience* as a final code, as the participants' self-perceptions could not be separated from key experiences that emerged within the DE context.

      In chapter six, I discuss the major findings of the study. Grades, firstly, are a powerful motivator for DE students and serve an economic end. Secondly, DE students manage ambiguous teacher expectations through an underground network of sorts. Thirdly, metaphors possess possible heuristic value for understanding DE students' perceptions of their significant lived experiences. Fourthly, a sense of cultural agency is gained through the DE students' lived experiences. Finally, a commonly perceived DE dualism is that of writing vs. writer. These findings highlight the fragmented reality of the DE student experience, which has praxis implications for collaboration, habits of mind, and reflection as necessary aspects of the DE context. I lastly discuss the limitations of this study and areas for future research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

TIMELINESS OF TOPIC

As within any scholarly conversation, gaps exist in the rhetoric and composition research and discussions related to Dual Enrollment (DE) students. DE First-Year Composition (FYC) classrooms can be characterized as "liminal entities [that] are neither here nor there; they are betwixt and between" the two educational worlds of K-12 and higher education (Turner 95; McWain 408). This rhetorical situatedness has made these spaces of liminality difficult to access or conceptualize as research sites, resulting in the FYC students inhabiting these liminal spaces remaining largely unknown to rhetoric and composition's conversations beyond their Socio-Economic Status (SES) status (Gilbert). Their agency is often in limbo as neither the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP), the only professional organization for DE, nor the U.S. Department of Education is willing to clearly define where these students fall when it comes to FERPA protection: We can only proclaim that "[d]ual enrollment has emerged as a FERPA gray area" (Hansen "The Composition Marketplace" 29; McWain 414). Unfortunately, it seems that DE has become a "gray area" in many regards throughout scholarly conversations, making key aspects of this major topic an under researched and represented arena.

Yet, this "gray area" has much to offer conversations within rhetoric and composition. DE students are living within two educational, political, and cultural contexts as they are simultaneously asked to assume the writerly identities of college writers while continuing through the daily grind of a high school schedule. This "'unsituated-ness'" ultimately impacts "not only *what* students write but *how* they write as well as *how* they perceive of themselves as

writers" (Denecker *Toward Seamless Transition* 21, 20). This is why Christine Denecker refers to DE Composition courses as "fertile ground" for researchers as it "combines issues of transition, place, and instruction in forming students' identities as writers [, yet] current research has yet to examine student writerly identity in the various places of PSEO [DE] college composition instruction" (19, 23). She specifically calls for more research into DE classrooms at private institutions, a gap in which this study can contribute.

The *TETYC* special issue in September of 2020 speaks directly to this "gray area" gap in highlighting DE issues. Editors Larracey and Hassel pinpoint a growing "disciplinary anxiety" related to dual credit courses and a loss of control, whether it be real or perceived, when it comes to assessments and instruction in DE classrooms (6). The fact that many DE courses are not on the same physical campus as our writing programs fosters much of this anxiety. It is, after all, harder to control a curriculum that is not within one's physical reach. It is also harder to control faculty development and feedback when many DE instructors and students are not in the same location and are reporting to different administrations when it comes to policies, like grading and late work (Russo 100).

In spite of these barriers, it is past time that we as scholar-practitioners acknowledge this anxiety and claim and support more research agendas that attempt to quell it through demystifying the DE experience. One way we can actively attempt to alleviate this anxiety is "to approach dual credit and concurrent enrollment with more optimism for the possibilities they offer" (Larracey and Hassel 6). This "optimism" can be brought into focus through a disciplinary embrace of the three goals that Larracey and Hassel posit:

> 1) assembling a picture of the dual credit experiences of students, teachers, and program administrators;

2) offering best practices models that readers can use to assess or adjust their own institution's approach to dual credit programs;

3) complicating and enriching the current scholarly conversation about dual credit writing courses, programs, instructors, and students within the larger field of writing studies and two-year college English studies. (5)

While these goals are not all-encompassing, they are broad enough to inspire an array of diverse research agendas that seek to promote optimism when it comes to DE, which can in turn start calming our "disciplinary anxiety."

This research project does fit within at least two of these interrelated goals, making the study results both timely and important to this revived conversation regarding DE. First, I seek to elevate the experiences of DE students who are taking an FYC course on a private high school campus. Because the students are minors and the campus is private, this study affords a snapshot into a DE classroom that might typically be difficult to access for research purposes, making the experiences of these students and their voices valuable for teacher-scholars within rhetoric and composition. Second, by highlighting the experiences and voices of these DE students, this study aims to enrich the scholarly conversation regarding dual credit courses. While DE is often discussed as a necessary yet less-than-ideal aspect of our writing programs, the student voices offered within this study may help overcome the tendency to discuss DE as commodity.

While there are certainly implications for practice, this study does not fit well within the language of Larracy and Hassel's second goal: "offering best practices models that readers can use to assess or adjust their own institution's approach to dual credit programs" (5). The term "best practices," while widely employed, is not easily defined as it unfortunately has become a buzz word throughout K-16 educational arenas. While undoubtedly some "best practices" can be

universally applied to DE curricula, each DE context is unique, demanding a paralleled unique approach to practice that is collaboratively determined by the secondary and collegiate counterparts. So, while this study hopefully holds inspiration for DE professionals to find ways to both "assess and adjust" the practices impacting their DE students, I am not claiming that this study fits within the second goal offered by Larracey and Hassel.

DUAL ENROLLMENT

HISTORY

Predecessor to DE, Advanced Placement (AP) courses began in the 1950s as a reaction against progressive education's focus on the "average" student to the supposed detriment of the "gifted or talented" students. AP courses were the solution to allow "gifted" students to be challenged appropriately (Jones 43). In the 1960s, other college credit awarding options also emerged. The College-Level Examination Program (CLEP), for example, began in 1967, primarily as a means for military service members and adult students to gain credit for experiential knowledge while saving some time and money on a college degree (Pilgrim). Then, amidst the progressive shift in education in 1968, International Baccalaureate (IB) was launched with the goal of "develop[ing] inquiring, knowledgeable and caring young people who help to create a better and more peaceful world through intercultural understanding and respect" ("The History of the IB"). Within IB programs, high school students can earn college credits if they pass exams at the end of each term.

These non-traditional educational programs created a pathway for dual credit programs to emerge as a viable and appealing option in the 1970s. While a few concurrent enrollment programs existed as early as 1955, the nation's oft-hailed first concurrent enrollment program, Syracuse University's Project Advance (SUPA), began in 1972 as "an attempt to address

'senioritis'" (Grant; "About SUPA"). Other concurrent enrollment programs began to surface across our nation throughout the 1970s, most with similar proclaimed goals of combatting senioritis. Because not all of these programs granted high school credits, they were largely marketed to high school seniors who had accrued the necessary credits for graduation as a means of "reduc[ing] boredom in high school" (Wolf and Geiger 219).

The educational arena in the early 1980s was starkly defined by the April 1983 report put forth by the National Commission on Excellence in Education. In short, the Commission labeled the United States "A Nation at Risk," as our country was falling behind other countries in areas such as commerce and technology. The reason for this devolving global competitiveness was connected to education: "...the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a Nation and a people" ("A Nation at Risk"). The call was clear: a restoration of educational excellence. While many new K-16 partnerships evolved in response to the Commission's report, the coordinated efforts at The City University of New York (CUNY) to answer this call for excellence produced a noteworthy concurrent enrollment program in 1984 called College Now. This program, today serving 20,000 students annually, represents the shift in goals for concurrent enrollment programs in the 1980s: they were no longer about combatting senioritis but were focused on "develop[ing] academic momentum" through offering college credits, access, and awareness ("College Now"; "About Us" College Now).

Throughout the 1990s, the overall goals of concurrent enrollment programs did not change much, as this became "a time of formalization and modification" (Hart 47). This often meant seeking to replicate and expand successful programs. For example, the University of Washington started its Running Start program in 1993 and has since seen "double-digit

enrollment growth," prompting four other states to adopt the Running Start program from 1999 to 2012 (Long; "Running Start"). By 1999, the sole accrediting organization NACEP was established "to ensure that college courses offered by high school teachers are as rigorous as courses offered on the sponsoring college campus," securing DE's future with the promise of standardized rigor and accountability ("About Us" NACEP).

The 2000s continued with the expansion of concurrent enrollment, maintaining similar goals of college readiness but for a broader student audience. In 2002, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation launched the Early College High School Initiative (ECHSI) with the thought "that even reluctant or discouraged high school students, who may be unengaged in traditional school settings, can be motivated at a relatively early age to view themselves as successful participants in the college experience" (Berger et al. 333, 334). By 2009, this hypothesis burgeoned into 200 Early College Schools that aimed to move students "quickly through a high school curriculum with a focus on advancing students efficiently, leaving more time during the traditional high school years for students to make serious inroads into college completion" (Berger et al. 345). This model did prove successful in terms of student college readiness and matriculation.

Yet, even with all the concurrent enrollment growth in our nation throughout the decades, it was not until 1991 that the topic of DE began to appear within our published rhetoric and composition conversations. David E. Schwalm's 1991 *WPA* article warned against getting involved with DE in any way, arguing it should never be accepted for college credit. In fact, he claimed that it was "impossible to replicate [the contextual experience of the collegiate writing classroom] in a high school English class" (53). This publication has now passed its thirtieth anniversary, a reminder of just how slow change is within our stratified writing programs. Yet,

scholar-practitioners are actively engaging more and more for the sake of our DE students, our traditional students, and ultimately the longevity of rhetoric and composition as a field.

TERMINOLOGY

Before exploring the engagement around the topic of DE, let me first offer up some definitions from these conversations. *Concurrent Enrollment,* "a subcategory of dual enrollment," has been commonly used to describe high school "[s]tudents who took courses for postsecondary credit… at their own high school" (Denecker "Closing the Gap" 66; US Dept. of Education). Yet, while concurrent enrollment is by far the more popular model with 80% of dually enrolled students taking courses through concurrent enrollment, *dual enrollment* (DE) has become the more popular, largely synonymous term used within these conversations today (US Dept. of Education).

In November of 2019, the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC), the Two-Year College English Association (TYCA), the Council of Writing Program Administrators (CWPA), and the National Council for Teachers of English (NCTE) put forth a collaborative executive summary, "Joint Position Statement on Dual Enrollment in Composition." The publication's purpose was to "address both the challenges and inconsistencies" that had come to define much of the DE landscape due to the rapid proliferation of dually enrolled students. In doing so, the executive summary solidified universal usage of the term *dual enrollment*, simply defining it as "any program that offers college courses to students enrolled in high school" (Johnson et al. 11).

However, these simple definitions often mask the neoliberal exigencies commonly used to market DE to parents and students. A more robust definition put forth by the ACT includes some these exigencies for DE:

> Dual enrollment allows high school students to earn college credit by taking college courses at postsecondary institutions, their own schools, or online. In some states, credits earned through dual enrollment can be applied to meeting degree requirements once the student enters a postsecondary program, thus potentially reducing time to completion, tuition costs, and some of the early strain of adjusting to college expectations. (3)

This definition snapshots DE's modern-day function: to gain college credit while still in high school. While the benefits seem obvious, the consequences of DE decisions are often less apparent. The following college readiness debate brings some of these tensions into focus.

COLLEGE READINESS DEBATE

In 2015, ACT, a "mission-driven nonprofit organization" that has largely come to be synonymous with the college entrance exam, published a policy brief announcing that, according to the test scores from the previous year, "28% [of high school students] were ready [for college coursework] in all four testing areas...English, reading, mathematics, and science" (ACT 5-6). They also provide an infographic highlighting the fact that the "number of unique mentions of dual enrollment in state of the state addresses" rose from only 3 in 2013 to 17 in 2015 (2). Considering this testing result and the gubernatorial addresses, they are calling for more students to be enrolled in DE courses that are deemed "effective" according to their four criteria: access, course quality, finance, and credit transferability.

Within this policy brief, ACT draws attention to some of the very issues of concern for composition teacher-scholars when it comes to the growing trend of DE. The document seemingly conflates the key issues of *student eligibility* and *readiness* through their use of inconsistent language when referring to student numbers. In a mere twenty-page document,

which contains more infographics than writing, the word *eligible* appears eleven times while *ready* occurs only seven times. While subtle, this relays the message that *eligibility*, based on test scores, is the benchmark for students being enrolled in DE courses, not individual student *readiness*, which factors both academic and "affective readiness" ("Joint Statement" 13). As the 2019 college admissions bribery scandal "Operation Varsity Blues[4]" has illuminated, college eligibility based upon test scores alone is problematic for many reasons, but the primary reason is one that has been known to composition teacher-scholars since our field's shift from product to process: a single assessment cannot adequately snapshot a student's overall knowledge and understanding. In other words, it cannot tell us if a student is *ready* to move on.

Student *readiness* is markedly different and most of the time grossly obvious to veteran teachers. Laura Jimenez, director of the American Institutes for Research's college and career readiness and success center, paints a practical picture of the stark difference in *eligibility* vs. *readiness*:

> We know a ton about what it takes for kids to be college *eligible*, what is the level of knowledge you need to do well in a college course, if you get a certain score on the ACT, it is predictive of whether a student will get a B in a college class...What it can't tell you is if your class is at eight in the morning, are you going to be able to get up and get to class? Are you going to seek help when you need it? That's where the social and emotional learning conversation is starting to take off, there are plenty of kids who are *eligible* but not *ready* [emphasis added]. (as qtd. in Felton)

[4] "Operation Varsity Blues" was the name for the FBI operation that investigated a college admissions bribery scheme, facilitated by college consultant William Singer. Over 50 people, mostly wealthy and famous parents of college applicants, were indicted on charged ranging from fraud to racketeering. Singer allegedly worked out a scheme with a standardized testing company to allow cheating in the form of stand-ins taking tests or proctors correcting answers. Most cases were connected to ivy league college admissions to places like Stanford and Georgetown (Kates).

For Jimenez, and many other leading voices in this conversation, such as Angela Duckworth[5], it is habits of mind like persistence that are the marked difference in *eligibility* and *readiness* (Felton). Yet, these collegiate entrance markers too often become conflated because the latter isn't easily assessed, as standardized testing cannot adequately capture practiced habits of mind and ultimately college *readiness.*

In fact, several leading organizations — CCCC, CWPA, TYCA, and NCTE — deemed this issue important enough to include a separate section entitled "Student Readiness" in their 2020 collaborative five page DE executive summary. Their definition is as follows: "Student readiness is the ability of a student to enroll in a 'credit-bearing, college-level course' and to be successful in that course" (13). The latter part of this definition focused on success is what has been largely missing from the discussion on *readiness:* a student must also demonstrate "the 'affective readiness' required to succeed in DE courses" (13). Since this aspect of *readiness* is not easily assessed, the summary's authors encourage collaborative consideration "by guardians, teachers, and administrators...before the student enters the DE course" (13). This consideration is to include weighted attention to a student's habits of mind, as they are laid out within the *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing*, another collaborative document put forth in 2011 by the CWPA, NCTE, and the NWP (13-14).

Yet, considering the neo-liberalist trend of educational commodification, the conflation of student *eligibility* and *readiness* is not surprising. This is because the very definition of *neoliberalism* — "a governing rationality that disseminates market values and metrics to every sphere of life and construes the human itself as *homo economicus* [economic man]" — necessitates not a look at individual students but rather students as numbers marked for

---

[5] Angela Duckworth is a leading psychology researcher on *grit.* See her book *Grit: The Power of Passion and Perseverance.*

production (Brown 176). This "governing rationality" has resulted in the call to increase the number of students enrolled in DE coursework. In 2010, Kristine Hansen and Christine R. Farris edited a collection titled *College Credit for Writing in High School: The "Taking Care of" Business.* The title alone snapshots the neoliberal usurpation of this aspect of our writing programs.

Meanwhile, while DE does have some positive implications for students (to be briefly discussed in ch. 6), this neoliberal trend and call for more dually enrolled students is altering the reality of our writing programs to ultimately create fragmented educational experiences and educational agendas largely devoid of civic betterment. Hansen captures this neoliberal backdrop of DE well in her metaphor of the "composition marketplace," where the emphasis is on "'getting ahead' — getting ahead of the usual time frame for completing high school and college, getting ahead of other students, getting ahead financially by marking a relatively small investment now for a bigger payoff later — a quicker trip through college or admission into a prestigious university and a well-paying profession" ("The Composition Marketplace" 2). This "marketplace" mentality creates a "[c]ompletion Agenda driven by neoliberal logics," which ultimately "compete[s] with... the democratic agenda" (Jensen 26). This competition between educational agendas distracts from and undermines the greater civic goals for education that have been a part of our rhetoric and composition classroom since our ancient, rhetorical, pedagogical roots (see Leff's discussion of Isocrates' "civic tradition" 246-247).

Yet, these neoliberal pressures within DE are not surprising when one considers broader societal contexts. Henry Giroux claims that decades of neoliberalism, practices that perpetuate capitalist gains for the wealthy, throughout our societies has led to a form of "economic Darwinism" that "promot[es] the virtues of an unbridled individualism almost pathological in its

disdain for community, social responsibility, public values, and the public good" (2). This individualism has become an embedded aspect of our K-16 educational systems, as "[p]edagogies that...connect classroom knowledge to larger civic issues have become dangerous at all levels of schooling" (6). John M. Ellis argues that higher education specifically has become "subservient to political orthodoxy," largely at the call of radical activists who comprise many university faculty rosters (xiv, xvi). He argues a one-party faculty is no longer committed "to scholarship and nonpartisan teaching" but to political radicalism that seeks to undermine freedom of speech through a disdain for dissent (xii, xx). With these broader neoliberal contexts impacting much of the educational arena, DE becomes just another layer of the economic survival of the fittest.

CONTEMPORARY CONVERSATIONS

As DE numbers have risen steadily throughout the last ten to fifteen years, leading voices within rhetoric and composition have not been silent. Marilyn Valentino's 2010 CCCC's Chair's address involved a video clip of "a herd of cattle thundering its way across the screens as the familiar theme from *Rawhide* played," blasting the lyrics: "Don't try to understand 'em, / Just rope and throw and brand 'em" (Stokdyk et al. 117). Valentino proffered a harrowing parallel between the stampeding cattle and the commodification of students through the "'efficiencies'" common to the DE marketplace, "'efficiencies'... [that are] selling learning as fast and easy — in effect, reducing our students to something like this [cues video clip of cattle]" (371). While dramatic, the visual provided an undeniable image of commodification that impacted her audience (Stokdyk et al. 117).

In 2016, Joyce Carter Locke echoed Valentino's negative outlook on DE's impact on students, instructors, and the rhetoric and composition field at large. She declared in her Chair's

address that "it's not hard to imagine a world where FYC no longer takes place in college… and while students and families are rightly concerned with keeping college costs under control, I fear that what they're buying is an overstated, underperforming product, a service that sells them short" (384). Carolyn Calhoon-Dillahunt in 2018 spoke to this continued reality for rhetoric and composition in her CCCC's Chair's Address: "...competency-based education, prior learning assessments, dual credit, and credit by testing are proliferating — and eroding the traditional notion of first-year writing courses..." (280). Yet, she ends her address with a call for redefining these "problems as possibilities" for change as "First-year writing is the access point to higher education" no matter where it occurs (282, 290). These past CCCC's Chairs highlight the tensions ever-present within this issue of DE as it relates to FYC.

While much research and conversations focus on the collegiate aspect of DE, problems also exist on the secondary side, as DE is a replacement for senior English is most cases. Tingerg and Nadeua, for example, draw attention to the problematic aspects of DE from a secondary perspective. One issue is the perceptions that DE impose upon high schools: "… a prime factor for the proliferation of such [DE] programs has more to do with the perception that something is wrong with US high schools" (35). Another problematic matter is the fact that a secondary senior English course tends to be more literature-heavy than a DE FYC course and arguably "serves a developmentally appropriate purpose," largely related to experience, for these high school students. So, the obvious question emerges: "… what will go missing for dual-enrolled writers" who forego their senior English course and the developmental and experiential aspects it offers? (39).

Clearly, many problems related to DE exist, most associated with the commodified coursework and possible experiential gaps from a missed high school course, and much of our

recorded conversations speak to these problematic realities. The issues impact both the colleges and high schools involved and, most directly, the DE students engaging in these hybrid courses. Yet, DE is not going away, for it "provides too many stakeholders too much potential benefit for it not to continue growing" (Stokdyk et al. 139). So, how are rhetoric and composition teacher-scholars attempting to turn these problems into possibilities?

Collaboration. One of the most basic ways composition teacher-scholars are answering Calhoon-Dillahunt's call is through increased collaboration between secondary and collegiate instructors. Wendy Strachan of Western Washington University, for example, met weekly with seven teachers for eight weeks to discuss the different conditions in which secondary and collegiate teachers work. These conversations provided her with "insight… [so] I can better explain to my students why they have learned what they learned and why it made sense in a high school setting... I can better help them understand what they are doing when they write at the university now that I better understand what lies behind the attitudes and beliefs they report" (148). This dialogic approach has the power to undermine the impact of educational commodification and restore a focus on helping students learn effectively while returning a sense of agency to student writers.

Susan Kapanke and Melissa Westemeier also use intentional dialogue to return the focus to student learning and agency. They determine that both curriculum and pedagogy must be different for DE students as their needs are ultimately "different from a regular college student's" (154). This is because DE students remain within a high school context for the most part, even if they travel to a college campus for their DE class. They still live at home, hang out with their high school friends, and participate in high school extracurriculars. Perhaps the biggest difference though is in attitude. Most DE students elevate grades over any other type of

feedback: "The compliment they really want is an A grade, and for some students, nothing but an A will do… [they] feel personally offended when they receive anything lower than an A" (161, 162). While this is not a phenomenon unique to DE students (see Oliphant's "Letter to a *B Student*"), it does seem to be exaggerated in these often-homogenous DE settings where high-achieving, driven, overly committed, college-bound students are usually found in concentration. Kapanke and Westemeier believe a curriculum and pedagogy that seeks to nurture these students is the best approach.

This type of intentional dialogue can ultimately lead to productive and consistent collaboration. Hansen and Farris make this call for "greater collaboration in teaching writing to students in the transition zone from adolescence to adulthood" in their collection *College Credit for Writing in High School* (xxxii). Hansen, after a thorough overview of how FYC credits have become a commodity through programs like IB and AP, turns to DE as the most logical place for institutional collaboration towards a K-16 sequence. Through this type of cooperation, we can better ensure our students are learning to write rather than merely collecting credits ("The Composition Marketplace" 34, 7). Farris calls specifically for an acknowledgment of pedagogical differences in secondary and postsecondary contexts and urges for an overcoming of the "either/or binary" through "real disciplinary collaboration" that addresses these differences in theory and practice in order to "make more of the concurrent enrollment business than just the 'taking care of' business" (281).

The authors within Hansen and Farris's collection echo this specific call for institutional collaboration across the secondary and collegiate divide. For example, after their rapid response to state legislation that required more DE course offerings in central Arkansas, Joanna Castner Post, Vicki Beard Simmons, and Stephanie Vanderslice were left with one main conclusion: the

only way to truly improve high school education, specifically DE courses, is through communication and collaboration with collegiate counterparts in which expectations are made clear (170; see also Thaiss and Zawacki 142-144). Miles McCrimmon similarly argues that collaboration is the only viable means for ethically honoring the mission and culture of both secondary and collegiate campuses (219-224).

More recently, scholar-practitioners returned to this matter of collaboration as a productive response to issues related to DE. Robyn Russo conducted a semester-long case study focused on the struggle that DE English faculty face in defining a professional identity. These faculty are perpetually caught in a balancing act and, as a result, face jeopardized agency when it comes to interacting with their collegiate colleagues and ultimately having a voice in curricular changes. Russo calls for greater collaboration between faculty in higher education institutions and those teaching DE on high school campuses. Part of her call for collaboration is focused on "listening more closely to the lived experience of faculty tasked with creating a college classroom in the middle of a high school," faculty with "dual/dueling" identities (90, 91). This requires collaborative professional learning and even collaboration on research agendas to allow for shared vision-casting among faculty.

One such example of this intentional collaboration can be found in Stokdyk, Johnson, and Grandone's discussion of their college's DE program. It is predicated upon effective collaboration through the building and maintaining of professional learning communities (PLCs) that seek to overcome traditional models of "top-down mandates" through an emphasis on "trust" (122, 133). Practical aspects of these cross-institutional partnerships involve year-long mentorships for new instructors, professional learning focused on student work (mainly portfolios), and collaborative observations. This collaborative approach elevates the DE teachers'

"underutilized… knowledge and expertise," restoring a sense of agency through voice and decision-making to their professional identities (127). However, one limitation of this college's DE program is that they do not offer FYC courses, but rather college-prep reading and writing courses that do not grant transfer credit (131). Yet, the collaborative and pedagogical principles they have maintained seem to be transferable to most DE partnerships, as they focus on a curricular emphasis on skills and professional relationship-building.

A different approach to collaboration is found in Ridinger-Dotterman, Rochford, and Hock's FYC course design focused on collaborative, experiential learning to support DE students from more ethnically and academically diverse backgrounds, as they increase in number among the broader DE constituency (45; US Dept. of Education). These FYC instructors found that a pedagogical redesign with an emphasis on agency through student voice was necessary, so they went beyond their classroom walls to incorporate "departmental and campus-wide collaborative learning experiences as an intervention for student success to address both affective and academic readiness" (46). The culmination of this new course was the multimodal Upstanders Project, which entails individual research as well as collaborative, active learning experiences that prompt contemplative questions about society. This project required collaboration among the FYC faculty, the DE students, and even other campus programs. An unintended consequence of this project was a stronger sense of community for the DE students as they familiarized themselves with the campus and its staff and got to know their classmates.

Christine Denecker has been engaging in collaborative work with DE instructors at high school institutions and designed a study to hear directly from them. Her data revealed four themes that portray how DE instructors perceive "how students demonstrate rigor": "*grit, text application, depth,* and *revision*" ("Closing the Gap" 75). These themes point to a "resulting

image" of what *rigor* is for DE instructors: "empowered students who grapple with writing as an ongoing pursuit rather than a finite skill" (77). Her data also highlighted disparities in how professional learning is defined, as well as the fact that it is lacking in general for DE instructors (79). Denecker makes an important distinction between what should take place and what is actually taking place when it comes to training DE faculty: "While little has been reported about how high school DE instructors are actually trained or supported, much has been said about how they should be guided in their work" (71). She ends with a call for a cultural shift that will undoubtedly take both time and money but will allow a closing of the infamous gap: "Those of us in the field of composition studies can continue to talk about the gap in how high school and college faculty teach writing, or we can roll up our sleeves and use CE spaces to go about the task of closing it" (83). She is essentially calling for more intentional, institutional collaboration.

Access and Equity. Yet, is institutional collaboration enough to truly undermine the neoliberalist trend of commodification and ensure student agency within our classrooms? Many scholar-practitioners would argue it is not. We need access and equity in placement and assessment policies, as well as in course designs and pedagogical approaches to learning. While only the higest academically-achieving students used to be the dominant population comprising DE markets, equity work has broadened access and diversified the demographics of the current DE student community[6]. Yet, access gaps still exist, and equity work demands immediate attention as access is increased.

Placement testing and policies present the most obvious hurdle when it comes to broader access to DE coursework. The TYCA Research Committee highlights the discrepancies between open-access institutional policies and DE access placement policies: "Placement using a single,

---

[6] See the NCES's report "Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, and Dual-Enrollment Courses: Availability, Participation, and Related Outcomes for 2009 Ninth-Graders: 2013" for statistical breakdowns.

standardized exam in Standard Written English tells diverse students to leave their language differences at the otherwise open-access door. Such placement tests do not value language difference and cannot measure the complex ways students bridge their literacies and languages with the often-unfamiliar practices of the academy" (12). In addition, no correlation exists to prove that performance on one assignment will impact consecutive performances (Hatch et al.). Ratcliff and Smith argue that the very notion of "good writing" is subjective and DE placement policies are therefore "a means of both access to higher education and of exacerbating inequality" (163). Their conclusion is clear: there must be "a strong, multi-institutional, community culture of access and writing" when it comes to DE, and this culture must be predicated on access and placement reform in order to overcome notions of "writerly whiteness" (165, 170).

While placement policies have issues with access, learning outcomes often represent pitfalls related to equity. Casie Moreland, in her discussion of "the fragmented practices of DE," argues that we have to admit that "we have little understanding of what students' varied age levels, teacher training, curricular differences, and admission standards yield in regard to equitable…[and] socially just outcomes… for various student groups and writing programs" (180). These are DE equity aggregates that are in addition to the plethora of equity gaps that already exist within FYC[7]. The 2020 Joint Position Statement on Dual Enrollment encourages higher education institutions to require that DE courses utilize the same FYC outcomes as traditional FYC courses and to offer professional learning for DE teachers to equip them to move students' learning towards these outcomes (13-14). So, the equity gaps that already exist within FYC are likely to be replicated in DE classrooms. Course redesigns to emphasize student voice,

---

[7] See the WAC Clearinghouse book *Writing Assessment, Social Justice, and the Advancement of Opportunity* for a snapshot of some of these broader FYC equity matters (Poe et al.).

such as Ridinger-Dotterman, Rochford, and Hock's (see pg. 29), are a good start in increasing equity and access within classrooms and across campuses and ultimately minimizing the gaps that Moreland mentions.

Yet, pedagogical change may have limited impact in the broader policy-focused conversations of DE equity and access. Terrier-Dobrioglo and Burton suggest mapping as a means of more broadly snapshotting DE access and equity across one's state. They specifically sought to understand their state's narrative of DE, so they mapped Oregon's state standards, teacher qualifications, professional learning, curriculum, and learning outcomes for DE across the state. They discovered that "the narrative of dual credit for FYC is considerably more complicated than the simple win-win slogans offered by legislators, state-level administrators, and other dual credit advocates. There are always complexities" (144). Oregon's complexities were largely related to geography, the rural-urban divide, race, and economic factors (156). These findings, which are likely mirrored in many other states, validate concerns of sustainability, particularly teacher sustainability, and funding, largely related to access and equity.

It is important to acknowledge here the difficulty that comes with access and equity work, not just in DE, but more broadly educational institutions. While a myriad of factors impacts these conversations and the associated work, a leading impediment for success with access work is the "shifting understanding of access itself. As a term, access is a moving target, a concept that sounds promising on its surface yet frequently offers little more than empty gestures" (Brewer et al. 151). For access work to gain momentum towards success, "a culture of access..." that "engage[s] the who, how, and what of access" is necessary (Brewer et al. 151). This type of access culture centers upon "identity and participation," ultimately seeking

"transformative access...that re-thinks the very construct of allowing" access (Brewer et al. 153-154). In short, transformative cultures of access engage constituents within the process of access work.

Another troublesome term is *equity.* A cursory look through rhetoric and composition conversations reveals that equity work also involves work of identity and participation, specifically as it relates to marginalized voices. One area where conversations have been robust is related to matters of race. An exemplar book from this conversation, *Working toward Racial Equity in First-Year Composition,* is a collection of six perspectives. The scholars within this text avoid reducing *equity* to a singular definition, neatly packaged for regurgitation. Rather, these scholars promote collaboration and conversation as a means of equity work: "Different voices, different stories... Think about how my meaning works in connection with yours. So, for me in the classroom, I always tell my students: 'You know so much more about things I know nothing about. So, in order for learning to take place, you teach me, I teach you. And together we create this synthesis.' I mean, that's equity. That's social justice" (Coleman et al. 142). This informal, pragmatic definition of equity hearkens back to the work of Paulo Freire, who argued that, within the classroom, all "are simultaneously teachers *and* students" (72). So, while *equity* may not bear a universal definition, there is no shortage of examples of this type of pragmatic work. In short, the common denominator for composition classrooms, whether they be DE or not, is that "writing is probably the most radical thing you could do to bring up the proletariat into equity. And if we don't start composition with that viewpoint, then we can never make it work" (Coleman et al. 140).

IDENTITY

With DE's expansion, moving some of our rhetoric and composition courses into the

secondary arena, identity has become more relevant to our research agendas in order to achieve a more complete picture of DE. Rhetoric and composition teacher-scholars has long been engaged in conversations of identity. From Aristotle's *ethos* and Quintilian's "good man speaking well" to more recent feminist rhetorical approaches, identity has been naturally integrated into rhetorical discussion from the field's inception (Bizzell & Herzberg "Quintillian" 359). However, as Aristotle's broadly adopted usage shows, rhetoric and composition's understanding of identity is indebted to several thinkers and scholars who are adjacent to our discipline. A cursory overview of these discussions is helpful in order to glean the richness of diverse conversation surrounding this topic of identity.

INTERDISCIPLINARY INDEBTEDNESS

Education has offered much to the pedagogical discussions of rhetoric and composition throughout the years. Pragmatist John Dewey has contributed theories and practical examples that emphasize the importance of experience, both within and outside of educational contexts, for personal identity and community knowledge[8]. While identity was not a primary focus of Dewey's thought work, his emphasis on communal experiences within education prompts a "philosophy of culture" (Hickman xii). Sociologist and Educationist Ali A. Abdi concisely wraps up Dewey's indirect promotion of identity work as a key aspect of education as follows:

> While … Dewey… may [not] have explicitly declared any special project that exclusively looks at the constructive or deconstructive points of identity, it is, nevertheless, critically clear that the direction of their intellectual programs were fully responsive to the question of identity as a means of socialization, learning, and overall development. In Dewey's case, the required congruence between the child's background and the school environment were strong recipes for what this philosopher wanted to

---

[8] See Dewey's *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education.*

characterize his American compatriots: practically productive, [sic] and critically oriented

citizens who could enhance progressive life chances for all. (197)

In other words, Dewey viewed educational enviroments as a means of aligning learners with the

ideals of democracy and community good through individual growth. In short, "the importance

of education, in Dewey's thinking… [was] as a social function that affirms our identity" with the

community context of the learner (Abdi 187).

Stephen M. Fishman argues that our very understanding of writing, particularly as it has

evolved since the expressivist era, is indebted to Dewey: "… understanding Dewey is essential

for understanding ourselves… [and] for understanding the discussion among competing theories

of writing which has been the field's focus the past twenty-five years" (315). We have adapted

some of Dewey's ideas in our concepts of communities of practice or discourse communities,

both of which are social identity constructs particularly fitting for composition classrooms. For

example, Etienne Wenger[9], whose contributions related to communities of practice are

foundational to many social learning pedagogies, hearkens to Dewey's[10] "situadeness of

experience," in which "thinking [is viewed] as engagement in action" (281). In other words, our

social contexts directly impact our thought processes and ultimately our identity as it relates to

our positionality within our communities of practice.

Educator Paulo Freire was another philosopher who never claimed projects directly

related to identity, yet his contributions to identity work are nonetheless represented throughout

his life's work. Freire's emphasis was on critical literacy as a means to individual identity

evolution and, more broadly, revolution. More specifically, as an individual learns to both read

the world around them and then the words of given texts, they can begin moving away from

---

[9] See Wenger's *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity.*
[10] See Dewey's *Human Nature and Conduct: An Introduction to Social Psychology.*

identity constructs aligning with the oppressed and towards a more authentic self (Freire and Macedo 35). This move away from the oppressor and the inauthentic identity cast upon one's self by the oppressor necessitates both an acknowledgment of and a casting off of the "'consciousness dependency,' that is, a worldview that arbitrarily depends on others' perception [sic] of reality" (Abdi 192). This identity work is at the center of Freire's liberation pedagogy: critical literacy as a means of overcoming inauthentic identity constructs.

Most famously, Freire debunked the myth of the "banking model," a perception that students can simply be filled with knowledge by the teacher, by shifting the power structures within the classroom (71-72). He did so by shifting the traditional identity constructs of the teacher as possessor of knowledge and the student as in need of knowledge: "the teacher-of-the-students and the students-of-the-teacher cease to exist and a new term emerges: teacher-student with students-teachers" (73). Hence, the educational theory of constructivism was popularized, and with it, a renewed interest in identity constructs and their implications for learning. Constructivism was embedded into our own field's tradition during the "social turn" in the 1980s and has since been "reimagined" to address issues of social justice and marginalized identities within our communities[11].

Within the field of psychology, Sigmund Freud popularized sexualized identity roughly a century ago: "Identification, in fact, is ambivalent from the very first; it can turn into an expression of tenderness as easily as into a wish for someone's removal" (as qtd. in Davis 123). This discussion of identity became predecessor to many psychological queries into identity. Erik Erikson, for example, followed Freud's foundational theory with his own theories of human development. His phase most relevant to this study is the fifth phase, concerned with adolescents: identity vs. confusion. Constant turmoil and ultimate confusion about identity

---

[11] See the special issue of *College English* from July 2014.

constructs depict this phase as adolescents shift, adapt, and evolve to societal pressures and context (Steinberg 208-234). Given Erikson's age range of twelve to eighteen for this phase, nearly all secondary students fall into this category, including most DE students involved in this study[12].

A Freudian follower on many accounts, literary theorist Kenneth Burke diverged from Freud in claiming that "the most fundamental human desire is social rather than sexual" and that "there is no essential identity," but rather the identifying *I* becomes essentially an actor assuming the mores of a group as a means of identification (Davis 124, 127). Ultimately, *consubstantiality,* or the joining through identification, is necessary to establish unity because of the inherent presence of division. Further, he points out that instances of identification "owe their convincingness much more to trivial repetition and dull daily reinforcement than to exceptional rhetorical skill" (Burke 26). These repetitions and reinforcements parallel aspects of the composition classroom in pedagogical practices that are designed to encourage student learning. However, they are also contributing to the rhetorical invention of various identifications within student writers.

Several philosophers have also taken up issues of identity. Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel introduced the concept of the Other, in which one can only truly understand the self through interactions with and comparisons to another (111). This concept is daily enacted amongst students at nearly all levels, but especially within secondary settings, in which many DE students experience their FYC courses. Students often start to decipher their own identity constructs by deducing what they are not in comparison to peers. For example, they are not smart

---

[12] While I briefly return to Erikson's 5th phase on pages 55-57, in-depth discussion of Erikson's developmental phases are outside the scope of this research project.

because they are not in the honors classes. They are not athletic because they are not on the Varsity teams. They are fat because they are a size larger than their closest friends.

Another philosopher Louis Althusser followed Hegel's theory with discussions of *subjectivity* as ideologically constructed (1335-1360). He claims that ideologies are ever-present and are constantly acting upon us, molding and making us who we are. Education being one of the largest ideological influences within our current society, students are daily subjected to these forces of power structures from an early age and throughout their most formative years. Some institutional settings have multiple ideological forces at work. For example, religious educational institutions, like the one under study, have at least two overlapping ideologies: religion and education. For DE students, the ideological layers are even more because they are subject to those of both the secondary and collegiate institutions in which they are enrolled. The resulting tensions can leave students little room to develop their own identity constructs.

Picking up similar threads of identity, Michel Foucault theorizes that identity formation is largely a social constitution. Self-consciousness is influenced by bureaucratic institutions— such as hospitals, prisons, military, and schools— that produce passive subjects. This is done through both knowledge and power. Foucault's claim is that power is both repressive and productive. The state and federal government seeks to regulate identity construction from day one. Requirements such as mandatory shots and schooling allow this type of control and influence on self-consciousness in multiple areas of life. Foucault also states that there is no outside; everyone and everything is subjected daily to this knowledge/power structure of identity formation (1460-1470). The education system is merely one such example.

A contemporary of both Althusser and Foucault, psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan similarly claimed identity as a social construct that is largely enacted through language: "We are

constituted and acculturated by signs. Even before we begin to speak, we are already being spoken...Language speaks us" (Leitch et al. 1160). One of Lacan's famous examples of this is his discussion of bathrooms, a timely conversation within our own culture in the aftermath of President Obama's letter to schools clarifying Title IX protections for transgender students, which included restroom usage[13]. Lacan highlights the fact that the bathroom doors look the same; the only distinction is the gender signifiers, *ladies* and *gentlemen* (416)*. In a writing classroom, language is both acting upon our students and being used by our students as they explore shifting identity constructs.

The above overview captures aspects of the broader identity conversation that has been entwined throughout our own field of rhetoric and composition. This theoretical potpourri can be traced through many of composition's turns since the 1970s. With the rise of each new turn, identity has been a part of those discussions. Perhaps the most directly imbued with identity implications is the "social turn" of the '80s, which shifted our collective emphasis on both knowledge and identity construction to our social settings.

Kenneth Bruffee, rhetoric and composition's quintessential voice of this turn, emphasizes the importance of interactive processes in social contexts as it relates to collaborative learning in composition pedagogy, ultimately "determin[ing] the way they [students] will think and... write" (422). The connection between private thoughts and public conversations is at the center of Bruffee's emphasis on collaborative learning: he argues that "thought is internalized conversation" and "writing is internalized conversation re-externalized" (422). This discursivity is central to not only the writing process, but also to entrance into new discourse communities,

---

[13] In May of 2016, President Obama and his administration issued a letter to schools clarifying how Title IX offers protections to transgender students. The issue raised within the letter that drew the most public attention and discussion was related to the use of restrooms: transgender students should be allowed to use the restroom that corresponds to their gender identity ("Dear Colleague Letter").

such as the collegiate writers' community that a composition classroom represents. In short, Bruffee's argument situates collaborative learning as generative for not only knowledge but also for identity construction, mainly as it relates to membership within new discourse communities. Similarly, Patricia Bizzell, extending Flower and Hayes' claim that a student writer engages in cognitive processes of conceptualization, argues that students need to understand "that their writing takes place within a community," so understanding "the community's conventions" is important to the writing process ("A Cognitive Process"; 402). Within each of these representative theories is an emphasis on individual identity as situated within and influenced by a community context, as well as a reminder of our interdisciplinary theoretical foundations.

HABITS OF MIND

Throughout the past decade, much of the identity conversation within rhetoric and composition has been related to habits of mind. In her 2016 CCCC's Chair's Address, Joyce Locke Carter declared that "writing isn't a body of knowledge that you acquire in ten or fifteen weeks. It's a habit of mind…" (384). So, how then do we define habits of mind and how do they impact the identity constructs of our rhetoric and composition students? The *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing* provides a worthy starting place for both defining habits of mind and discussing collaborative pedagogical change.

The Framework*'s Exigency, Development, and Terminology.* The 2011 executive summary, the *Framework for Success in PostSecondary Writing,* is a response from three leading organizations — the CWPA, NCTE, and NWP — to "a very specific exigency, the creation of the then not-yet-finalized Common Core State Standards (CCSS)" (O'Neill et al. ix). The task force was comprised of twenty-two members, who sought feedback and document reviews "by hundreds of K-12 and two- and four-year college teachers" (ix). According to members of the

task force, the *Framework* was an attempt to claim a voice in the "college readiness" discussion in helping to craft the definition and the curricular agendas to follow the widespread implementation of CCSS: "This *Framework* reflected our desire to represent college readiness in writing in a way that was quite different from the CCSS: in our case, as an organic statement of principles and ideas from the educators closest to the heart of the matter, classroom teachers" (x, xi).

So, while this document directly responds to the neoliberal agendas of standardized testing and large-scale assessment, specifically relating to the Common Core State Standards as the educational reality of the early 2010s, the heart of the summary is agency (Johnson "Beyond Standards" 517-523). In essence, "...the *Framework* writers sought to turn the focus of conversations about college readiness from test scores to students, their development and their capacity as human beings...In a sense the *Framework* returns agency to students" (Powell 132). In short, the *Framework*'s writers are calling for student behaviors and experiences to be prioritized over products and test scores. These intellectual behaviors and educational experiences can ultimately foster habits of mind, which become part of students' dispositions.

The *Framework* introduces eight "habits of mind" with little emphasis on student writing; the focus is on the development of student writers, which aligns with the broader disciplinary conversations on identity. These authoring organizations highlight "habits of mind and experiences with writing, reading, and critical analysis that serve as foundations for writing in college-level, credit-bearing courses" (CWPA et al. 1). Their list of habits of mind includes the following traits: curiosity, responsibility, openness, engagement, creativity, flexibility, persistence, and metacognition.

It is useful at this point to define the term *habits of mind* as it pertains to this discussion. The *Framework,* published in 2011, defines "[h]abits of mind…[as] ways of approaching learning that are both intellectual and practical and that will support students' success in a variety of fields and disciplines" (CWPA et al. 1). According to this definition, the term and therefore the conversations around it are interdisciplinary in nature, for pedagogy focused on habits of mind doesn't solely emphasize the teaching of writing (Hansen "The Framework" 541). It seeks to foster student identity. Kristine Johnson draws on a similarly expansive definition from Arthur Costa, a pedagogy scholar who founded and directs *The Institute for Habits of Mind*: "a 'pattern of intellectual behaviors that leads to productive action'" (Costa and Kallick as qtd. in Johnson "Beyond Standards" 524). These "intellectual behaviors" are often learned through experiences that have been reflected upon for the purpose of identity formation and character development. The resulting "productive action" implies a shift in agency back to students who have developed habits of mind.

The discussion of habits of mind sometimes occurs using different terminology; the term *disposition* is one such example as it is becoming more prevalent within rhetoric and composition scholar-practitioner circles. Eric Leake, for example, employs the term *disposition* throughout his discussion of writing pedagogies of empathy, arguing empathy is both rhetoric and disposition ("Writing Pedagogies of Empathy"). The terms *habit of mind* and *disposition* are similar, even synonymous in some instances, as the latter deals with character and cognitive habits, akin to the "intellectual behaviors" of the previously defined *habit of mind.* However, the term *disposition* is often used to describe a person's character in general rather than specifically, as *habits of mind* often do. Costa uses both terms: "A 'Habit of Mind' means having a disposition toward behaving intelligently when confronted with problems" ("Habits of Mind").

Dispositions then are more deeply rooted and are comprised of practiced *habits of mind*, yet both terms maintain student identity as prioritized focus over student writing.

One of the leading voices in this conversation is Kristine Johnson, who "argue[s] that the *Framework* positions rhetoric and composition to address troubling gaps in American education by reinvigorating historical and traditional frames…" ("Beyond Standards" 519). These "troubling gaps" largely lie within the arena of delegated agency, another matter relevant to our identity research and reciprocity goals. Assessment experts who are outside of the classroom — or academia for that matter — are given priority when it comes to agency; for, as developers of large-scale assessment, they hold the power as it has been handed to them by educational policymakers, who also work outside of classrooms and academia. Johnson claims that this educational emphasis has shifted the overall purpose of education to "participat[ion] in the free market…[and] individual commodity rather than public good" ("Beyond Standards" 522). In her opinion, the *Framework* is a step in the right direction when it comes to reassigning agency because it "defines college readiness not in terms of standards but in terms of intellectual behaviors and experiences…" (523). This claim places the discussion, albeit interdisciplinary in scope, firmly within rhetoric and composition, as it hearkens back to Quintilian, Cicero, Isocrates, and other ancient rhetorical pedagogues with their emphases on being as well as knowing and doing.

Rhetorical Roots. Johnson argues that "the *Framework* positions rhetoric and composition to address troubling gaps in American education by reinvigorating ...ancient rhetoric and the liberal arts — frames for writing instruction that encompass multiple habits of mind" ("Beyond Standards" 519). These "troubling gaps" are largely found within the *gross* emphasis on grades and test scores as well as the credits as currency trend. The *Framework* pitches habits

of mind that Johnson believes are akin to the civic good and virtuous education that rhetoric and composition's ancestry employed: "Ancient rhetoricians envisioned a rhetorical education as an education in multiple habits of mind, and the *Framework* first encourages rhetoric and composition to reinvigorate this historical frame and affirm student intellectual agency" (525). This historical framing and affirmation of student agency emphasize student identity or "*who writers should become*" with an emphasis on "the person behind writing products and processes" (527).

Reaching back to our rhetorical roots then, Johnson's historical framing starts with Aristotle. Aristotle spoke much about moral virtues in his discussion of virtue ethics, specifically in *The Nicomachean Ethics.* There is, of course, irony in appropriating Aristotle's principles of virtue because of the elitist nature of the society in which he lived and taught. His rhetorical education was for the wealthy men of ancient Athens. Yet, as Fleming poignantly argues, an idea from classical rhetoric can be appropriated without having to replicate the original curricular structure or the societal experience, for "what that idea represented might be an inspiration for us" (118). While Fleming's discussion is oriented towards the ideas of the progymnasmata, I believe that the ideas behind Aristotle's virtue ethics, specifically those related to moral virtues and his components of *ethos*, can be an inspiration for habits of mind in our FYC classrooms today.

Aristotle's rhetorical principles are often the heart of the composition textbook as his ideas are somewhat formulaic and easily organized into a teachable structure. For example, *ethos* shows up in nearly all FYC courses as writing students are often instructed to utilize his three rhetorical appeals: pathos, logos, and ethos. *Ethos*, commonly taught as a writer/speaker's credibility, is comprised of three components: *areté* (virtue), *phronēsis* (practical wisdom), and

eunoia (goodwill). *Areté* is perhaps most relevant to habits of mind. Aristotle defines *areté* as "a state of character concerned with choice, lying in a mean" (*Nicomachean Ethics* II.6). This mean is located in between vice and ideal virtue and is the aim for any virtuous choice of action. Aristotle believed that people have the capacity for two types of virtues: virtues of character and virtues of intellect. Virtues of character are often referenced as moral virtues that are acquired over time through habitual repetition: "moral virtue comes about as a result of habit...none of the moral virtues arises in us by nature [yet]...we are adapted by nature to receive them, and are made perfect by habit" (II.1). This emphasis on moral virtues as habits learned over time and through intentional activities provides a means for instructors to embed habits of mind into FYC course designs.

However, virtues of character don't stand in isolation. Aristotle's virtues of intellect ultimately work with moral virtues to enable citizens to both feel and act "at the right times, with reference to the right objects, towards the right people, with the right motive, and in the right way" (*Nicomachean Ethics* II.6). The specific virtue of intellect most directly relevant to habits of mind is *phronēsis,* or practical wisdom, another component of Aristotle's *ethos*. *Phronēsis,* simply defined, "is correct reason" (VI.13). This reason is related to intuition rather than scientific knowledge and is thusly perfected over time through lived experience, which is a key component the *Framework* puts forth for the development of habits of mind. Therefore, "the man who is capable of deliberating has practical wisdom…[which] which must be a reasoned and true state of capacity to act with regard to human goods" (VI.5). *Phronēsis* provides the rhetoric and composition instructor with a classical, rhetorical goal for practiced reason in doing, which can guide students and teachers alike in a pursuit of habits of mind.

Areté and *phronēsis,* two aspects of Aristotle's *ethos,* provide both the means and the goal for practiced habits of mind through a dual emphasis on feeling and doing, for "it is not possible to be good in the strict sense without practical wisdom, or practically wise without moral virtue" (*Nicomachean Ethics* VI.13). In other words, "Aristotle does not believe that it is possible to be truly virtuous unless one has already acquired the ability to *think* correctly about moral decisions" (Hughes 71). These connections ultimately provide a space for *areté* and *phronēsis* in FYC course designs that can aim at helping students grapple with identity construction during a season of transition.

Johnson also brings in Isocrates, at least briefly, to her historical framing of the *Framework* for modern classroom implementation. While distinguishing character from *ethos*, Isocrates believed that natural ability, practical experience, and formal training were all necessary to fashion a student into one identified as a good rhetor ("Against the Sophists" 14-15). He relays much of his pedagogical emphasis on character in his educational treatise *Antidosis:* "What the studies are which have this power I can tell you, though I hesitate to do so; they are so contrary to popular belief and so very far removed from the opinions of the rest of the world, that I am afraid lest when you first hear them you will fill the whole court-room with your murmurs and your cries" (337). His educational paradigm shift landed him in between camps; he didn't ascribe to all the sophistic or philosophical tenets. This positioning set him up perfectly to break down not only this binary but also to address many dualisms of his day through his pedagogical approach.

1. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*: Isocrates took from each what worked for his school. He interpreted philosophy theoretically as wisdom and a pursuit for truth and practically as

reflection and instilled both within his students. He focused on rhetoric's emphasis on

eloquence in his framing of the art of discourse (Poulakos 7).

2. *Mind and Body*: While Isocrates did privilege the mind over the body, he acknowledged

that instructing both are necessary for a proper education. Hence, gymnastics and

philosophy became the crux of his curriculum (*Antidosis* 289).

3. *Theory and Praxis*: Isocrates believed that three things are necessary for a student to be

successful: natural aptitude, training and knowledge (theory), and practiced application

(praxis) (*Antidosis* 293).

4. *Individual and Community*: His goal for each student was to not only see himself as

existing as an individual, but also as a member of a democratic community; therefore, all

words and actions should be for the good of the polis (Poulakos 46).

5. *Words and Deeds:* Isocrates implies that both matter as his education focused on

speaking well and acting for the good of Athens: "...they are on the watch for

contradictions of words but are blind to inconsistencies in deeds…" (*Against the

Sophists* 167).

6. *Speech and Writing*: While Isocrates did not initiate written discourse (see Herrick 78), he

did use it often in both his curriculum and his own life. *Antidosis* is one such text.

Isocrates' pragmatic pedagogy provides a pedagogical example that encourages overcoming the

binary of writer and writing, for a writer's identity construct is imbued with a sense of both *who*

the writer is and *what* they are writing.

Quintilian also shows up in Johnson's historical framing discussion as he sought to

produce students who possessed both skill and character. In other words, he desired his rising

rhetors to be good men speaking well (2.2.2-6). Similarly, Augustine speaks to identity in his

emphasis on a speaker's life serving as an example. A life of moral character and authority is

one's ethos rather than mere performance (1.37). Johnson echoes Augustine's aim in her

admonishment of turning habits of mind into outcomes, for that encourages student performance

of habits of mind. Instead, she suggests habits of mind as practices for student cultivation

("Beyond Standards" 534-535).

As this brief historical overview suggests, our "rhetorical tradition… [is one] that

cultivated numerous habits of mind…[as a]ncient rhetoricians made clear statements

about the connection between rhetoric and personal virtue" (Johnson "Beyond Standards" 527-

528). This tradition largely continued into the 1800s with rhetoricians and educators like Hugh

Blair, whose "rhetoric aims ultimately at a rather classical goal, to produce good men who will

speak (and write) well in the service of the community" (Bizzell and Herzberg "Hugh Blair"

947). Yet, this tradition did not continue once composition courses began to emphasize "taste in

their students" and ultimately became the gatekeepers of higher education in the late 1800s

(Crowley 34). While our contemporary rhetorical conversations about identity are less about

moral character and natural ability, they do still highlight the multi-faceted nature of identity and

often bring in, or at least hearken to, these classical foundations, as Johnson does in her

discussion of the *Framework.*

Contemporary Conversations. While the kairotic moment of the CCSS evoked the

development of the *Framework* in 2011*,* ongoing growth of DE, among other reasons, has

reinvigorated conversations around the *Framework* as "a key alternative narrative of college and

career readiness" (Behm et al. xxiv). The intended design of the *Framework* was to "give voice

to teachers as advocates for change… [as taskforce members] positioned it as a border-crossing

kind of document… a living artifact" (O'Neill et al. xi, xii). Some of these recent conversations,

snapshotted below, reflect this intention through sustained engagement with issues related to communication, advocacy, and collaboration.

Kristine Johnson, a leading voice in conversations related to habits of mind, argues that as the *Framework* is communicated in education policy conversations, certain frames are evoked through the language used. She argues that two major frames imbue the *Framework* document: the commercial frame and the growth frame ("Framing" 6, 10). While these frames seem to be on either end of the spectrum — with the commercial frame aligning with the "free-market fundamentalism" that is synonymous with neoliberalism and the growth frame aligning with our traditional goals of civic betterment — rhetoric and composition scholar-practitioners in these education policy conversations use both liberally (Giroux 1). The dominant frame in these conversations and in our educational culture is the commercial frame, where student credentials hold exchange value and students become commodities, and the goal of this frame is to produce economic winners and achievers (Johnson "Framing" 12). On the other end of the spectrum is the growth frame, which emphasizes use value and the production of citizens. Student learning is at the center of growth frame conversations. While evidence for both frames exists within the generative *Framework* document, Johnson argues that the growth frame is preferable as it better aligns with our disciplinary identity and ideals. Yet, this frame is not evoked without raising challenges. How can it be used convincingly against the relevance of the commercial frame in today's educational climate? More importantly, how can our discipline actualize such lofty goals as citizen formation? (17). Ultimately, Johnson argues that writing teachers and WPAs need to be aware of the implications of the frame they evoke in these high-stakes educational policy conversations.

Communication was a key goal in the *Framework*'s design, with the intention of advocacy: "the *Framework* offers a way to talk about education in language that is relevant and hopeful and that brings diverse groups of people together, encouraging bridges both vertical and horizontal and spanning disciplines, grade levels, and contexts" (O'Neill et al. xv). Peter H. Khost argues that all members of the rhetoric and composition community, led by senior faculty with tenure security, need to rally behind the *Framework* as the "rhetorical common denominator," while encouraging "numerators" unique to each classroom context to allow "pedagogical diversity" (137). Adopting a collective identity behind the *Framework* would allow a unified voice to emerge from within rhetoric and composition to claim a more viable stake in the "college readiness" conversations that are largely dominated now by governmental institutions and testing agencies — in short, non-educators and non-writing instructors.

The *Framework* also provides a means for collaboration. Alice Johnston Myatt and Ellen Shelton have found the *Framework* helpful in several ways: supporting Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) implementations focused on student writing, developing and continuing meaningful K-16 professional learning, and revamping curricula. Since their Qualitative Enhancement Plan (QEP) of 2009, the University of Mississippi's Writing Program has developed into a distinct and influential department of its own. This development has given rise to recurring symposia to foster dialogue between secondary and postsecondary instructors to better understand just what "college and career readiness" means for students when it comes to writing. This exchange of ideas is largely facilitated by using the *Framework* "as a leveling text" for collaboration across vertical boundaries (192). Ultimately, Myatt and Shelton claim the *Framework* is useful as "a set of principles that defines good writing instruction: one that provides multiple entry points for supporting dialogue among writing teachers in various institutional settings" (201).

Yet, while communication connected to the *Framework* has proven useful for some advocacy and collaboration work, opposition exists among some rhetoric and composition scholar-practitioners. Hansen, for example, cautions against assuming a disciplinary responsibility for civic formation:

> Perhaps more troubling [than the *Framework*'s irrelevance against the commercial frame] is the idea that writing programs should claim responsibility for forming citizens and fostering habits of mind… If writing programs claim responsibility for intellectual formation, they put themselves in the difficult position of teaching and assessing not only an expanding set of outcomes but also personal, moral, and intellectual qualities. ("The Composition Marketplace" 17)

Hansen is highlighting the pragmatic issues of feasibility and sustainability, as habits of mind pose a real threat to an already overwhelmed faculty, as well as assessment. How do we assess abstract qualities like habits of mind?

Johnson takes up this problematic issue of assessing habits of mind by calling for a pivot from this focus on outcomes to call for habits of mind as practice. This primarily rests upon her premise that assessing habits of mind can be problematic and even ethically questionable because students in today's educational culture of large-scale, high stakes testing are trained to perform for grades rather than to learn for personal and community betterment. One of Johnson's ethical questions then is how a teacher can "discern mere performance from actual cultivation" ("The Framework" 531). While it isn't directly answered, a move to habits of mind as practice rather than outcome maintains a focus on cultivation rather than performance. She ends her discussion with two takeaways the rhetoric and composition community can draw from the *Framework:* 1) we need more research on knowledge transfer and 2) we need a paradigmatic

shift in pedagogical focus that gives agency back to students as persons. Her call for habits of mind as student practices allows room for both takeaways to flourish because practices, like the habits of mind, that are interdisciplinary in nature are naturally more transferable than disciplinary-specific outcomes.

Perhaps a larger issue is the *Framework*'s lack of community consideration when it comes to students' language and identity constructs. Johnson reminds rhetoric and composition teacher-scholars that some "home discourse communities discourage particular habits of mind," which is problematic when many interpret the *Framework* as having set habits of mind before the rhetoric and composition community as desirable outcomes ("The Framework" 527). Similarly, Rebecca Powell argues that students' communities significantly impact both their writing values and experiences, for which the *Framework* does not adequately account. She found that students who live in cities are more likely to have family communities that value writing at home, while rural students express a value for writing in their school community. Furthermore, students in cities reveal a higher value for writing that "allow[s] them to display and/or develop aspects of their identity" and believe that hard work and effort were the "capital" necessary to achieve successful writing, whereas rural students see writing as "a means to an end" and maintain an "ambivalent and pragmatic" attitude towards writing (125, 129-130). Building on Hansen's claim that "education is the development of certain kinds of people rather than the accumulation of so many credit hours," Powell concludes that the *Framework* ought to focus more on shaping the communities that impact students rather than just the students themselves (Hansen "The Framework" 540, Powell 119).

The *Framework* also does not adequately address reading skills. Alice S. Horning, for example, argues that the *Framework* is a helpful structural support for writing, but lacks a vital

section for reading, a major oversight since it is the combined "effective reading and effective writing [that] are the keys to the liberal learning we seek to provide in the university and beyond it" (55, 66). Horning proposes an additional section, complete with five learning objectives coupled with discussion, for inclusion in the *Framework*: "Developing Critical Reading and Information Literacy Abilities." Ellen C. Carillo makes a similar claim, mainly that the *Framework* is a helpful tool but is incomplete as it stands. She argues for the inclusion of language geared towards reading as well as writing as "college reading [is] writing's counterpart in the construction of meaning" (39). Furthermore, reading-writing connections must be intentionally taught, as "students do not learn to write simply by reading," making the need for attention to college reading in the *Framework* even more imperative (39). She advocates for pedagogical connectivity through assignments such as dialectical notebooks and difficulty papers for each habit of mind to connect reading to the *Framework*'s writing experiences.

IDENTITY IN HYBRID ENVIRONMENTS

While the *Framework* has prompted identity discussions related to habits of mind, identity constructs of perhaps our largest growing population, our DE students, have been almost entirely non-existent in research and discussion within rhetoric and composition — until 2020 that is, when Larracey and Hassel pinpointed three themes in the submissions for the Sept. *TETYC* issue, one of which was identity in these hybrid environments. Those contributions and more are highlighted below.

One aspect of identity in these hybrid spaces is that of the instructors. Robyn Russo argues that our DE faculty are perpetually caught in a balancing act. She paints the following picture:

Like any first-year composition teacher, dual enrollment composition instructors are

expected to help transition writers from secondary to college-level writing cultures. But

unlike those on campus, that threshold is — quite literally — crossed daily by all the

students who move between their dual enrollment classes and the rest of their 'regular'

high school day. And also unlike those in campus, the demands of a dual enrollment

college composition class may be competing with pep rallies and spirit week dress-up

games, with a high school principal's demand for leniency on late work, or with the

pressure of high-stakes standardized testing whose definition of writing knowledge bears

little resemblance to that of higher education. (Hansen & Post et al. as cited in Russo 89)

As I am typing this on a Sunday morning, I'm chuckling at the irony of the truth of this statement

in my life: our spirit week begins tomorrow, and I have no country outfit or TV character

costume ready. A few years ago, I was observed by the Director of Composition at our

partnering collegiate institution during spirit week. She was able to see me teaching in cowgirl

attire to a room full of country life representations, complete with a fully camouflaged student in

a ghillie suit (picture a tree and you're close!). Russo claims that these realities jeopardize our

agency when it comes to interacting with our collegiate colleagues and ultimately having a voice

in curricular changes. She echoes the calls for collaboration and claims the focus should be on

"listening more closely to the lived experience of faculty tasked with creating a college

classroom in the middle of a high school," faculty with "dual/dueling" identities (90, 91).

Yet, DE student identities demand even more immediate attention as students are the

primary reason our field of composition exists. Erin Costello Wecker and Erin Wilde discuss

"the repercussions of undertheorized hybridity, specifically highlighting the logistical/financial

hardships, social/communal pressures, and disparate academic expectations" and proffer

pedagogical considerations that center around "knowing our students" in order to "challenge them more meaningfully" (17, 32). While the positionality of DE students dwelling within the liminal space of "neither-here-nor there" causes an influx of challenges and disparities, one benefit of the laborious construction required of a hybrid identity is that the process often produces a key habit of mind in these DE students: persistence.

For students involved with "come-to-campus" DE programs, these matters of identity can be even more pronounced. According to the CWPA's Position Statement in 2019, the come-to-campus DE model accounted for 23% of all precollege programs (8). Students within these programs are typically "hyper-aware of their 'and/not' identity as they took college classes but were not quite college students… [they are] cognizant of the necessity to be two things at once but… lack guidance or insight regarding how to navigate this neither-here-nor-there status" (Wecker and Wilde 17). This unique situatedness necessitates pedagogical flexibility and "adaptations that recognize hybridity but maintain the academic rigor expected in a DE course" (20). While this is especially true for the come-to-campus model, these pedagogical innovations should be a priority in all DE programs.

So, what then do we know about the identity development of students within our DE programs? One of the most well-known developmental models is psychologist Erik Erikson's theory of psychosocial development that contains eight phases covering birth through the end of one's life. Constant turmoil and ultimate confusion about identity constructs depict his fifth phase as adolescents shift, adapt, and evolve to societal pressures and context (Steinberg 208-234). Erikson's age range for this phase is twelve to eighteen years old, placing most secondary and DE students within the boundaries of this developmental phase. However, I would argue

that, given our modern trend of extended adolescence, this phase would encompass most of our traditionally aged FYC students.

FYC classrooms, and DE FYC classrooms even more so, are common sites for identity confusion and a hyper-developmental phase as the context is an introduction to the higher education world and disciplinary discourse communities. This can be an unsettling time as students' more established identity constructs are encountering new language expectations, community practices, and worldviews, which often presents a "double bind" as students are caught between two or more communities, such as school and home (Engeström in Wardle and Clement 162). This critical transition requires difficult "reconciliation work" (Wenger 160). Because of this reality, "the subject of composition is not only writing but the person who writes, that in changing how they use language students can also change their sense of who they are" (Harris 42).

So, who are our DE FYC students exactly? FYC students are expected to enter our classrooms as *novices*, yet not all recognize this identity construct; for "noviceship is a state all writers potentially inhabit and yet not one that students necessarily recognize they need to inhabit" (Yancey et al. 39). It is this noviceship that makes them eligible for participation in discourse communities as "writing development is predicated on noviceship" (39). This identity transition as students move from outside of a discourse community to *novice* and then active participant within the community and eventually *expert* is the FYC transitional context. The *novice* identity construct in the middle can not be skipped because "[j]ust as the bicyclist must develop a tacit understanding of how to stay upright, novices who seek to participate in specialized traditions must learn the knowledge-in-action out of which the field is constituted" (Applebee 11). These realities position the FYC and the DE FYC classroom specifically as an

ideal, even imperative, identity research site as it is a universally transitional and hyper-

developmental rhetorical space.

Sommers and Saltz speak directly to identity movement of novice to expert over time.

Their longitudinal study of Harvard freshmen reveals two truths: "...freshmen need to see

themselves as novices in a world that demands 'something more and deeper' from their writing

than high school" and "...freshmen build authority not by writing *from* a position of expertise but

by writing *into* expertise" (133-134). Students are often uncomfortable with the uncertainty that

is characteristic of the identity role of *novice,* yet an eventual identity construct of *expert* rests

upon this sequence of moving from *novice* to *expert*. Sommer and Saltz capture both what is

required to move from one identity position to another and what benefits this process affords

student writers:

> ...it involves adopting an open attitude to instruction and feedback, a willingness to
>
> experiment, whether in course selection or paper topics, and a faith that, with practice and
>
> guidance, the new expectations of college can be met. Being a novice allows students to
>
> be changed by what they learn, to have new ideas, and to understand that 'what the
>
> teacher wants' is an essay that reflects these ideas. (134)

Ultimately, what this identity process requires is putting off "old habits" (134). This then allows

an adoption of traits, such as the habits of mind found within the *Framework*, which allows a

student to write "*into* expertise" (134).

Transfer work also engages this aspect of the identity conversation. Kathleen Blake

Yancey, leader in the transfer conversation, and her research colleagues emphasize the need for a

writer to assume the identity construct of *novice* within their work focused on a "Teaching for

Transfer" course design: "their [students'] writing experiences seem more successful if they

identify themselves as *novices* [emphasis added], particularly as they enter college and again as they enter their major… In sum, writing development is predicated on *noviceship* [emphasis added]" (Yancey et al. 37, 39). These identity conversations of novice / expert and transfer are ideally suited for DE identity research, as the institutional context in which DE students are most commonly taking these courses situate them as the "smartest" and the oldest students on campus, which often impacts their actions, their attitudes, and, as I speculate, their identity constructs.

SUMMARY

This review of the literature focused of the topics of DE and identity. I provided a snapshot of the historical influences, such as the birth of AP and IB coursework, that impact our current DE composition classrooms, as well as an overview of the terminology most readily used within these conversations, mainly related to the terms *concurrent* and *dual enrollment*. Then, I contextualized the issues associated with DE through tracing significant aspects of the college readiness debate, such as the weight given to standardized testing scores. I ended the DE section with common topics raised within contemporary conversations: collaboration and access and equity. Within the "Identity" section, I began with an overview of scholarly voices from rhetoric and composition's interdisciplinary heritage, such as Dewey and Freire, and then moved into a discussion of habits of mind as a topic associated with identity and the composition classroom. The 2011 executive summary *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing* reintroduced this topic of habits of mind — arguably akin to Aristotle's, Isocrates', and Quintillian's teachings on character — into our disciplinary conversations with a focus on collaboration and communication. Yet, like all goals related to character, pitfalls exist related to community considerations and assessment. Finally, I ended this literature review with a connection of the topics of DE and identity by looking at identity discussions as they relate to hybrid

environments, like those common to DE contexts. These topics include matters related to

liminality of the DE spaces; instructors; and common labels used to define our student writers,

such as *novice.*

CHAPTER III

STUDY DESIGN AND METHODS

OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

This study was designed to hear from Dual Enrollment (DE) students about their preceptions of themselves as writers. Their unique positionality brought about through the lived experience of simultaenously being both high school and college students has intrigued me since I first began to work within the DE classroom in 2013. This intrigue, fostered by my own experiential knowledge of DE students and the gap in composition research, led to the following research questions[14]: How do dual enrollment composition students perceive themselves as writers? Also, what conflicts do they experience in their self-perceptions as writers in the DE context?

This qualitative study took place throughout the fall semester of 2020, during which the participants were enrolled in a freshmen composition course. I employed ethnographic methods in order to prioritize the participants' voices and to allow for observational data in conjunction with my direct data collection methods of focus groups, interviews, surveys, and reflective

---

[14] These research questions are a final version derived from multiple revisions, dialogue with research mentors, and most importantly data analysis. In August of 2020, my initial research questions were as follows:
> 1) How do dual enrolment students construct their sense of writerly identity?
> 2) To what extent can this sense of development be understood through habits of mind?

They were revised in the dissertation drafting process on August 28, 2021, to pull out the habits of mind, as my primary results did not speak to habits of mind:
> 1) How do dual enrollment composition students describe their identities?
> 2) How do dual enrollment composition students perceive practiced aspects of their writerly identities?

The final version of the questions, the ones you see throughout this dissertation, came in December of 2021, in an effort to better align with the results and to remove the term "writerly identity," which is a complex term within Composition that does not have a consistent definition.

writing samples. I collected data at two main times in the semester: within the first month and in the final two weeks. The timing was to snapshot participants' perceptions of themselves as writers at both the start and end of the DE composition course for points of comparison. At each point, I had a verbal and a written data collection method in order to allow for direct data points that could be triangulated in data analysis. At the start of the course, participants were given a survey focused on how the participants perceived certain habits of mind as an integrated aspect of who they are as writers, as habits of mind was an integral part of my original research questions (see footnote on previous page). Also, within the first month of the study, three focus groups occurred, designed with more open-ended questions to provide verbal insight into student preceptions of who they are as writers and what experiences contribute to these perceptions.

Within the final two weeks, I conducted interviews, focused on reflective questions that reminded students of their voiced perceptions of who they were as writers at the start of the course and asked them to assess if those descriptions are still accurate to how they perceive themselves as writers at the course's end. These interview conversations connected to both research questions in the participants' relaying of their perceptions of who they are as writers, as well as experiential conflicts that relate to the nature of the DE context. I also looked at their final writing assignment, a reflective essay they couple with a portfolio of their selected writings that they feel captures the improvements and challenges they encountered as writers. This data collection method offered written insight into their perceptions of themselves as writers and the conflicts they encountered throughout the DE experience. Lastly, as a source of indirect data, I recorded observations throughout the semester in an effort to maintain an ethnographer's stance throughout the data collection process. These observations also allowed for indirect data of the participants' perceptions of themselves as writers with the classroom community context and of

their experience as writers alongside other DE writers. I will provide a more detailed discussion of the data collection methods later in this chapter.

While these data collection methods were not dramatically altered as a result of the pilot study, it is worth noting at this point the details of the pilot study, as well as some of the changes it did evoke. The pilot study was conducted in a condensed version in April and May of 2020. DE students (different from those in the actual study) who were concurrently high school seniors were involved. The biggest difference between the study's intended plan and the pilot study that occurred is that the pilot study had to take place completely at a distance because of the pandemic's impact and the resulting protocols. Harville Academy, like nearly every other school in America, shifted in late March 2020 to an entirely virtual campus. Students and faculty utilized Canvas as the Learning Management System and conducted digital synchronous interactions, both individually and collectively, via Google Meets. So, all focus groups and interviews were conducted through Google Meets as well, as the participants were comfortable with the platform. All written artifacts were also collected in a digital format through Canvas.

I made two major changes to the "Experimental Procedures" section of the study design after analyzing the pilot study results. I shifted the methodology from *action research case study* to a qualitative study employing *ethnographic methods*. This change was to ultimately shift the focus of the study to be on participants rather than the implementation of change elements to the classroom environment. This allowed me to adopt an ethnographer's stance and add observations into the data collection methods. This change in methodology also allowed me to avoid the rhetorical acrobatics necessary to marry the methodologies of *action research* and *case study,* as there are no existing studies within the field of rhetoric and composition that I could find with such a methodological approach.

My second change was to the methods: I changed the *optional student reflective journal* to a *researcher observational notebook*. This was based on participant feedback from the pilot study that no student would likely engage with an optional journal or the encouragement of such could limit students signing up to participate, as it would appear as "just more work." The *researcher observational journal* allowed me to document the participants' perceptions as they were relayed through responses to an array of factors, such as texts and discussions as well as other DE students. It also allowed for indirect data noting shifts in self-perceptions and contextual challenges experienced throughout the semester (see Figure 1 on pg. 86 for template). Finally, it also allowed me to note casual and impromptu happenings and participant quotes that did not occur within the boundaries of the already established data collection methods (discussed in detail later in this chapter).

Other changes were minimal and did not warrant IRB application changes. For example, questions involving rating themselves on a scale of 1 to 10 as writers, community members, and readers occasionally prompted clarification as to what constitutes a 1 or 10 (see appendix C and D for focus group and interview questions). I chose not to over-determine the participants' responses by providing descriptors as to what constitutes the numerical response because I always asked for them to follow-up with a justification of their rating. This provided more insight into their mental processes used in the perceptions of themselves as writers. So, I made personal notes but chose not to change the wording in those questions.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

I sought to elevate students' self-perceptions as writers, for these perceptions often drive their academic actions and ultimately create, at least to a degree, the circumstances of their academic situation. For example, if a student writer perceives themself as a weak writer who is

unable to clearly relay ideas important to them, they can become hesitant to complete

assignments, which can jeopardize their learning and consequently their grade. Regardless of

reality — for they may in fact have strong writing potential — their perception of themselves as

a writer can ultimately carve out the boundaries of their growth (See Lakoff and Johnson's

linkage of perceptions and behavior 35-40[15]).

SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVIST APPROACH

The above snapshot of the student whose perceptions of themself as a weak writer, which

consequently impacts their reality for their composition coursework, reflects my interpretive

framework for this project: social constructivism. While a student's perceptions play a large role

in constructing their reality, those perceptions are not solely the result of their own internal

reflections. The student's perceptions of themself as a writer are, at least in part, socially

constructed, likely through teacher and peer feedback as well as teacher-assigned grades among

other influencial factors. It is the sequence of these social experiences that have impacted the

student's perceptions of their writing and ultimately their self as writer.

While social constructivism is not a philosophical framework unique to composition, it

has long been a field-embedded approach to inquiry since the social turn in the 1980s, when

compositionists began to publicly acknowledge that "thinking and language use can never occur

free of a social context that conditions them" (Bizzell 217). This connection allowed for an

interdisciplinary usage of Vygotsky's developmental theories. In short, Vygotsky claimed that

"[k]nowledge is not simply constructed, it is co-constructed," a belief that evolved into social

constructivism ("Education Theory"). Barbara Everson, a secondary teacher consultant for the

---

[15] Lakoff and Johnson argue that we act according to our perceptions, mainly our metonymic perceptions in which we see just a part of something or someone (ie. Their face). Our metonymic structures that drive our perceptions are "grounded in our experience" and impact "not just our language but our thoughts, attitudes, and actions" (39).

Clemson Writing Project, reminds teacher-scholars that "[m]ost of what he [Vygotsky] found in his research speaks directly to some aspect of writing instruction… Writing teachers must recognize this interplay of inner voices and social contexts that are ever combining to form written discourse" (11). It is this "interplay of inner voices and social contexts" that I sought to prioritize within my approach to inquiry in this research project.

Researchers relying upon a social constructivist framework "seek understanding of the world… [and] the specific contexts… in which people live and work" (Creswell 24-25). My primary inquiry led me to inquire into the specific contexts in which my DE students "live and work," mainly their physical location daily on a high school campus while they are being asked to do college work through their concurrent enrollment status. This initial inquiry evolved into the stated research questions regarding students' self-perceptions and possible conflicts experienced within a DE context. My social constructivist framework helped me to maintain a consistent focus on "the complexity of views" that participants offered of their lived experiences, which are "negotiated socially and historically" (24-25). Ultimately, a social constructivist framework allowed me to approach the collected data inductively, allowing ideas to emerge through the participants giving voice to the kairotic situatedness of their first semester of DE composition.

RATIONALE FOR ETHNOGRAPHIC METHODS

Upon conception of my research ideas, I knew that qualitative research was definitely the route with which I intended to pursue my research goals related to student identity. This was primarily in opposition to the neoliberal tendency to reduce students to standardized test scores. Yet, to employ ethnographic methods for this research project was not such a simple decision. In fact, I had at one point decided upon the case study and then even tried to marry action research

with case study in an effort to accurately capture and then textually represent the lives of my student participants. However, all my methodological research made one limitation clear: it is, in fact, impossible to provide a truly accurate representation of the context in which my participants live and work as the material, social, and ideological contexts are compromised once they are appropriated into institutionally-negotiated modes of discourse, such as a formal ethnographic report (Herndl 320-322).

This limitation of qualitative studies, such as ethnographies, was similarly argued by James Clifford: "... how is unruly experience transformed into an authoritative written account? How, precisely, is a garrulous overdetermined, cross cultural encounter shot through with power relations and personal cross purposes circumscribed as an adequate version of a more-or-less discrete 'other world' composed by an individual author?" (120). Yet, in spite of this limitation, I continued to return to ethnographic methods. The ethnographies that I had read, such as Lindquist's *A Place to Stand: Politics and Persuasion in a Working Class Bar*, were captivating in that they relayed the experiences of their participants in a manner in which they had a voice, seemingly apart from the researcher's. Their voices and their very lives had power to force perspective and to encourage empathy. And while every ethnography does undoubtedly fall short of fulfilling the lofty goal of providing "an adequate version of a more-or-less discrete 'other world,'" ethnographers still engage in such research projects.

While an ethnographic approach would require me to grapple with the above limitations related to power and institutional-discourse expectations, the affordances related to participant agency solidified my commitment to ethnographic methods. Herndl and Nahrwold argue that too many research agendas are governed by a traditional framework of "philosophical paradigms," which is how researchers perpetuate systems of inequity and further divide access to power.

They argue for a careful selection of "research practices organized to their relationship to social power rather than abstract paradigms" (258). This focus is compelled by an exigency related to social needs in Herndl and Nahrwold's push to embrace qualitative research, such as ethnography, as social practice that aims to disrupt power structures and to restore agency to students and local communities. This perspective resonated with my research project: to prioritize student agency through elevating their self-perceptions. Further, Sullivan and Porter also argue for disruptive methodologies connected to social action, but from the unique rhetorical situatedness of each chosen methodology: "Methodology is not merely a means to something else, it is itself an intervening in social action and a participation in human events. It is itself an act of rhetoric, both with our participants in research studies and with our colleagues in a given research field" (13). Yet again, I found a rationale I could relate to as a researcher intent upon humanizing student participants through voiced experiential data focused on self-perceptions, a goal which contrasts with the commodification of students caught within the educational pipeline of K-16 education.

Ethnographic methods, rooted in as a social-epistemic rhetoric, allow me to situate this study's results within a broader context of the DE classroom as a part of our current democratic society. Katz claims that "ethnographers... [can] appreciate that whatever site they study is an artificially bounded fragment of a larger social reality" ("On the Rhetoric and Politics" 299). In this case, the "larger social reality" is the neoliberal backdrop of the educational culture of DE, a culture that is understudied within rhetoric and composition. This gap within our disciplinary conversations creates an exigency for "…ethnographers to complete the picture… [as the ethnographic] researcher enters to make a connection with people the imagined reader has… been shielded from encountering" (Katz "Extended Warrants" 266, 259). As one situated within

this "picture" of DE, I am uniquely positioned to build a connection between my "imagined reader[s]," the scholar-practitioners of rhetoric and composition, and those whom they have largely "been shielded from encountering." Ethnography is, after all, "also a set of social and historical practices located in institutions" (Rainbow 9 as qtd. in Herndl 327). As the instructor of the DE course in which this study occurs, I am embedded within the social and historical practices of my research site. It is for these reasons that I chose ethnographic methods to undergird this qualitative study.

No matter what methodological approach a researcher may select, a level of flexibility and a reflexive approach are necessary (Sullivan and Porter 186; Sheridan 82). Much of the research in rhetoric and composition is looking at human experiences, which ultimately yields a level of unpredictability and uncertainty because each human is a rhetorical embodiment of any number of shifting identity constructs (Restaino and Maute 72). These identities, many of which are co-constructed by the world and others, are often distinguishable only through a reflexive stance towards one's self as researcher as well as towards the participants and their sharing of their experiences.

I am claiming "Surrender," as introduced by Restaino and Maute, as a reflexive method of this qualitative study ("Surrender as Method"). Any study dealing with people demands a level of surrender to the emergence of new ideas, to research questions made null or redirected, and ultimately to emotional connectivity between researcher and research participants as creating unforeseen biases. For true patterns to emerge and valuable conclusions to be reached, surrender must be at the forefront, guiding the study into a natural progression that might yield genuine responses and impactful results. Similarly, Sullivan and Porter claim that methodologies need to be reflexive and flexible in order to fit the given research text or situation (70; Yin 63). No

researcher can know the full boundaries of a study or can fully account for participant reactions and commitment. Thusly, "Surrender," comprised of reflexivity and flexibility, is the only sure method available to me as an identity researcher.

Ethnographic research, specifically, requires an acute awareness of context that necessitates reflexivity. Jack Katz, sociology professor at UCLA, argues the following:

Ethnography is distinguished from other forms of social research by the constant interaction of method and substance… the ethnographer eagerly changes questions and angles of observation depending on what has been learned and where curiosity leads. When done well, the ethnographers' data can be seamlessly informative about the social life under study. But that requires a reflexive shift to examine how the ethnographer's methods and experiences took shape in response to recurrent features of the scenes studied. ("Ethnography's Expanding Warrants" 269-270)

This excerpt could also be a declaration that reflexivity is required not just on the part of the researcher, but also by disciplinary readers of any ethnographic discourse in order to "examine how the ethnographer's methods and experiences took shape in response to the recurrent features of the scenes studied." In short, both an ethnographer and readers of ethnography need to practice a reflexive stance in order to maintain an awareness of contextual shifts.

While reflexivity is a discursive practice that could seemingly be infinite, every study does need an exit point and a write-up in order to bring sustainable value to our discipline, so I must hold lightly this flexibility and must always keep the research goals and agenda in sight. This balanced approach of flexible and reflexive while also focused and planned is especially important when the research topic is something as personal and vulnerable as identity, such as in

this research project. The study design laid out below is the plan that I used in order to establish and maintain focus.

STUDY DESIGN

SETTINGS: IDEOLOGICAL, MATERIAL, AND INSTITUTIONAL DESCRIPTIONS

Harville Academy. The DE FYC course under study is offered at Harville Academy[16], a "non-denominational private Christian [K-12] school" that is still relatively young at only twenty-two years old ("Who We Are"). It is home to approximately 1,200 students and has had great success in Chattanooga, Tennessee, winning "Best of the Best" eight out of the last nine years as well as being named a "Best Christian Workplace" in 2017 by the Best Christian Workplaces Institute ("Fast Facts"; "Employment Opportunities"). With class sizes with an average of seventeen students per teacher, students are given ready access to their teacher(s), as well as a myriad of support services, such as the math lab, the Writing Center, and the Learning Center where students can get tutoring in any subject. The school also boasts many trendy initiatives like the Outdoor Education Initiative SOAR, through which students can participate in classes outdoors, take outdoor electives, and experience outdoor activities; a STEAM initiative, complete with a competitive Robotics team and several engineering courses; and a technology initiative, which mandates that all high school students have a personal tablet or laptop to enhance learning experiences ("Outdoor Education"). In the following chapter, I discuss the institutional context of Harville Academy in more detail.

Lee University. Prior to 2016, Harville Academy had offered DE composition courses on their secondary campus through the local community college, Chattanooga State Community College. However, the decision was made to move the DE partnership to Lee University because

---

[16] The name of the institution has been changed as a means of ensuring confidentiality for the participants of this study.

Harville and Lee ideologically align in their religious mission statements and institutional goals.

Also, many of the Harville graduates were already considering Lee for their college education, so

it seemed like a natural fit. Harville Academy has partnered with Lee University, "one of the

largest Christ-centered private institutions in Tennessee, and the largest in the Appalachian

College Association," for DE courses since the fall semester of 2016 ("About Lee University").

The FYC course under study in this research project is made possible on Harville's campus

through this partnership.

Lee University, founded in 1918, has a longstanding relationship with the Church of God

movement, a Holiness Pentacostal Christian denomination. In fact, Lee's campus is located in

Cleveland, Tennessee, which is the international headquarters for the entire denomination

("Church of God International Offices"). This relationship, of course, ideologically impacts the

mission statement of the institution:

> We seek to provide education that integrates biblical truth as revealed in the Holy
>
> Scriptures with truth discovered through the study of arts and sciences and in the practice
>
> of various professions. A personal commitment to Jesus Christ as Savior is the
>
> controlling perspective from which our educational enterprise is carried out. The
>
> foundational purpose of all educational programs at Lee is to develop within the students
>
> knowledge, appreciation, understanding, ability, and skills which will prepare them for
>
> responsible Christian living in a complex world. ("Our Mission")

This mission statement is operationalized in a myriad of ways, from mandatory chapel

attendances to required Bible classes. In fact, each Lee graduate receives a minor in religion

("Lee University"). All curriculum and instruction is also required to maintain biblical

integration, as the classroom observation form has a section for "Comments on the Integration of Faith and Learning."

One of the major marketing points for Lee University is the price tag. For the academic year 2020-2021, their tuition and fees were around $20,000, comparably making it an affordable private university. In 2021, they were #13 in the "Best Value Schools" rankings by *U.S. News and World Report* ("Lee University"). Lee's website boasts that "many students find Lee comparable to top-tier state institutions. Given the fact that 23 percent of our students are first-generation college attendees, and 42 percent of our students qualify for the Pell Grant, we are confident that you can afford your Lee education no matter what your situation" ("Afford Your Education"). This statement highlights the material connections to state and federal money, impacting the overall affordability of Lee University. The DE students in this study were able to benefit from this affordability through the DE Grant, made possible through Tennessee lottery money ("Dual Enrollment Grant").

No part of this research study took place on the physical campus of Lee University, as the DE course is on Harville's campus and COVID-19 precautions lifted the campus connection requirement that Lee typically maintains for all DE students. This campus connection is usually met through tours of the physical library and/or attendance at a Lee event, such as a play or an English department event like a book-to-movie screening and discussion. The above institutional description is, therefore, limited in scope as the physical campus was not a material part of this study.

PARTICIPANTS

Researcher. Ethnographers bear the burden of trying to sort out where the research and the researcher begin and end. As such, my goal in this chapter is to make transparent, as much as

possible, my epistemological and axiological orientations and, in doing so, to disclose, as much as possible, the "rhetoric and politics of [my] discourse" as it is represented within this ethnographic report (Herndl 320). I have been an employee at Harville Academy, the site on which this study occurs, since August of 2011. I have taught the DE composition courses at Harville Academy since fall of 2013. From 2013 to 2016, I taught these FYC courses as an adjunct instructor at Chattanooga State Community College. In 2016, Harville moved our DE partnership to Lee University, a move of which I was a proponent. I encouraged the Academic Dean to consider this shift as the rigor of the FYC curriculum through Chattanooga State did not adequately equip many of our students for the universities where they later attended. My conclusion regarding the curricular rigor was arrived at through informal conversations with alumni at various institutions like New York University, the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, and Samford University.

The overlap between the research site and my professional appointment positions me as both an insider, as a Harville instructor within the classroom under study, and an outsider, since I am not a DE student. Yet, Nancy Naples, in her feminst perspective on the insider/outsider debate, claims that "... as ethnographers we are never fully outside or inside the 'community'... [because] 'Outsiderness' or 'insiderness' are not fixed or static positions, rather they are ever shifting and permeable social locations that are differentially experienced" (103, 84). In order to maintain an awareness of this fluidity of positionality, I sought to use physical locations in order to establish my social roles with the participants. When I was in the classroom, I was their instructor. When I was interacting with them in the halls or in the writing center outside of an appointment, I was a mentor or, as one participant described me, a "teacher friend." When I was conducting focus groups or interviews, I was the researcher of this study. While the boundary

lines were not as clear cut as these few sentences portray, physical location did help me maintain a reflexive awareness of my multiple roles within this study.

To address validity threats, it is necessary to directly state that this study is undergirded with my own biases, which are influenced by my participation in a setting similar to the one under study. My own K-12 schooling was in a private Christian school, much smaller yet ideologically similar to the institutional contexts within this study. This background, coupled with my positionality within this study, forces me to engage on some level the ideological dimensions of the study, even though they are not the focus of the research questions (Herndl 323). This engagement is perhaps evident in this written discourse, which is, at least on some subconscious level, produced "according to a detailed logic governed not simply by empirical reality but by a battery of desires, repressions, investments, and projections" (Said 8). My familiarity and engagement with this ideological collision of education and religion is, I would argue, an affordance to this study, as I am equipped to both speak and decode the religious jargon employed by students in this religious educational setting.

As a further means of enhancing the validity of my data, I engaged in "intensive, long-term involvement" with my participants and the DE context under study (Maxwell 126). I had a "sustained presence… in the setting studied," as I was both in the DE classroom three times a week with the participants and on the physical campus with them five days a week (126). While the temporality of this qualitative study was only a semester, my involvment with the DE context spans nearly a decade and involves a partnership with two different collegiate institutions. Also, to ensure validity of my evidence collected, I sought "rich data" in order to effectively triangulate the data during analysis (127). For example, rather than simply recording notes during focus groups and interviews, I recorded the sessions so that I could have "verbatim

transcripts" of this data (127). I also strove for "rich data" by collecting both written and verbal data at two distinct points in the semester: in September, when students are not as familiar with me, and then again in December, once we had established a relationship as both instructor and researcher. While these accounts of my inherent biases, sustained involvement, and rich data do not account for all validity threats to this qualitative study, I believe they do demonstrate validity as a key goal and focus on my part as a transparent researcher.

Students. My research participants were DE composition students within my own DE FYC course. In order to take the DE composition course, students were required to score at least a 21 on the ACT and have been provisionally accepted at Lee University, our partner institution, upon starting the course in August of 2020. As I interact with many students throughout grades 6-12 via my role in Harville's Writing Center, the DE students and I were able to begin the semester with a level of familiarity and trust. The small class size of just fifteen students also aided in the relational quality typical of Harville Academy. The trend of this college preparatory high school is that most, if not all, students will attend four-year institutions following their senior year. Most of these DE students were highly motivated by grades and were driven to complete all course assignments at an above average level. A snapshot of each participant is provided in the following chapter.

COURSE DESCRIPTION

The ENGL 106 course is the fall semester FYC course offered through our DE partnership. The course description at the time of this study in fall of 2020 read as follows: "A writing course in which students develop strategies for thinking critically, reading analytically, and writing rhetorically informed prose. Students will analyze and compose a variety of texts for diverse rhetorical situations with the goal of developing a recursive, transferable writing process

suitable to academic writing" (see Appendix A for fall 2020 syllabus). This course description is actualized with a level of difference according to the instructor, as Lee University has traditionally required all English faculty to teach a section of FYC. This means that even faculty who hold graduate degrees in literature are instructing in these composition courses, which fosters a rather diverse approach to the implementation of the above course description. Further, differences in the implementation of the course description are impacted by location, as ENGL 106 is offered on at least two off-campus DE locations: Bradley County High School, which is the public high school in the same city as Lee University, and Harville Academy, which is in the neighboring city of Chattanooga and is the site of this research study.

The course description, as it is implemented on the Harville Academy site, fosters a multiplicity in student identity as the purpose of this course is to encourage students to see themselves firstly as critical thinkers and active readers and then as responsive writers. At the start of the semester, students are presented with an "Intellectual Engagement" contract, which was adapted from an instructor at Lee University's main campus (see Appendix F). This contract details certain actionable items that correlate to the above identity constructs of "thinker," "reader," and "writer," as well as situating the DE students as "community member[s]." Students are asked to consider the contract in August and sign if they feel they are able. Then, in late November, the students are asked to return to these identity categories and to reflect upon their development in each role in their final reflective essay (see Appendix E).

This ENGL 106 course was updated in fall 2019 to implement a textbook change from *The Sundance Reader* (7th ed.), which focuses on modes of writing, to *They Say, I Say: Academic Moves that Matter* (4th ed.)*,* a book focused on providing students with writing templates for the purpose of demystifying rhetorical moves common to academic writing. The

textbook presents Burke's metaphorical parlor as a broader context for student writing. The major essays required within this course were also updated to reflect academic and rhetorical writing in smaller, learned steps. Students move through "they say" in the first half of the course by writing an annotated bibliography and a literature review and then into "I say" in the second half of the course through a critique and a problem-solution proposal. While much of the course is determined by the Director of Composition at Lee University, I am given autonomy to adapt the essays and grade distribution as needed for our DE context (see Appendix B for full syllabus). This has allowed for the addition of reflective assignments, both formal and informal.

DATA COLLECTION TIMELINE

The intended timeline for my study is listed in table 1. However, after three months of virtual learning at the end of the previous spring semester, the return to campus was more unnerving than any of us could have anticipated. The school was following the city's mask mandate, so none of us could really see each other's faces. All desks were arranged in table pods of four with Lexan, akin to plexiglass, between them and students were in mandatory seating charts in all classes all year. After every class, students had to wipe down their desk with a Clorox wipe. There was also directional tape and stickers on all floors directing one-way foot traffic. All students and faculty were required to complete a daily health report through the Ascend app. There were also cameras in every classroom to allow quarantined students and students who opted for virtual learning to view each class.

Initial Timeline	Action Items
August 2020	- Consent and Assent Forms - Survey
September 2020	- Focus Groups - Initial Interviews with volunteer students
December 2020	- Final Interviews with 6 students - Closing Reflective Writing Assignment: Reflective Essay
Option: May 2021	- Final Interviews with 6 students - Closing Reflective Writing Assignment: Reflective Essay
*August 2020-December 2020 (Option: through May 2020)	Researcher Field Notes

Table 1: Initial Timeline for Data Collection

The cumulative result of these physical alterations to our learning environment was a collective anxiety about even being in the same physical space. A place in which students largely felt at home, as some had been attending Harville since preschool, was suddenly sterilized and felt rigid to say the least. Because of this anxiety, one DE student opted to switch to fully virtual after a week on campus. For these reasons, I opted to adjust the survey date to early September to allow students a little more time to adjust before asking for participation assent forms. I also waited until late in September to conduct focus groups. Lastly, I reflexively chose not to continue data collection through May 2021, an option I had built into the study's initial design. This was for two reasons: I felt I had enough data by the end of the study in December 2020 and the student participants were struggling to stay engaged with normal academic and social life because of the daily obstacles of campus life during a pandemic.

The biggest change in the initial timeline involved interviews. I did not conduct the initial interviews with six students in September because the students who committed to participate in focus groups and interviews were largely the same, so collecting information from the same participants in the same month would likely be redundant. I also wound up interviewing only four students in December. These four students piqued my interest throughout the semester as they seemed to function as two case studies: Timothy and Chrissy, a dating couple who did not take Honors English in their junior year, and Sheldon and Heather, close friends and academic accountability partners who did take Honors English 11. Each participant had demonstrated openness and honesty throughout the course as they engaged with each other and with me in class discussion and in the writing process. This gave me confidence that they would be more likely to engage openly and honestly in a final interview. The actualized timeline of the study's events is in table 2 below.

Actualized Timeline	Action Items
August 2020	● Consent and Assent Forms
September 2020	● Surveys ● Focus Groups (9/29)
December 2020	● Final Interviews with 4 students (12/8-12/10) ● Closing Reflective Writing Assignment: Reflective Essay
August 2020-December 2020	● Researcher Field Notes

Table 2: Actualized Timeline for Data Collection

DATA COLLECTION METHODS

I chose the below qualitative data collection methods for three reasons. First, my ethnographic research goal was to highlight the lived experiences of the participants as I sought answers to my research questions regarding their perceptions. To that end, I sought to collect both direct and indirect data that captured these perceptions through multiple sources, which would allow me to validate my data through triangulation of the data during the analysis phase (discussed in the next section) (Bishop 13). Secondly, I chose the data collection methods of surveys, focus groups, interviews, and artifact sampling because they seemed to be the most appropriate to my research questions focused on collecting participants' self-perceptions related to themselves as writers and possible challenges resulting from the DE context. The focus groups and interviews would allow for verbal self-perceptions at different points in the semester, while the surveys and artifacts would provide written snapshots, also at different points in the semester. Lastly, my ethnographer's stance prompted me to include observations as a source of indirect data that would allow for social context and possible experiential factors that span more than one participant. In short, these data collection methods allowed me to collect data from multiple points in the semester and through methods that would allow for both direct and indirect data related to the participants' perceptions of themselves as evolving writers in the DE context. Each data collection method I employed is snapshotted below.

The specifics of the data collection methods below, most directly the survey, were framed through the language of the habits of mind, as they are laid out in the collaborative executive summary, the *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing.* While the intention behind my initial research questions was to gain an organic perspective on DE composition students' perceptions of their identity constructs, implementing language from the *Framework* as it defines

specific habits of mind allowed me to generate language to design focus group, survey, and interview questions that are relevant to rhetoric and composition scholarship and discussions. These eight habits of mind also gave students a framework for their reflective assignments that were collected as artifacts for this study. So, while the habits of mind are no longer an integrated aspect of my research questions, they were a part of my study design as it derived from my initial research questions, which had a greater focus on habits of mind. Even the data collection questions that did embed habits of mind ultimately provided a launching point for conversation with participants that led to their perceptions of themselves as writers and their experiences in the DE composition classroom, which became the focus of my revised research questions as they are represented above.

Focus Groups. I conducted three focus groups on September 29. The groups were arranged and scheduled according to participants' schedules throughout the school day. The first focus group was conducted in the DE classroom with only two students, one of whom was joining via Google Meets for medical reasons. The other two focus groups were conducted in the choir room, as it was an available space that day. The second focus group, the shortest discussion, had three students who did not spend much time together outside of class. The last focus group had two participants who were lively and willing to engage in discussion. All participants were typically hesitant to be the first to respond but were willing to answer every question after the first participant proffered a response. In total, I have 54 minutes and 47 seconds of focus group discussion time with the nine student participants.

The focus group questions were written in an open-ended manner to engage discussion. For example, in the second question, after asking about their deciding factors for chosing DE Composition in their senior year, I asked them to describe themselves as students with a follow-

up question to describe themselves as writers more specifically (see appendix C for more focus group questions). In several questions, I asked the students to describe components of their writing process in order to give participants an opportunity to divulge aspects of their perceptions of themselves as writers through their writing practice. These questions asked them first about their writing process for English assignments and then for other disciplinary assignments. Other questions were more direct in asking participants to describe themselves as students (#2) or to rank themselves as writers on a scale of 1 to 10 (#8).

Surveys. All participants completed the survey (see Appendix B for full survey) via Google Forms in early September, roughly three weeks into the semester. Within the survey questions, I utilized the definitions for each of the eight habits of mind as they appear on the *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing,* aligning with my research questions as they were written at the start of the study. In the first survey question, for example, I asked the participant to respond to the following definition for *curiosity* as it might apply to them as a DE student writer: "I desire to know more about the world." I opted to use the definitions rather than naming the traits to allow for consistency in term definitions across participants. This also allowed me to break apart each definition into its individual parts as different questions for potential coding purposes. For example, *flexibility* is most simply defined in the *Framework* as "the ability to adapt to situations, expectations, or demands" (5). I broke this apart in the survey questions into three questions: 1) I can adapt to any learning situation, 2) I can adapt to different teachers' expectations, and 3) I can adapt to the demands of any course (#16-18).

I wrote survey answer options according to the Likert scale as the primary psychometric scale utilized for measuring attitudes (McLeod). My response options were as follows: "Always, Very Often, Sometimes, Rarely, Never." I selected these five options utilizing a Likert scale to

allow for some level of nuanced difference in participant perceptions as they relate to the survey questions. I also chose the Likert scale for the survey question responses because Denecker also utilized a Likert scale for many of her student survey questions, and she was able to unpack her survey results without any statistical work, a move I intended to follow in my own study in order to maintain a focus on the participants' perceptions (*Toward Seamless Transition* 225-228). Other measurement instruments that look at dispositions and participant perceptions — Konrath et al.'s Interpersonal Reactivity Index and Piazza and Siebert's Writing Disposition Scale — also employ Likert scales (Johnson 531; Konrath et al. 185; Piazza & Siebert 279). This gave me confidence in using the Likert scale as a means of capturing my participants' perceptions of their dispositions as writers.

Interviews. I conducted semi-structured one-on-one interviews (see Appendix D for interview questions) with four students at the end of the semester, yielding a total of 93 minutes and 45 seconds of interview time. These four students all participated in the survey at the beginning of the semester, and three participated in the focus groups (Sheldon opted out of focus groups). I selected these four students because the data collected throughout the semester from these participants were rich and provided differing perspectives related to my research questions. Each of the interviews took place on campus: three in the guidance office and one in our DE classroom. The locations for the interviews were selected simply based on available space, as COVID protocols resulted in very limited availability of physical space on campus at any given time.

I designed the interview questions in such a way as to allow me to adapt the wording of some questions to include summaries of their responses to focus group questions in September. For example, one interview question from Timothy's interview was worded as follows: "At the

beginning of the semester, you described yourself as someone who tried 'to make an effort to get stuff done in a good way.' How would you describe yourself now as a student?" For each interview, I would sub in the participant's unique response from the focus group in September. However, Sheldon's interview was different since he did not participate in the focus groups. I adapted each question to ask him to consider himself from beginning of semester to end more generally. For example, his version of the same question as Timothy's above read as follows: "How would you describe yourself as a student? Do you feel like you are a different student now than at the beginning of the semester?"

Wording the interview questions in a way that allowed students to hear their perceptions of themselves as writers in their own voice from the beginning of the semester allowed participants to respond in such a way that could provide data related to either of my research questions. It allowed me a more complete picture of the potential development in their perceptions from September to December, aligning with my first research question. Also, the "semi-structured" nature of the interviews allowed for impromptu follow-up questions or supporting anecdotes, which gave them an opportunity to address conflicts they encountered throughout the semester as they relate to their self-perceptions. For example, Timothy described to me his struggles with time management, an issue he saw as integral to aspects of his self-perceived failure, most commonly related to his grades. This response led to his demonstration of the Eisenhower scheduling tool he began using near the end of the semester. He even pulled out a version of his weekly schedule which utilizes this tool.

Writing Samples. To triangulate data collected directly from participants, I collected the final reflective assignments for the course. Within the final course assignment, I ask students to

reflect upon one of their first assignments, personal mission statements[17]: one for their senior

year and one for their life after high school. These mission statements are informal and low

stakes, as they are graded largely for a completion homework grade. Before completing the

assignment, each student was to read the *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing*.

While this executive summary is written for an instructor audience, the assigned reading was an

effort to be open about expectations for college writers (see Thaiss and Zawacki 142-144) to

consider the eight habits of mind: curiosity, openness, engagement, creativity, persistence,

responsibility, flexibility, and metacognition. This was an attempt to invite students to be

intentional in building a collegiate identity construct from the beginning of the semester.

 The final assignment of this FYC course was a reflective essay that required students to

revisit their personal mission statements as well as the intellectual engagement contract from

August. This contract is another attempt to be explicit about the collegiate expectations for the

course in terms of assumed identity roles, both personal and communal, and associated tasks.

The role of reader, writer, thinker, and community member are listed with actionable items such

as "substantially revise their work during each major assignment," "engage in rhetorical

reading… to synthesize the ideas," and "take responsibility for the… productivity of each class

session… by listening, engaging, and sometimes challenging the ideas being discussed" (see

Appendix F for the full contract). Several of the habits of mind, such as responsibility and open-

mindedness, are included in this contract as well, again connecting to the original research

---

[17] Details for the personal mission statement assignment are as follows: "As you are beginning your senior year, it is important to pause and reflect on where you want to be at the end of the year as well as who you want to be by then…develop two specific mission statements for yourself: 1) A Personal Mission Statement for your senior year and 2) A Personal Mission Statement that expands beyond the year." Write a paragraph for each detailing your rationale behind each statement." The students are given a couple articles to read with sample personal mission statements and are asked to look at the habits of mind embedded with the *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing*.

questions that launched this study. The students are not required to sign it but are encouraged to consider each item and their willingness to engage in the classroom community in these ways. All participants in this study did sign the contract.

Using these starting artifacts, alongside their written work from the semester, the DE students were to reflect upon and then discuss in 600-800 words their improvements, challenges, and future applications of learned skills and developing mindsets. They were asked to "think about the process of writing and the effort, or craft, of your compositions… [and] to record/document the most important concepts you have learned about writing and about yourself as a writer during this class" (see Appendix E). These final reflective writing samples provided me with written self-perceptions of their growth as writers to couple with the verbal perceptions from interviews. Since they were given time to revise and edit these reflective assignments, they brought a different participant voice and self-perception to the data.

Researcher Observational Notebook. While the data collection methods detailed above involve students formally engaging with the study's data, the researcher observational notebook

Date: _____

Participant: _____
      **Names will be changed in study's write-up

Description of Activity:
      **Examples: Class Discussion, In-Class/Out-of-Class Informal Writing Activity,
      Reading Response

Initial Observation:
      **Examples: Body Language, Change in Verbal or Written language

Figure 1: Template for Researcher Observational Notebook

allowed me as the ethnographer to record indirect data, mainly interesting participant exchanges or behaviors as they occurred, mostly within the confines of our class time. For example, I recorded aspects of a conversation among four DE students about GenZ vs. millenial humor, a conversation that I was invited directly into by the end. This indrectly provided insights about participant perceptions of social identity related to a non-academic topic, humor. Observations not occurring within the classroom took place in the Writing Center, which I direct. One participant, for example, served as a Student Director in the Writing Center, so we spent a lot of time together and had many discussions about her plans for college. I had twenty-one entries by the end of the semester, most of which were focused on two participants: Sheldon and Heather. This was the reason I invited both to be a part of the final interviews. A template for my notebook entries is in figure 1.

DATA ANALYSIS AND METADATA ACTIVITIES

Pre-Coding Process. After transcriptions were completed, I had to decide how to format the data corpus for analysis. As Gee, Michaels, and O'Connor remind qualitative researchers, "[f]ormatting choices are a part of the analysis and may reveal or conceal aspects of meaning and intent," so I wanted to give this part of the pre-coding process diligent consideration (240). I opted to keep all data collected for the analysis and to manually code the corpus. So, I printed all transcripts for focus groups and interviews as well as the writing samples in landscape orientation with double-spaced text and wide margins on both sides of the text for coding notes (Saldana 17-19). I also printed the survey results in both pie charts and as a spreadsheet in order to maximize possible perspectives on that data. This all went into a binder, which became my focus for February through April of 2021. I read through all the data before beginning first cycle

coding, highlighted any interesting quotes, and got my initial thoughts down through an analytic memo.

      First Cycle Coding. Once my pre-coding process was complete, I established a couple baseline codes that would be helpful with any coding method. I used "N/A" as a marginal code for chunks of transcribed data not relevant to my research questions or data that was merely smalltalk. I also coded significant quotes from the ones I had highlighted in my preliminary reading of the data in the pre-coding process by writing "key quote" in the margin. Then, I proceeded through first cycle coding using in-vivo coding and initial coding as my primary coding methods.

      I opted for these coding methods for first cycle coding for a few reasons. First, my foremost research goal was to "prioritize and honor the participant[s'] voice[s]," for which in-vivo coding is perfectly befitted as it "ground[s] the analysis in their perspectives" (Saldana 106, 71). Secondly, I needed a coding method that would be a good fit for this qualitative study with ethnographic methods "with a wide variety of data forms," for which initial coding is well suited (115). Similarly, "In-vivo coding is particularly useful in educational ethnographies with youth," validating the addition of this coding choice for the age demographics of my participants (106). Thirdly, both in-vivo coding and initial coding rely upon, at least in part, instinctual knowledge, something I felt confident I could trust with my years of experience in the classroom with secondary students (107, 119).

      This rationale was important to acknowledge in my coding method selection because "'All coding is a judgment call' since we bring 'our subjectivities, our personalities, our predispositions, [and] our quirks' to the process" (Sipe & Ghiso 482-483 as qtd. in Saldana 8). Because of this unavoidable subjectivity that is elevated as "a lone ethnographer [is] intimately at

Codes from First Cycle Coding	Coded Sample #1 from Data Corpus	Coded Sample #2 from Data Corpus
Grades	(When asked how their writing changes across disciplines) "I wouldn't say that my writing itself changes. I just…there's less stress, I feel like because I don't think that I'm graded as harshly" (Chrissy in focus groups).	"I would describe myself as well-performing. I perform well, I get good grades, and I'm generally well-behaved" (Sheldon's interview).
Writing vs. Writer	"Are we talking about the skill or just overall attempt?" (Timothy's interview)	"…reads like you are trying to complete an assignment rather than inform your readers" (Kristin's essay).
Metaphor	"I'm practically a cult leader" (Sheldon's interview).	"I'll just throw up words on my paper and kind of organize it as I go" (Chrissy's interview).
Teacher Expectations	"I try to write to the best of my ability in other classes, but I definitely devote more time to minor details in this class, I guess, just because I know it's going to be looked at and everything differently" (Heather's interview).	"This is the only class I worry about. And that's just because I know I'm held to a higher standard in this class" (Sheldon's interview).
Honors vs. Non-Honors	"I feel more…different between regular classes and Honors classes" (Timothy's interview).	The four DE students who took the Honors English 11 course together last year formed a "sort of nerdy clique" that uses elevated vocabulary and only relies on each other for peer reivews (observational note)
Fragmentation	Timothy was shaken when the topic of ACEs was discussed in class, as he had some familial trauma. Yet, he overcame some of this fragmentation between home and school by writing his narrative essay about his family situation (observational note on Timothy).	In a discussion about her fall break, she said she would have to attend her DE math class online on the plane ride to Disneyworld because the college didn't have a fall break. She expressed confusion: "It's like, 'Where are we and what are we doing?'" (observational note on Heather)

Table 3: First Cycle Codes

work with her data," I routinely met with my dissertation chair to discuss what I was finding throughout my first cycle coding (Saldana 36-37). I also relied on routine analytic memo-writing throughout my first cycle coding to reflexively pause to evaluate what I was finding and if any of my own "predispositions" were apparent in my coding. The codes emerging in first cycle coding are listed in table 3.

Defining Initial Codes. It was through my analytic memo-writing that I was able to narrow the codes from my first cycle coding. Six dominant codes that had the potential to become categories or even themes emerged with various levels of relevance to my research questions. In discussing this with my chair, he suggested I take some time between first and second cycle coding to define the emerging categories. It was through this reflexive, definitional work that I came to drop *fragmentation* as a code, as it was becoming apparent that it was all-pervasive. I expected fragmentation to be instrumental to my overall conclusions as a broader phenomemon and therefore dropped it as an individual code. I also removed *grades* from the coding list that would move with me into second cycle, for it too was a broader code that spoke more to a backdrop for the DE context. While it was represented throughout the data, it was not revelatory when held up to my research questions.

While I still had four dominant codes that were now categories — writing vs. writer, metaphor, honors vs. non-honors, and teacher expectations — this process prompted me to elevate a fifth code: experience. This was added early in March as I reviewed my initial coding and saw how many times I had marked "experience" as a code. However, it was not until I did some reading that I decided to add it as a category. I thought it might be something that was captured within the existing four categories, but it became evident that it is in fact a pervasive

connective factor for most of the categories, something I thought would become significant in the write-up.

Codes from Second Cycle Coding	Coded Sample #1 from Data Corpus	Coded Sample #2 from Data Corpus
Experience	"I hate when people don't give their full effort for stuff, so I always try to do that" (Timothy in focus groups).	"Through my experience in DE English, I have improved my ability to research…" (Heather's essay).
Writing vs. Writer	"When I began this class, I believed that I was a well-developed high school writer…Although my writing was serviceable for the high school environment, it needed to be improved before I could be ready for college writing" (Sheldon's essay).	Lilly chose to write a problem-solution proposal on eating disorders in teens after watching her friend battle an eating disorder: "I feel like I'm interested in this, so I feel like it will be easier [to write about]" (observational note on Lilly)
Metaphor	"…I just…write in a rush of throwing stuff out" (Timothy in focus groups)	"…it kind of just feels like I'm spitting information back out…regurgitating other people's ideas" (Heather's interview)
Teacher Expectations	"I think I'm a pretty good student. I try to be, as best as I can, so I can please the teacher" (Chrissy in focus groups).	"So, for this class, I'm focused on style and flow, and all that good stuff, whereas in my other classes, I know that people aren't going to care as much, so I don't try as hard" (Chrissy's interview).
Honors vs. Non-Honors	"I feel like I take my peer reviews seriously, because it's always [Sheldon—another student from the honors crew], and I know that he wants to help me" (Heather's interview).	"…kind of grouping them into two categories, Honors and non" (Timothy's interview).

Table 4: Second Cycle Codes

This process of moving from codes to categories through a return to the scholarly conversations proved difficult, as many of the terms are not easily defined. For example, when I tried to narrow and define the category of *writing* and *writer*, I found that experts in the field like Denecker conclude that there is "...no universal definition [that] clearly delineates what it means to be a 'college level writer' or what even constitutes 'college-level writing' for that matter" (23). Yet, it was through this discursive thought exercise that my six dominant codes became four and then five categories, complete with definitions: writing vs. writer, honors vs. non-honors, metaphor, teacher expectations, and experience (see table 4).

Second Cycle Coding. After narrowing my codes and tentatively defining my new categories, I returned to the data corpus for second cycle coding. I was reliant upon this cycle of coding to validate the codes I kept and defined, ultimately elevating them to categories. So, I claimed focused coding as my method for second cycle coding. It is a flexible method that seeks "to develop categories" and usually "follows in-vivo, process, and/or initial coding," so it met my needs at this point in the data analysis process (Saldana 240). As I moved through focused coding, I continued to write analytic memos after each data set. But I approached these memos a bit differently. I would read my memo that followed the corresponding data set (ie. observations or interviews) from first cycle coding and then reflexively respond to it in this set of memos. If the ideas were validated in focused coding, I would expand and reiterate my initial memo ideas. If the initial memo ideas were insignificant at this point, I did not include them in the analytic memos at this point. Overall, this set of memos was generally shorter and more direct.

SUMMARY

Within this chapter, I provided a snapshot overview of the study, as well as the few changes made to the study's design following the pilot study. I presented my theoretical

framework, comprised of a social constructivist approach and the usage of ethnographic methods in conjunction with a reflexive stance. I then unpacked this study's design with brief institutional contexts, an overview of my own involvement and the participants, and the course description for this fall FYC course under study. Then, I provided my data collection timeline and methods, ending with the details of my data analysis process.

Each of the above-discussed decisions represents dialogic and discursive processes that required an eventual surrender to the research process. The study had to have boundaries, both temporal and theoretical, and thus has limits as far as the reach of the data collection process. The very penning of fieldnotes and transcribing of participants' experiences creates a new "rhetorical activity," that of "the ethnographic account" (Herndl 321). My hope is that each move of this rhetorical activity and my subjectivities from past experiences are made adequately known in this chapter.

CHAPTER IV

MAPPING CULTURAL TERRITORY: AN EMIC LOOK AT THE INSTITUTION AND PARTICIPANTS

While I briefly introduced the institutional context in the previous chapter, the purpose of this chapter is to provide an emic look at the institutional culture. In other words, this chapter is the ethnographic bridge between my methods and results and, in some ways, functions as an extension of the results. I am both an outsider and insider within the context of this study. I maintain an outsider's positionality when it comes to the culture of Lee University, the higher educational institution offering the Dual Enrollment (DE) courses, because I do not teach any courses on their physical campus and have limited access to the faculty and staff on campus. Yet, I am an insider at Harville Academy, as I am a full-time employee of this institution and am the instructor on record for the DE course under study.

While some may view this primary positionality of insider as a limitation to the study due to bias, I posit it to be an affordance to this qualitative study: "To the charges that the researcher brings her own biases,… [I] would reply that bias is a misplaced term. To the contrary, these are resources and, if the researcher is sufficiently reflexive about her project, she can evoke these as resources to guide the data gathering… and for understanding her own interpretations and behavior in the research" (Olesen 165). More specifically, it is an affordance to the ethnographic approach to this study, as I maintain "both private and professional commitments to making meaning," which has compelled me to consider the data in multifaceted ways (Bishop 181). It is with this goal of transparency that I trace the institutional culture in this chapter.

INSTITUTIONAL CULTURE: HARVILLE ACADEMY

LOCATION

Harville Academy is located within the Bible Belt of the South in Chattanooga, Tennessee. Tennessee is traditional and conservative in nearly all ways, as its politics are largely influenced by the religiosity of its residents. For example, the current Governor's bio reads as such: "The governor and first lady are people of strong faith. They are active in Grace Chapel Church and in numerous faith-based ministries, which have taken them all over the world to serve people in need, including to Africa, Haiti, Central America, and the Middle East" ("Bill Lee, 50th Governor of Tennessee"). Governor Lee's agenda is largely directed at protecting rights, "especially religious liberty," which prompted one of his earliest signed bills, which was to allow religious adoption agencies to deny same-sex couples who apply to adopt a child (Ebert). Hamilton County, in which Harville Academy is located, voted to elect Governor Lee in 2018 ("Summary for...Hamilton County").

Hamilton County also boasts 42 private schools, of which 71% are religiously affiliated. These numbers align with a 2017 report claiming that Chattanooga is the "buckle of the Bible Belt" because it is the "most churchgoing city in the U.S." (Walton). These 42 private schools serve nearly 12,000 students, which is approximately 21% of the K-12 student population in the county ("Best Hamilton County Private Schools 2021"). Of these 12,000 students, Harville Academy maintains a student population of around 1,100, making it one of the larger private schools in Hamilton County. With a history beginning in just 1999, this school has gained a strong foothold in the community with its rapid and consistent growth. The school invited students back in August of 2021 with another brand-new building, costing around 10 million dollars, which houses a new gym that can seat 1,000; a Fine Arts performance center, complete

with an orchestra pit; a dance studio; a black box theater; a large weight room; and a grandiose lobby boasting a stone fireplace and cafe-style seating.

HISTORY

While the numbers are astounding and the facilities are some of the best in Chattanooga, Harville Academy's culture rests upon its religious affiliation, mainly with its parent ministry, Harville Church[18]. The church has a longstanding history in the area of Chattanooga known as Tyner and is now a mega-church with multiple sites across Hamilton County and North Georgia. Harville Academy was started as a ministry of the church in 1999 in order to partner "together with parents to raise young men and women of character" ("Silverdale Baptist Academy"). The current Head of School and her family are members of Harville Church, along with several other members of the school's administrative team. The Head of School has been there since the school was founded and often bears witness as the school's "Memory Keeper," relaying details about the school's beginnings, such as a lack of bell system requiring faculty to blow whistles in the hallways for class changes and no curriculum for the first semester the school was opened due to a misplaced order.

The Head of School also relays tales of the church's history in the community as part of her assumed role as the school's "Memory Keeper." One story revolves around Shirley Finch[19], an early church member. At the time Shirley Finch was alive, Harville Church occupied a small building. The church's pastor at the time felt the Lord leading the church to commit to an expansion project and invited church members to give in support of this plan. Shirley was openly against the plan, yet when the time came for church members to demonstrate support through physically giving monetary donations, Shirley walked to the front of the church and placed a

---

[18] Church name changed for anonymity.

[19] Name changed for anonymity.

single dollar in the basket. She then declared that while she felt the expansion project was unnecessary, she trusted the pastor and his relationship with Christ, so she wanted to be one of the first members to show support through her offering. This story of Shirley Finch is told to students and faculty so often that it has become part of the collective memory. Many students can tell the whole story of Shirley Finch, while nearly all students recognize the name of Shirley Finch as an integral part of the school's history.

DAILY LIFE AND POLITICS

This ministry relationship between the church and school has influenced the construction of the school's mission statement, which reads as follows: Harville's "mission is to partner with families in order to provide an environment of academic excellence with a Biblical worldview, which is conducive to developing educated young people of character, while preparing them to represent our Lord Jesus Christ in all walks of life" ("Fast Facts"). The school, officially a non-denominational institution, requires active church involvement of all faculty and staff as a means of embodying the mission statement as the "living curriculum," a term employed in the annual evaluation of each faculty member. Each application for employment at this educational institution requires a pastoral reference to verify active involvement with a local church; and, upon hiring, faculty and staff are encouraged to serve within their individual church communities through filling roles such as small group leaders, nursery workers, and deacon or elder positions. The school also has a Chaplain for the upper school and one for the lower school to oversee chapel schedules; to create and maintain a discipleship infrastructure, complete with homeroom chapel times and student-led Bible studies each week; and to promote a culture of spiritual formation across the school.

The school's culture is most heavily impacted by the ideological framework of religion. This can cause some tension between the school's educational purpose and its religious mission, a common tension for religious educational institutions according to Richard Reisen, author of several books related to Christian school culture: "The central problem for Christian schools is of the most basic sort, namely, the relationship between *Christian* and *education*" (14)*.* Reisen argues, in short, that a religious school's mission statement is often largely framed around religious ideology, so a liberal arts education as a means to this end is mismatched, resulting in daily ideological frictions.

Harville Academy does demonstrate some of this ideological tension as well, as the mission statement is largely constructed with religious language, relegating education as a means to the religious end of "preparing them [students] to represent our Lord Jesus Christ in all walks of life" ("Fast Facts"). Further, the language employed by administration at Harville Academy is often along the lines of God's plan for appointing people to certain positions, which empowers them to craft party lines such as "When you can't see my hand, trust my heart." God's timing and plan are also often credited when faculty leave, which again elevates the religious ideology to the forefront of the daily operations of this educational institution.

In addition to God's timing and plan, prayer is a common justification for delaying or validating decisions, as prayer is a commonly accepted religious practice among the members of this educational institution. For example, prayer often is the first thing a teacher will do to start a class period. Faculty laptops even boast stickers with a reminder to take attendance and start class in prayer. In addition, the observational tool used for administrative classroom visits requires prayer and biblical integration, which is a connection between the lesson's content and the Christian worldview. Also, all faculty meetings are opened with prayer and a devotion, a

short religious challenge from a passage in the Bible. This practice sets a tone for meetings that all that is done at this institution is out of religious service. Similarly, one of the required faculty summer reading books a few years ago was Mark Batterson's *The Circle Maker: Praying Circles around Your Biggest Dreams and Greatest Fears.* In this book, Batterson claims that "bold prayers honor God because God honors bold prayers," a prayer principle that was quickly adopted and promoted as practice for our faculty ("About the Book"). In fact, the administration offered to buy a prayer journal for any faculty member who was interested in fully committing to Batterson's prayer principle for the year.

Inter-relational issues are also governed by religiously interpreted practice. One of the guiding principles for dealing with internal conflict at Harville Academy is referred to as the "Matthew 18 principle." All stakeholders are expected to abide by this principle whenever conflict arises. The principle is derived from chapter 18 in the biblical book of Matthew. The student version of the principle is laid out in the handbooks as follows:

> As part of our [Harville] family who are concerned for one another, students are responsible to follow the Matthew 18 principle when they are aware of violations of the school standards by another student.
>
> 1. They should personally confront (in the same manner they would want to be confronted) the fellow student and encourage him/her to stop the violation and make known their problem to those in authority. The problem should not be communicated to other students.
> 2. If this confrontation is unsuccessful, the offense should be reported to those in authority in order to help the offending student. Inability or

failure to follow the first steps should not keep a student from

following the last step. (18 "Employee Handbook")

This principle, in short, requires that any grievance is brought first to the attention of the

offending individual before taking the matter to a higher-level authority figure. While the

principle exists for many reasons, it practically functions as a means of protecting faculty

members from parents whose tendency is to bypass discussion with their student's teacher before

taking the matter to administration. All faculty, students, and parents sign a contract that includes

an agreement to adhere to the Matthew 18 principle as long as they are a member of the school

community.

In short, politics within the school are dealt with through an emphasis on shared religious

practice. This includes language employed, such as "God's timing," and the verbal practice of

prayer. It also includes lifestyle expectations that are laid out in handbooks for faculty and

students. These expectations are ultimately in line with the culturally accepted interpretation of

biblical passages, like Matthew 18. Community members within this educational institution,

whether they are professing Christians or not, are aware of the heavy influence of religion, as the

school is seated within the "buckle of the Bible Belt" and is a ministry of Harville Church. In

fact, the church and school share space on campus, so there are a myriad of physical reminders

of the religiosity of the institutional culture, which ultimately impacts the daily life and politics

of the community members of Harville Academy.

STUDENT CULTURE: PARTICIPANTS

All participants are students attending Harville Academy. At this institution, student

applicants and their families do not have to be professing Christians to be accepted, yet students

may not opt out of religious requirements, like weekly chapels and Bible classes. Many families

within the school have multiple children in various grades at Harville Academy, and more and more students are attending all the way from K-12. So, students mostly maintain a tight-knit community. This, along with the tuition price tag, does have an impact on the overall demographics of the school with an overwhelming White[20] student (and faculty) majority. The homogeneity of the mostly student body combined with the smaller class sizes and the familial expectations for college makes the atmosphere amongst many students competitive.

COMPETITION AND CHOICE

The DE students are typically among the top 10-15% in their class and they are acutely aware of their standing within that percentage, as valedictorian and salutatorian are common goals for these students. All participants within this study are high school seniors who have scored a minimum of 21 on their ACT and have maintained at least a 3.5 high school GPA. The GPA requirement for DE enrollment for Lee University is only 3.0, but since this DE English course is counted among the honors courses at Harville Academy, the high school maintains an internal requirement of 3.5 as well as a recommendation from the English 11 teacher. Most of the students in this class travel through their high school careers together as they typically sign up for nearly all of the honors, AP, and DE classes together. So, they become a familiar community with a good bit of competition amongst them.

Most of the students who take DE English at Harville Academy come straight from the Honors English 11 course. However, a handful of students who took the regular English 11 course always join DE English in their senior year, so there is a divide within the class from day one, as students are aware of the honors vs. non-honors "crew." Within this study, this divide

---

[20] I made the choice to capitalize "White" in this context as it is refering to the race and ethnicity of the student population, for "[t]o not name 'White' as a race is, in fact, an anti-Black act which frames Whiteness as both neutral and the standard" (Nguyên and Pendleton).

was largely maintained, as the honors crew relied almost exclusively on the feedback and collaboration of other honors students. Some non-honors students who realized that they were caught in a sort of rut with feedback during peer reviews did venture out of their comfort zones to ask honors students to review their papers. The honors students would usually oblige but sometimes acted inconvenienced as they had several papers lined up to review during most peer review days.

Students at Harville Academy typically choose the DE English course for two reasons: to gain another high school honors credit in order to graduate with an Honors diploma (a minimum of 8 honors classes required from grades 8-12) and to accrue higher level courses on their transcripts for their college applications. Some are very conscious of their high school transcripts, trying to not just gain honors courses but to diversify those courses through a mix of honors, AP, and DE courses to display on their transcript. Others do not plan out their path as much and are mainly focused on the Honors diploma. A few will say that they chose DE English because they wanted to better their writing skills, but that response is usually in conjunction with one of the above two reasons. As the instructor on record for the DE course, I have been teaching the senior DE English courses since 2013, so many recent students take the course at the recommendation of older siblings who went through the course and found it beneficial for their college career. The common thread through all these reasons for choosing to take DE is related to the course as commodity: they are aiming to get something out of the course beyond learning. This motivator has proven valuable in maintaining consistency in student work ethic. DE students rarely miss assignment deadlines and typically strive to produce polished work in an effort to achieve As on all assignments.

TIMING AND CULTURAL CONSIDERATIONS

The DE students within the study fulfilled many of the above behaviors the instructor has come to expect. However, the timing of the study may account for some differences within this DE student collective. This study took place in fall of 2020, so the students had not been on campus since the middle of March 2020 due to the COVID lockdown in spring. The fourth quarter of their junior year was entirely online with a lot of flexibility on assignment submissions and more student autonomy over their grades. For example, students had the option to take exams in May of 2020: if they were happy with their grades, they did not have to take exams. This flexibility they had grown accustomed to may account for the increase among these participants in submitting late assignments, a rare behavior amongst DE students in previous years. The participants within this study also submitted revision work at a lower rate than previous DE students the instructor has encountered at Harville Academy.

When the participants returned to campus in August of 2020, a citywide mask mandate was in effect and lasted the duration of this study. This mandate was in conjunction with other health and safety protocols the school had to implement: no lockers for students, meaning they had to carry everything in their backpacks; one way traffic in the halls; all students seated according to strict seating charts in table pods of four with Lexan between each table; lunch in homerooms instead of the gym; and all high school gatherings, such as chapels and senior talks, viewed from homerooms via Zoom or Google Meets. Students also had the option to attend class in person or virtually from home, which they had to commit to at the beginning of each quarter. One DE English student opted to be a virtual student after attending in-person for one week. Students were also quarantined from time to time, meaning they had to attend all classes virtually for a two-week quarantine period. All students and faculty also had to submit a health report via

the app Ascend before reporting to school each morning. If a student failed to submit this report, school personnel would pull them from their first class to take their temperature. Failure to complete the Ascend report three times resulted in a lunch detention.

While students adjusted to these protocols eventually, it changed the class dynamic. Students could not easily engage with other students who were not at their table pod. This may have furthered the honors vs. non-honors divide as students chose their table pod mates in the first week of class and then were forced to stay there until the end of each quarter. Classroom instruction was also limited during the time of this study since students could not be freely moving about the room for activities and experiential learning. All students, even in-person, were receiving more instruction and direction via the school's new learning platform, Canvas, since at least a few students were always attending virtually due to choice or quarantine. Faculty and students were learning Canvas as the semester progressed, which meant that students more often missed assignment details as they either didn't know where to look or faculty didn't know where to post them. All of this seemed to wear down students who were already maintaining a high stress level because they were trying to figure out how to apply for colleges they couldn't visit because of COVID restrictions. This overall atypical learning environment yielded a decrease in student participation in class discussions and lower course grades.

The pandemic's impact on the school's day-to-day activities also impacted my ability to gain informal access to participants. In previous years, as the DE English Instructor and the Writing Center Director, I would often build mentorship relationships with several of the DE students, as they usually comprise a large portion of the Writing Center tutoring staff. These tutors would often come find a beanbag in the Writing Center to just hang out and talk, which allows for casual and comfortable relationships. Little to no casual hang out time was allowed

this year, so I was somewhat limited in access to participants and therefore to informal observations. Of the fifteen enrolled DE English students, I received consent and assent forms from parents and students of nine students. A brief snapshot of each of those nine participants is detailed below.

"HONORS" PARTICIPANTS

While all students enrolled in the DE English course are technically honors students by the high school's classification of the course, an unofficial divide exists between the students: those who came into the course from the Honors English 11 course and those who came into the course from the regular English 11 course. The two instructors of these junior-level courses have starkly different reputations among the student body: the Honors English 11 teacher, also the English Department Head, is rigid and demanding in her expectations while the regular English 11 teacher is rumored to award easy As. Whether these reputations are rooted in truth or not, the effects of these reputations impact the way students perceive one another in their senior year. Those who did take the Honors English 11 course become a sort of intimidating pack who dominate class discussions, present an air of confidence in their questioning of texts, and ultimately stick together for all collaborative assignments. The five "Honors" participants who opted to take part in this study are briefly snapshotted below. Three other DE students who came from the Honors English 11 course chose not to participate in the study.

Heather. Heather is the classic Honors student: she is a Type-A perfectionist who is driven and organized in all aspects of her life. Her dream school was always Wake Forest University in North Carolina and she spent all of her high school years crafting the perfectly well-rounded transcript to that end. She took nearly all the honors classes offered at Harville Academy, making only one B during an eighth grade Honors course for high school credit. She

was sure to take a mix of honors, AP, and DE courses to diversify her transcript and hopefully to highlight her ability to navigate difficult courses on any level. She also participated in Community Theater, served on the Mayor's Youth Council, and volunteered to work the polls on Election Day in November 2020. Her goal is political journalism, so she made sure her college application highlighted her early interest and involvement in political issues.

Heather served as the Student Director of the Writing Center in her senior year, which allowed me to develop a closer relationship with her than perhaps the other participants. She and I, as the Writing Center Director, co-presented at the Southeastern Writing Center Association Conference in February 2021, making Heather the first Harville student to present at a professional conference. Heather, an only child, came to Harville Academy in middle school and had a hard time making friends. This continued into her high school years, leaving her with few close friendships. She enjoyed talking to her teachers and referred to me as her "teacher-friend." She and Sheldon, another Honors student, were close and used each other to calibrate their academic efforts to some extent. While Heather got deferred at Wake Forest, she got accepted into the Honors College at Florida State University, where she began attending in fall of 2021.

Sheldon. Sheldon is a diligent student with a personality that stands out from his peers. Having transferred schools seven times during his middle and early high school years, he had a hard time making friends and ultimately reading social cues. Because of this, Sheldon developed acute observational skills. This allows him to behave in socially acceptable ways much of the time. However, he was at times off-putting to his classmates, as he was quick to dominate class discussion and was often rigid in his beliefs and views of the world. For example, he made comments in class during a discussion on social justice that was in support of seeing only one race. Yet, Sheldon is not mean-natured and is willing to dialogue about issues with those who

hold differing opinions. He was, in fact, one of the more empathetic student participants, as he reads to understand where the writer of a text is coming from.

Sheldon and I had a good conversation in a Writing Center session one day about his essay for the Honors College at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville. He didn't feel that he had any leadership skills, as he had not held any traditional student leadership positions, like Student Government. However, I pointed out his leadership in his ability to start and sustain dialectical exchanges. He took pride in this revelation and demonstrated a sense of gratitude after that discussion. Sheldon's abilities to dialogue with nearly anyone relates to his voracious appetite for knowledge. He spent nearly all waking hours on academic pursuits, as even his hobbies by nature are academic. He grew up reading science textbooks his dad would bring home and he was teaching himself Japanese during the time of this study. He would arrive at school early every day to practice writing out the Japanese alphabet on the whiteboard in the classroom and he dedicated blocks of time daily to practicing this new language. This hobby is to hopefully enable him to work in Japan one day in the computer science field. His love has always been engineering and that is what he intended to study at the start of his senior year, yet his dad discouraged this and pushed him towards computer science. He conceded and claimed to have found an interest in that field as well. He began attending the Honors College at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville in fall 2021.

Kristin. Kristin is an artistic student who participated in theater and ran her own Etsy art business. She also participated in pop-up art venues and markets, which she claimed gave her the ability to work with the public in a professional way. She was seemingly always positive and happy and contributed consistently to class discussions. While she was a member of the Honors pack, she often deferred to Heather or Sheldon to answer questions first or to be the voice for any

collaborative presentations. She cared a lot about her schoolwork, but it did not consume her, like it did Heather and Sheldon. She submitted assignments late from time to time and didn't always do the optional revisions on major papers. She had a self-proclaimed tendency to procrastinate, which impacted the nature of her work sometimes.

Kristin is part of a large family who is fairly strict. For example, she was not allowed to have any social media accounts until she turned eighteen during her senior year. Yet, she did not seem bitter about this rule. In fact, she was an advocate for encouraging adolescents to wait to get on social media until they were older, as she saw herself being spared from a lot of the normal social pressures, like body image and sexual activity that often arise through social media. Her compassion and concern for others prompted research topics for her DE English papers like drop-out rates in inner city schools and possible intervention programs. She began attending the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga in fall 2021.

Wes. Wes tended to start strong yet burnout before a course ended. This was true of his performance in Honors English 11 and then again in DE English. This may have been because he spent quite a bit of time working with a friend who owns a videography business. Wes would stay up late many nights editing videos and then work on homework during the early morning hours, sometimes submitting assignments as late as 3:00am. Because of these patterns, Wes had a lot of absences and tardies for DE English, an 8:00am course. He also played soccer for Harville Academy, and late game nights would prompt him to sleep in and skip class. This became a sort of joke among his honors tablemates, as Honors students do not typically miss class as they are afraid of getting behind or missing something important. Wes is good-natured and would further the jokes surrounding his sporadic class attendance. For example, he missed class presentations one day because he slept in. So, the other students said they were going to

wait in the hall while he did his make-up presentation since he missed theirs. They did not, of course, do so, but Wes got a good laugh at their reaction.

Despite his dropping grades throughout the semester, Wes never got openly frustrated. He was the "cool kid" persona, boasting a perm and brightly colored clothes on dress down days when school uniforms are not required. He wore a gaudy gold earring, even though school rules prohibit it. He often gave Sheldon a hard time about his lack of pop culture knowledge. Yet, Wes was never unkind to classmates. He just acted like things didn't bother him. He is very talented in his video editing abilities and when he chose to write about this field or give presentations related to his work, he would excel. He exuded a casual confidence when he presented that got all his audience involved. He began attending Lee University, the DE sponsoring institution, in fall 2021 for video production.

David. David is the stereotypical gentle giant: he was a large defensive lineman on the football field yet is one the kindest and most respectful students I've encountered. He and his twin brother are extremely close. Their nicknames, given by their football coach and teammates, are "biscuit and gravy" and they would always boast the same shoes and backpacks: one with blue and one with red. They lived with their father, as their mother passed when they were just three-years-old. In several of his papers, David demonstrated reflection beyond his years regarding this formative experience. For example, his experiential narrative acknowledged his brokenness over this loss, yet focused on the resulting unity his family has experienced as a result. David rarely spoke up in class discussions, but when he did, all community members would stop to listen and consider his contribution. He had that kind of quiet power in the classroom.

David did not sit at the dominant honors pack table pod. Rather, he sat with another football player and a male student whose primary identity related to his workout routines and summer construction job. David's primary identity was that of a football player. His work ethic derived from the discipline he had come to adopt from his participation on the football team throughout his high school years, and the football team's emphasis on the teammates treating one another as a "brotherhood" carried over into all aspects of his life. He always looked out for others and saw his work efforts as directly impacting others around him. David began attending Sewanee: The University of the South with his twin brother in the fall of 2021 on a football scholarship. He is studying sports communication.

"NON-HONORS" PARTICIPANTS

While these participants are officially in an honors course according to Harville Academy's classification of the DE English course, the socially deemed divide created by the English 11 course each student took in their junior year places these participants on the "Non-Honors" side of the classroom discourse community. While most of these participants are just as academically capable as those in the "Honors" pack, these students enter DE English with less formal writing experience, based on the distinct difference in the Honors English 11 and regular English 11 curriculums. Some also enter with little to no experience with grades lower than an A. This means that first quarter, and for some all of first semester, is a rough experience as it impacts their identity perceptions as far as they are connected to their academic performance and their personal expectations for high As on all assignments. The four "Non-Honors" participants who opted to take part in this study are briefly snapshotted below. Three other DE students who took regular English 11 chose not to participate in the study.

Timothy. Timothy was typically kind and encouraging to his classmates. He enjoyed class discussion and was often one of the first to contribute, offering insight regarding texts the class was assigned to read for discussion. While Timothy seemed like a positive person at first, he did become quite negative about the course, as his frustration regarding his performance mounted throughout the semester. Timothy worked usually at least twenty hours a week, unlike most of his classmates who did not hold jobs during the school year. This limited the time he had available for schoolwork. He also is a self-proclaimed procrastinator, which would impact his writing performance. He was dating Chrissy, a perfectionist who was also very frustrated, for the duration of the study. Her overall attitude towards the class did seem to impact his rising negativity towards the class and his performance.

One of Timothy's biggest changes in his self-perceptions occurred through his reflection upon his background of familial trauma. After reading an excerpt from J.D. Vance's *Hillbilly Elegy* for a DE English assignment, the class had a brief discussion on ACEs (adverse childhood experiences), which included an activity involving taking the ten-question ACEs quiz. This brought Timothy into direct conflict with much of the suppressed impact of this trauma. He had an emotional response initially, confronting me as his instructor on my choice to embed this activity within class[21]. Yet, the experiential narrative that came out of his intentional reflection following this conversation was beautiful. It was vulnerable and showcased the power of personal reflection for Timothy. In short, his realization was that he was "wounded," a descriptor he had not allowed himself to consider before. This led him to a personal goal of "help[ing] others going through the same situation." Timothy began attending Middle Tennessee State University in fall of 2021.

---

[21] I have since this encounter adapted the class activity to allow for more student autonomy in deciding if they want to participate.

Chrissy. Chrissy began attending Harville Academy in her junior year, so her social circle was quite small, as her introverted nature prompted fewer close relationships. She was somewhat socially dependent on Timothy, her boyfriend, at least from an outside perspective. She was rarely without him by her side while on campus, and she looked to him to validate many of her decisions, even class discussion insights. Chrissy is an extreme perfectionist. At times, it would debilitate her writing ability and she would come to the Writing Center frustrated. It also led her to be silent throughout most class discussions, as she liked to really think through any response she was willing to share. By the time she would think through a response to one question, the class had moved on. Chrissy is a deep thinker about all things from assigned reading to personal religious decisions, leading her to choose a faith different from her family. She began attending Belmont University in fall of 2021 to study psychology.

Lilly. Lilly is also a perfectionist. She paid careful attention to details in assignment guides and internalized feedback from paper to paper, rarely making the same writing mistake twice. She was an active voice in class discussions and diligently completed all assignments on time. She tried to choose topics to write about that held some personal connection for her. For example, she wrote a critique essay about an issue related to gun rights and laws. This issue became deeply personal for her when her older brother entered the military. She shared stories of all her brother had encountered as far as some of the public's visceral response to those who advocate for and carry guns. As a member of the military, her brother uses and often carries a gun, especially when he was sent to an area where violent protests had been occurring. She saw these responses as hatred towards her brother, which evoked a protective and emotional response. She also wrote a paper about the imminent need to normalize talk about eating

disorders, as one her best friends has struggled with an eating disorder for years. Lilly began attending Middle Tennessee State University in fall of 2021 to possibly study psychology.

Maddy. Maddy maintained a positive persona, almost always excited and smiling in class. She likes to learn and often processes verbally, which led her to be an active participant in class discussions. She was consistent in nearly all aspects of her life, from her work ethic to her Starbucks drink each morning. This bent towards consistency, even predictability, could stem from her complicated family situation. Yet, in spite of familial trauma, Maddy is kind and compassionate to others. In fact, this concern for others led her to her college decision. She began attending Middle State Tennessee University in the summer of 2021 as a student within the Medical School Early Acceptance Program, which will train her for rural medicine specifically.

SUMMARY

Within this ethnographic bridge chapter, I provided a deeper look at the institutional context and the participants. Harville Academy is a young school boasting rapid growth. The institutional context is most influenced by religious ideology with shared practices, such as prayer, and common biblical references. The participants within this study are all seniors enrolled in a DE FYC course who share a competitive spirit and common motives for enrolling in the DE course, mainly reasons related to efficiency and economical savings. This study took place in the fall of 2020, so COVID was a factor that changed aspects of the DE context, such as the daily seating arrangements, and likely impacted the participants' self-perceptions as writers. The participants demonstrated a divide between the "Honors" and "Non-Honors" students according to who took the Honors English 11 course in their junior year.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

This chapter outlines the results of my coding processes through providing the five

primary codes that emerged: grades, teacher expectations, metaphor, writing vs. writer, and

experience. *Grades* is discussed first as it serves as a contextual code, meaning that it pervades

all aspects of the DE context. While direct discussion of *grades* was found primarily in the focus

groups and some reflective essays, it permeated all data as a key influence impacting these DE

participants' self-perceptions. In short, this code is a broader connection to the external

neoliberalism that ultimately creates the reality of the DE context. I then move into the results

that demonstrate *teacher expectations*, as this was another dominating code, exhibited primarily

through the focus groups and interviews, that demonstrates an external factor seemingly

influencing students' self-perceptions as writers in the DE context.

The next two codes, *metaphor* and *writing vs. writer*, move more into the internal aspects

of the participants' perceptions of themselves as writers, while demonstrating apparent conflicts

related to language usage and primary frameworks for their self-perceptions. *Metaphor* showed

up across much of the data, but most dominantly in the focus groups, the reflective essays, and

my observational journal entries. *Writing vs. writer* again permeated the data, albeit less directly

than some of the other codes. I believe this is because this code perhaps most directly connects to

the complexities of identity construction that DE students experience in their self-perceptions. I

found this code emerge most within the reflective essays from the end of the semester. The final

code in this chapter is *experience*, simply included last because it was the last code that emerged

within my coding process. My initial coding showed that everything was experiential in some

way, yet a second round of coding and reflective memos revealed that there were in fact key experiences that may be influential to their self-perceptions within the DE context. These emerged primarily within the interviews and the observational notes.

The last two codes, *writing vs. writer* and *experience*, differ in their organization: they are discussed under subheadings highlighting participants rather than sub-codes. This is because these two codes seemed to be the most personal and therefore unique to each participant. For example, while many participants experienced a grappling in their perceiving themselves primarily as a writer versus one who performs assigned writing tasks, their perceptions are unique in their thought processes. So, in order to honor my ethnographic goals of prioritizing the participants' voices and experiences and to be true to the way the data emerged as significant, I discuss these two codes by participant rather than sub-codes. While all codes discussed below reveal elements of participants' perceptions of themselves as writers as well as conflicts rooted in the DE context related to these perceptions, I will reserve discussion of their direct connections to my research questions until the next chapter.

GRADES: CONTEXTUAL CODE

While "grades" is a pervasive thread throughout the data collected from the DE participants, I've chosen to reserve this code as a contextual code as it best represents and supports the backdrop of neoliberalism that imbues the arena of DE, providing insight into some of the external conflicts that these students experience within the DE context. The participants' consistent and dominating awareness of their grades as both driving force and reward for their work efforts is significant, but not apart from the larger context of the neoliberal machine that is DE. Within the institutional context of this study, from the marketing of these DE courses to the course content, the emphasis is most often on "bang for your buck" in accruing college credits

simultaneously with the completion of secondary senior year. For example, the "Dual Enrollment" section of the *Parent and Student Handbook* for Harville Academy opens with the following purpose: "The purpose of the DE program is to provide our students a means of beginning their college careers while simultaneously earning high school credits" (61). This message, loud and clear, has likely been internalized by the participants in this study as they demonstrated through the prevalence of their references to grades, as well as their association of grades to self-efficacy.

In the initial focus groups in September, several participants gave credence to the neoliberal context of DE through their references to expediency and college credit as motivators for their decision to enroll in the course. Lilly, for instance, claimed that she chose to take DE English because she "kind of wanted to get some English stuff out of the way because I knew I wasn't going to be like, focusing on English as much in college." Maddy emphasized college credit as her primary motivator for enrolling in the course: The English 11 teacher told her that she "would get college credit, so it was worth the struggle and transition into college classes." Similarly, Kristin said that "the college credit… really helps" when deciding to take DE English. For Heather, it was expediency in adjusting to the collegiate learning curve: "I just wanted to be more prepared for college, I guess, because you always hear that there's that huge divide between high school classes and college classes, so by going ahead and taking it, I could get used to it quicker." While these are just a few voices, they are representative of the general decision-making factors that participants prioritized during course sign-ups, which take place in spring of their junior year.

While most participants at some point revealed their motivational connections to their grades, a few participants divulged a dominating preoccupation with their grades. For example,

at the beginning of the semester in their focus group, Chrissy and Timothy indicated an understanding of writing as being based on their own experiences with the world and others, as well as the experiences of others they have observed. This, however, is seemingly extrinsically motivated primarily by grades and a desire to please people, mainly the instructor. So, these participants appear to perceive writing as a means of performing, as their existence within the neoliberalism context of DE has experientially taught them that performance is their primary means of being within our capitalist society. Grades, and therefore the teacher's response to their writing, are seemingly dictating their future success.

Timothy, for example, opens and frames his final semester essay through a growing frustration in direct response to his grades:

> There is nothing more frustrating than putting effort into a paper only to have it graded at a less than ideal grade. It hurts when the work you put in is not reflected in the end result. What hurts even more is seeing the grades on the papers go from bad to worse with each new submission… Ultimately, each paper has only left me more and more frustrated, confused, and doubtful of my writing abilities... mistakes… have continued to beat down both my grade, and my confidence as a writer.

Timothy is displaying emotional responses to his grades and seemingly correlating those grades with not only his writing, but also his abilities as a writer. Chrissy similarly expresses frustration and in fact titles her final reflective essay "Stagnant Writing." One excerpt from her essay is as follows: "The structure, flow, grammar, and overall composition of the essay are sure to receive good marks… [yet] I wonder what I did to deserve yet another subpar evaluation no higher than a 'B.'" Chrissy and Timothy seem to have internalized the mechanistic nature of DE grades as

commodity as they translate to college credit and possible scholarships. In short, both Timothy and Chrissy give representative voices to the frustrations and consistent stress that is felt by undoubtedly many DE students.

However, not all participants seemed to remain within this neoliberalist mental framework by the end of the semester. Heather, while very conscientious of her grades consistently throughout the semester, was able to see past her grades as well: "For me — and I can probably speak for Sheldon as well — I genuinely wanted to be proud of my papers. Rather than just wanting to get an A on this, I need to say something with this." This quote reveals both a present motivation to work for an A, as well as an urgency to have a voice through her writing. She credits this slow shift in mental attitude to the numerous honors courses she took throughout her junior year: one AP class, 2 DE math classes, and 2 honors classes. While nearly everyone in her classes had the same drive — to make an A on every assignment — her mindset expanded to include also having a voice as a means of individualizing her academic purpose.

TEACHER EXPECTATIONS

Closely aligning with an ever-present backdrop of the pressure of grades is teacher expectations; for, from the perspective of most students, the teacher holds the power because they control the gradebook. Yet, clearly defining or even casually stating what any given teacher expects for any single assignment is often as divergent as each participant is in their approach to the classroom context. Early in the semester in a focus group discussion, one participant proffered her definition for *teacher expectations*: "the teacher, the criteria, and the standard that they expect." While some student writers feel they understand exactly what a teacher wants and then can clearly execute an assignment according to the writing goals and parameters, others feel that fulfilling the expectations a teacher sets forth for an assignment is a moving target, leaving

them frustrated at best and giving up entirely at worst. Yet, for better or worse, teacher expectations are a nearly constant motivating presence for DE students, as they strive to achieve success in their writing, primarily determined by extrinsic metrics of grades, which seem to correlate to meeting a teacher's expectations.

DUAL ENROLLMENT STUDENTS AS PEOPLE-PLEASERS

One interesting discovery that emerged in this study is that some of the DE participants are self-proclaimed people-pleasers, which prompts them to seek to understand a teacher's expectations early and thoroughly. This tendency to seek approval, specifically from authority figures, likely impacts their academic motivation and ultimately their performance, sometimes enhancing it while other times limiting it. Take Maddy, for example: "I'm a people-pleaser extremely… and I'm a perfectionist." Her need to please others seems to have nearly stripped her of decision making capacity. Her "dad set… a goal" for her to read the classics, so she set out to do so in her early high school years. Similarly, when I asked her why she chose DE English over English 12, she responded that her English 11 teacher told her "that I pretty much had to" take DE English because of her creative writing abilities. Finally, Maddy is set to start Middle Tennessee State University's Medical School Early Acceptance Program in summer of 2021, immediately following her high school graduation. When I asked her about her decision to pursue this path, she pointed to her science teacher's promptings to apply. Her self-proclaimed people-pleasing nature seems to compel Maddy to strive to pinpoint her teachers' (or parents') expectations in order to meet them and, in turn, to gain approval.

Similarly, Chrissy is a self-proclaimed people-pleaser. In a focus group discussion early in the semester, when asked to describe herself as a student, she quickly replied, "I think I'm a pretty good student. I try to be, as best as I can, so that I can please the teacher, not always, I

guess for myself, for my learning, but kind of like, it's a status thing." However, by the end of the semester, Chrissy did note a shift in this tendency in her final reflective essay: she's "working on trying to, like, become smarter myself… and develop myself… I've found that it [her writing process] works for me." While subtle, this reveals perhaps one of the most important aspects of development in Chrissy throughout the semester: her shift away from valuing teacher expectations above her own. This shift, while seemingly positive, may be a result of her frustration with feeling like she could not accurately interpret her instructor's expectations. When discussing her progress as a writer throughout the semester in her final reflective essay titled "Stagnant Writing," she wrote, "I wonder what I did to deserve yet another subpar evaluation no higher than a 'B.'" She is keenly aware of the difference between teacher expectations in each of her classes and works according to the expectation set, claiming to work harder in this DE English class, not because it is a college class but because the teacher expects more.

GAPS IN STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHER EXPECTATIONS

DE instructors teach in a unique liminal space. There exists an ever-present tension between the students' embodiment of high school students while the course is framed as collegiate. This DE English course is a Lee University freshman composition course: ENGL 106 "College Writing." While the collegiate expectation is blatantly named in the course title, the enactment of that expectation is anything but obvious as the adjunct instructor, in this situation at least, must function primarily within the high school institutional context. This means adhering to the high school schedule, which is prone to interruptions that are anything but collegiate: fire and intruder drills, class award ceremonies, and meetings with the principal to name a few. Yet, I, as the course's instructor, strive to maintain collegiate expectations of my students by using

framing course documents, such as the college syllabus and learning objectives, as well as the *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing.*

High School or College? While I as the instructor aim to uphold college standards and expectations for coursework and student involvement, the DE participants in this study largely did not perceive of themselves as college students. Some saw the course as an Honors-level high school course. Kristin, for example, claimed at the end of the semester to have borne "the workload of multiple honors classes." Timothy, in an interview at the end of the semester, stated his perception of DE English as "just a really hard high school class":

> I feel like because the only time I really see, like, on paper, this class being different, is the letters "DE," and I get, maybe like, a [Lee] email now and then… So, when I walk in the classroom, I'm not like, 'Oh, college class time.' Same for DE Stats. I don't necessarily feel that I'm not a part of [Harville Academy] in that moment. It just kind of feels like a little bit harder class, like an Honors class.

This perception of the DE course as being an honors high school course is, after all, perpetuated by the high school's marketing of DE English as another class offered within the honors track.

Further solidifying the participants' perceptions of the course as an honors high school course was their distinct awareness of the divide between honors and non-honors. The 2019-2020 Honors English 11 course was small, only nine students to be exact. So, several of the DE students within this study were not in an honors English class in the preceding year. This factor seemed to be enough to create a schism and ultimately delineate an honors community within this perceived honors DE English course. Because of the COVID protocols in place at the time of this study, all the classroom desks within this secondary institutional context were arranged in table pods of four. One table pod became the honors crew: they were the class contributors, the

students nearly always earning the highest grades on papers, and the students with seemingly the highest level of confidence within this honors classroom context. They were four of only six students in this DE class who had taken honors English 11 in the previous year. Two of these students, Heather and Sheldon, were rumored to be in a position to become the salutatorian and valedictorian. This foursome only sought peer review feedback from one another and engaged in outwardly lofty casual conversations about politics, race, and religion. Other students referred to this group as "the people on the other side of the room," who were initially "scary" or "intimidating," validating the divide within this learning community.

While most students saw the course as a high school honors course, other participants viewed the DE course as a bridge of sorts: a transitional space between high school and college. Heather showed the clearest distinction of perceiving DE as something between high school and college in her final reflective essay:

> Because of the collegiate nature of Dual Enrollment English… there is a distinct difference between the difficulty of high-school-level courses and Dual Enrollment classes. While enrolled in Dual Enrollment English, I have had to develop unique skills that are necessary for excelling in a college course… In one semester, I will enter college as a first-year student; therefore, it is important that I prepare myself for success by working diligently in college-level courses… Although being a Dual Enrollment student is challenging, I would recommend that each high school student enrolls in one Dual Enrollment class that they are interested in. Not only does enrolling in a Dual Enrollment course prepare one for college-level coursework, but it can force participants to become introspective and practice metacognition, which is something each graduating senior can benefit from.

Heather didn't claim a collegiate identity, but rather used language of taking DE courses as a means of preparing for "college-level courses." For Heather, a high school student is different from a DE student, who is not yet a college student. This implies a view of DE as a sort of bridge between high school and college.

Finally, some students did perceive the course to be a college course. Chrissy referred to the DE course by stating, "this being my first college class…." Similarly, Lilly wrote within her final reflective essay, "During the first semester I spent in a college English class…." Yet, even these participants at other times in the semester would shift in their discussion of the DE course, highlighting perhaps the unique liminality of the course and their place within it. Overall, this gap in teacher and student perceptions of the liminality of the course and their resulting implied roles as either high school students and/or college students could be an instigator for perpetual gaps in student perceptions of teacher expectations within DE contexts.

Grades. Participants seemed to directly correlate teacher expectations with grades. As I claim in the previous section on grades, DE students have a pervasive obsession with grades, as they directly impact their GPAs. As seniors in the honors track in high school, these participants upheld expectations for themselves, sometimes intrinsically-derived but often resulting from familial pressures, that exclusively included four-year colleges and scholarship money. For many, professional schooling beyond the bachelor's degree was the expectation. Within their personal expectations and resulting standards, these collegiate and eventual career goals rest upon their grades, which trickle down from the accuracy with which they are able to interpret and meet teacher expectations.

Timothy was perhaps the most outwardly frustrated about his grades, which he seemed to directly align with his inability to grasp the teacher's expectations. For Timothy, effort invested

into his coursework should equal higher grades: "There is nothing more frustrating than putting effort into a paper only to have it graded at a less than ideal grade. It hurts when the work you put in is not reflected in the end result." This simple deductive logic dictated his interpretation of the teacher's expectations: just invest more time and effort into his writing assignments. However, his perception proved inadequate through his focal metric of his earned grades:

> What hurts even more is seeing the grades on the papers go from bad to worse with each new submission. That was the case with each paper I turned in this semester, and frankly I haven't been able to pinpoint why. Some papers get "C" level grades with only grammatical issues listed as an explanation. On top of this, my papers go through six in class revisions and an additional Writer's Workshop review before submission, yet it still seems like so much is missed. Ultimately, each paper has only left me more and more frustrated, confused, and doubtful of my writing abilities.

This excerpt from Timothy's final reflective essay demonstrates a clear gap in the student's perception of his teacher's expectations as simply more time and effort invested would equate to higher grades. Timothy seems to have missed the connective pieces often found in individualized teacher feedback that might reveal teacher expectations. So, he would make similar mistakes on each paper, no matter how much time and effort he invested.

In contrast, while Sheldon also demonstrated an obsession with grades (he knew the exact grade he had to make on his final paper in order to maintain his A), his tedious tracking of feedback from paper to paper seems to have allowed Sheldon to more accurately grasp teacher expectations in order to achieve an A, his metric for success in the course. His reflective essay was full of statements like the following: "The primary critique [by the teacher] against this

paper was the poor connection between my topic sentences and their body paragraph" or "After receiving critique from my teacher…." He thusly perceives the teacher's expectations to fall along those lines: his writing is either right or wrong. For example, in his reflective essay, he discussed the changes he made to his construction of topic sentences: "This [weak topic sentence] is problematic because it sets up the following paragraph to be summary, even though the paragraph is almost entirely critique… After receiving critique from my teacher, I addressed this in my revision by changing the topic sentence…." He consistently demonstrated an awareness of the teacher's expectations through the feedback he received on his writing.

In addition to his tracking of the teacher's feedback, Sheldon also relied upon external factors, like a classmate and course documents to help him discover the teacher's expectations in order to maintain his A. Sheldon has moved along the honors track for several years with Heather, so he has come to trust her perceptions of teacher expectations and seems to use her feedback as a calibration measure for his interpretation of teacher expectations. For example, while he does get peer reviews from multiple classmates on each paper, he ensures that Heather always looks at his drafts and he only really implements changes to his drafts according to feedback from Heather or the instructor. The other feedback is used to find a "mean." He also relies upon a "prescribed list" put forth by a teacher for aligning his translation of teacher expectations: A "prescribed list is good because I don't think especially people our age and of our development, we're not able to set good goals for ourselves. I mean, we're not fully developed people…." In this interview discussion, Sheldon was referencing the "prescribed list" given in the *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing,* which was given to each student at the beginning of the semester as a tool to aid in constructing individual course goals. This document and Heather's feedback are examples of the tools Sheldon has come to rely upon for

identifying and meeting teacher expectations in order to achieve success in the course, mainly an A for both his college and high school grade.

College Prep. While grades were a common motivator for many participants to work towards understanding teacher expectations, college preparation was another motivating factor for some students in heightening an awareness of teacher expectations. Lilly and Heather, two of the strongest writers in the class, were acutely aware of their grades, but with a broader focus of their goals for college and careers. They saw DE English as a means to an end: college preparation in order to ensure success in college. Teacher expectations, therefore, became what dictated their energy invested in assignments, specifically "the teacher, the criteria, and, like, the standard they expect." Because they are both goal-oriented, they were hyper-aware of their time and managing their time. Expediency seems to be what governs most of their decisions. For example, Heather said she took DE English so that she "could get used to …[the] huge divide between high school classes and college classes… quicker." They both perceive themselves to be responsible and engaged students and therefore prioritize acclimating themselves to teacher expectations in order to ensure success, which for these writers was college preparation.

When asked in the focus group discussion to rank themselves on a scale from 1 to 10 as writers, Lilly and Heather both agreed that they "would change the number based on classes" and quickly justified that response by connecting to teacher expectations, at least as they are evidenced via student perceptions through their grades, validating the pervasivity of the theme of grades for these participants. Lilly said the following:

> If I was in a regular English class, I know that I would probably get a better grade
>
> than most people in there… Like, speaking from Mrs. Hoffman's[22] class [English
>
> 11], I was always one of the highest grades, and she was like, 'Oh, good job.' But

---

[22] Name changed for anonymity.

in DE, of course, I definitely wouldn't be… Because I know a lot of teachers, if

it's like, science or econ, we just had a paper, if she wanted 400 words, and I

wrote down my paper, I was explaining everything, and I looked, and I had like,

600 words. I'm like, 'Either she's going to count off for this, or…' I don't know.

Because I'm used to explaining myself and all this stuff, but yeah, I guess it just

depends on the teacher… I think, I guess it depends on the class, too, 'cause you

put me in Mrs. Hoffman's class, I aced all her papers… Like, everyone was doing

bad, and I'm like, a hundred. I'm like, 'Okay.' But then this class is a higher level,

and more is expected from me.

Lilly seems to be aware that a teacher's expectations limit the capacity for a class to challenge

her and ultimately prepare her for what's next: college. So, while she was preserving her high

GPA in the regular English 11 class, she opted instead for DE in her senior year, as it was

marketed and rumored to be more college preparatory than English 12.

Similarly, Heather recommends that eligible students should consider taking DE courses

for the college preparation they offer:

Although being a Dual Enrollment student is challenging, I would recommend

that each high school student enrolls in one Dual Enrollment class that they are

interested in. Not only does enrolling in a Dual Enrollment course prepare one for

college-level coursework, but it can force participants to become introspective

and practice metacognition, which is something each graduating senior can

benefit from.

For Heather, the weight of the choice to commit more time to a harder class is off-set by the

benefits of college preparation. She is, yet again, governing her decision making through the lens

of expediency: "In one semester, I will enter college as a first-year student; therefore… I just wanted to be more prepared for college, I guess, because you always hear that there's that huge divide between high school classes and college classes, so by going ahead and taking it, I could get used to it quicker." The implication behind her statement here is that she would be given the opportunity to adjust to different teacher expectations, perhaps more like those she would experience in college.

Chrissy and Sheldon also made comments throughout the semester about the benefit of the college preparation they would receive from opting for DE English, indirectly implicating teacher expectations as a motivating factor in their decision. Sheldon said his decision rested upon his hope that the course would help him "prepare myself for writing I must do in the future," implying a difference in teacher expectations in the two senior English class offerings: English 12 and DE English. One he felt would prepare him better for college. Similarly, Chrissy, who is often slow to contribute to class discussions (she likes to really think through her ideas before offering them up to others), chose DE English because she appreciates the "opportunity to speak more and to be more engaged," as it contrasts with her "normal high school class[es]" that require her to "memorize it, put it on a test." This line of reasoning implies a choice towards college preparation when it comes to acclimating to a difference in pedagogy, learning environment, and teacher expectations.

DISCIPLINARY DIFFERENCES IN TEACHER EXPECTATIONS

Perhaps the most typical stereotype associated with English teacher expectations is their obsession with grammar. Several participants in this study illustrated a keen awareness of their grammar mistakes when it came to meeting teacher expectations. In Chrissy's interview, she expressed her view of her English teachers as concerned with "grammatical errors" and

"sound[ing] nice" in contrast to her other disciplinary teachers. Lilly also made a direct reference to grammar as being of high importance as far as English teacher expectations are concerned: "My [English] instructor also left two comments on my critique essay saying I needed to add a colon instead of using a comma… My improvement is shown in the last paper of the semester where I correctly used a colon six times… Being taught to use colons has allowed me to write with more flow…." While grammar was not an all-inclusive snapshot of their perceptions of their English teacher's expectations, Chrissy and Lilly did dedicate time and/or space in highlighting grammar as an important aspect of the expectations they believed they were subjected to.

Participants also noted a time obligation difference when it came to meeting disciplinary teacher expectations. Kristin, for example, mentioned a reflective paper for her economics class that she felt she could just "spit out" and still earn a decent grade, implying a lower perception of her economics teacher's expectations as far as writing assignments are concerned. Ironically, what Kristin was unaware of is that I, also serving as Writing across the Curriculum Coordinator, helped the economics teacher to write that particular assignment guide and rubric. So, the assignment parameters were quite similar to a reflective assignment she may encounter in her DE English class, since I was the instructor of the DE course. Yet, if Kristin did notice a similarity between the assignments, her perception was that the economics teacher would interpret the rubric differently, perhaps more leniently. Chrissy used a similar metaphor to highlight her perception of the difference between teacher expectations across her various courses: for writing assignments outside of English class she claims to "just throw up words on my paper and kind of organize it as I go, hoping that's ok." Both Kristin and Chrissy expressed that they dedicate less time to assignments, specifically writing assignments, that are outside of their English class.

Another coded revelation regarding disciplinary differences among teacher expectations was related to an expectation for students to practice certain habits of mind. In the DE English class, students were given a copy of the *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing* at the beginning of the semester as a means of introducing them to certain expectations as far as their involvement as readers, writers, thinkers, and community members. In her interview, Heather alluded to prioritizing her efforts according to teacher expectations: "… we kind of talk about different skills in [English] class that we need to utilize, like metacognition, and stuff… It's probably not going to be something I'm like, 'I need to actively do this,' in other classes…." This statement implies that habits of mind don't align with the teacher expectations for her other classes, so she isn't going to invest the energy and time to really develop those mental practices outside of English class.

METAPHOR

The general ambiguity resulting from the seemingly common gap between teacher expectations and the participants' abilities to interpret those expectations likely relates to the students' reliance upon metaphor, which emerged as an embedded aspect of student language throughout this study. It seemed to be used rhetorically for a few reasons: in an attempt to describe something they don't have language for (ie. habits of mind), to demonstrate something they perceive to be unfamiliar to a listener (ie. Gen Z humor to a member of an older generation), or to relay their internal processes (ie. individualized aspects of their writing process, learning gains). The metaphors most commonly employed by the participants were reliant upon action verbs or nominalizations. Two primary categories of metaphor emerged through the coding process: metaphors of progress and cultural or colloquial metaphors.

METAPHORS OF PROGRESS

      Participants often employed creative metaphors to describe their feelings about collaboration as a part of their learning progress. Timothy, for example, illustrated his collaborative process for coming up with paper topics with a vivid metaphor of fire: "If I'm like, a stick, they're [classmates] a fire that's already burning, and if I can get close enough, it can kind of like, catch, and then my ideas can go." When discussing collaborative projects, David, a student athlete, employed a metaphor his football team utilized to stress the importance of teamwork: As a "brotherhood," "… I help hold the people that I'm working with accountable, to make sure that they're doing what they're doing so that we can all succeed." Kristin was less exuberant than her counterparts in exclaiming that "Nothing makes my eye twitch more than someone not doing anything" when it comes to collaborative projects. Lastly, Sheldon used humor to highlight his leadership and active involvement in the class community: "I'm practically a cult leader." Each of these metaphors showcases the student's capacity for creatively relaying their perceptions of collaboration as part of their learning process in the writing classroom.

      Participants would also employ metaphors to highlight progress within their overall perceptions of their writing process. Sheldon sees his writing progress largely connected to his interactions with his classmate Heather. He perceives her as much better at the writing process than he is. So, when he is tasked with high stakes writing, such as his application for acceptance into the University of Tennessee at Knoxville's Honors College, he said, "I tried to channel my inner Heather Carter," implying a relational component to his writing process. Within her final reflective essay, Chrissy also employed emotional metaphors to reveal the setting and discursivity of her writing process: "As I sit in the dark abyss of my bedroom, only illuminated

by the harsh, bright light of my computer, my eyes droop with sleepiness, and dull numbness fills my body… When I correct one mistake, I make another, and this occurs each time I cycle through the process of writing… improper citations are issues that I wrestle with in recent papers." Chrissy also used a metaphor to describe her writing process for assignments outside of her English class: "So I'll just throw up words on my paper and kind of organize it as I go, hoping that it's okay. And then I'll do some revisions after that, to fix it." These metaphors illustrate the relational and emotional aspects of the participants' writing processes, as well their likely ability to distinguish disciplinary differences in teacher expectations.

Broader in scope, participants used metaphors to highlight progress, or a lack thereof, within their overall perceptions of their writing. Kristin's final reflective essay revealed a positive view of her writing progress, as she declared that she had to "overcome obstacles with my writing" and to discover "new tools" to better her writing. Other participants had a more negative view of their writing progress. Chrissy and Sheldon both claimed that their writing had become "stagnant": Chrissy titled her final reflective essay "Stagnant Writing," while Sheldon stated in his essay that "I have remained relatively stagnant in my usage of fundamental punctuation and grammar." Similarly, Heather and Sheldon both identified aspects of their writing that they deemed to be a "flaw": Heather said that "… I have become aware of this flaw…" in focus as "… I strayed from the topic…" and Sheldon says of his punctuation usage, "… I have not yet overcome this flaw…." Wes also used a metaphor to acknowledge his misinformed perception of his writing ability upon entering DE English: "Once I reached the Dual Enrollment English class, I thought I had evolved my writing ability to be able to meet the requirements of the class, but I was incorrect yet again. In order to further evolve my writing, I had to realize my most common mistakes…." These metaphors participants used to discuss their

writing within their final reflective essays seem to be their way of describing the complexities which they have come to realize represent writing.

Participants would also employ metaphors to illustrate perceived progress within their overall perceptions of themselves as writers. Heather, when asked in her interview to describe herself as a writer, said she was "a huge skyscraper" without "the foundation" because "I feel like I have a lot of writing still to get through." This architectural metaphor implies a perception of herself as a novice writer because she hasn't yet risen beyond the "foundation" of college writing. Later, in her reflective essay, she said she "exercised metacognition," which demonstrates a likely understanding of habits of mind as cognitive functions that requires exercise to improve. Sheldon, when asked to describe himself as a writer, also relied upon metaphor: "I feel like I've polished the marble a little bit." In the same interview, when asked about his takeaways from any readings this semester, he responded with a syllogism with an embedded metaphor: "Human experience is not a good reflector for reality because everyone's human experience differs. Therefore, you cannot trust human experience." Finally, Chrissy also used metaphors to illustrate her perceptions of herself as a writer in her final reflective essay: "I am confident that my abilities as a writer have skyrocketed… fixing most of these mistakes has allowed me to progress in my abilities as a writer… Next semester [ENGL 110] will be a welcome challenge that will hopefully further acquaint me with college writing…." Each of these students engaged creative metaphors to describe the abstractions of their self-perceptions as writers as they evolved over the course of the semester.

A few participants unknowingly gave credence to the neoliberalist nature of DE through their use of metaphors of progress that employ economic language. Timothy, for example, described his decision making process on whether he would spend time on revision based upon

peer feedback: "big picture stuff, if people suggest a change, I should at least look into it… Just because everyone else doesn't see it, doesn't mean that it's not there. So, I'm definitely giving it more credit." This shows progress in his willingness to consider feedback received on his drafts. Sheldon also used an economic metaphor in his discussion of peer feedback: "… it [peer feedback] helps me realize when I'm investing too much in something." Kristin utilizes economic language in some of her metaphors within her final reflective essay. She referred to her "high school career," "an advancement of the flow" of her writing, and the "valuable… skills I have acquired… that I will certainly utilize in college." This acquisition and "advancement" ultimately have made her "feel prepared for the fast pace of college, and I will utilize the the [sic] research skills I have gained through my years at [Harville Academy] to be successful in a university setting." Kristin's economic language here implies a perception of her DE English course as a means to an end: success in "a university setting."

One of the most common metaphors employed within the final reflective essay was related to growth, either in writing abilities or as a writer. Lilly's metaphor was her focal point in her essay's title "Growth as a Reader, Writer, Thinker, and Community Member." She also declared the goal of the course "is to persistently commit to growing as a reader, writer, thinker, and community member." Chrissy demonstrates her writing progress by saying, "I have grown in my abilities to write precisely, concisely and with semi-strong grammar." Wes similarly states, "I have grown confident in my abilities thus far, and know that I will be able to continue to improve in my English journey." Kristin also makes a similar statement employing an active metaphor of growth: "This year has had its ups and downs, but I feel like I have grown and matured as a person and as a writer because of it." Sheldon follows suit with his growth metaphor: "Ultimately, after struggling through the semester, I do believe that I have grown as a writer. I

have been able to learn new skills like semicolons, address flaws in my writing style such as structure, and have recognized my failure with fundamental punctuation." Sheldon's second sentence here also offers up support for his growth. These snapshots of growth metaphors employed by participants throughout the semester could highlight the dominating pursuit of upward progress.

A second common metaphor was that of a journey. Maddy simply titled her final reflective essay "My Writing Journey." Heather's essay title was quite similar: "My Journey as a College English Student." Wes's title, "Slow and Steady; [sic] My Progression As a Writer," had an implied metaphor of journey, as "slow and steady" is often associated with moving forward on one's journey. Chrissy also had an implied connection to a metaphorical journey, claiming she was "take[ing] strides in the right direction." Kristin's journey metaphor in her title was more creative with her pop culture reference to *The Wizard of Oz:* "Toto, I've a feeling We're Not Sophomore's Anymore." A reader would likely be aware of Dorothy's journey away from her Kansas home and would recognize this title as a direct reference to Dorothy's most famous line, "Toto, I've a feeling we're not in Kansas anymore." Kristin's metaphor could also imply a forced journey: just as Dorothy's journey began caught up in the fury of a tornado, Kristin may feel caught up in some fury associated with the happenings throughout the course. Finally, in a casual conversation, Heather made an indirect reference to being lost on a metaphorical journey: "It's like, 'Where are we and what are we doing?'" This statement was prompted through a discussion of her having to virtually attend her DE math class on a plane because the University calendar did not allow for a fall break like her high school schedule. These journey metaphors, either direct or indirect in their usage, seem to highlight the participants' perceptions of their

progress in aiming for a goal that could be a physical setting, like college, or a cognitive gain, such as in their writing abilities.

COLLOQUIAL AND CULTURAL METAPHORS

While many of the above metaphors of progress were at least partially unique to each student's take, others were colloquial cliches. For example, Chrissy said that the diversity of readings throughout the semester was "eye-opening" for her in that "just seeing other perspectives that are not my own… makes me think differently." Kristin used the metaphorical expression "I'm in the same boat" to show comradeship and a similarity in writerly attributes during a focus group discussion about themselves as writers. In Sheldon's interview, he acknowledged value in the habits of mind as put forth by the experts behind the *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing*, but he declared that he ultimately "blew them off," metaphorically describing his dismissal of the contents of the document. Each of these metaphors was employed without any visible hesitation in linguistic construction, as they are likely colloquial cliches within their linguistic communities.

One student revealed some interesting insights to ultimately undermine the power of the cultural metaphor of the American Dream. During a casual conversation, Sheldon admitted his disillusionment regarding the American Dream, as it rarely yields contentment. He wants to move to Japan and have a career in academics or business because he says he's become "disillusioned with the whole idea of America… it was destined to fail from the beginning." The Honors English 11 teacher was there as well and reminded him why this failure was inevitable from a lesson from her class last year: Thomas Jefferson changed John Locke's statement from "life, liberty, and property" to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Sheldon said he doesn't want to never feel content with his job and he's learned from his dad, who works two full

time jobs and is "working himself to death," that he (Sheldon) "doesn't want to live to work." Sheldon said his biggest aspiration is to be a father because he's seen that is what brings his father the most enjoyment. Sheldon, acutely aware of the harsh ironies of the American Dream, spends hours each day teaching himself Japanese in an effort to make his dream for a simple life of contentment a reality one day.

Another casual impromptu conversation about Gen Z humor led to an implication about the participants' understanding of and reliance upon metaphors. One day, the bell had rung to end class and the students were packing up and laughing at a visual artifact on a phone. Sheldon asked, "Mrs. Johnson, do you find Gen Z humor humorous?" These students then proceeded to define for me, as best they could, Gen Z humor, showing me examples like a "Man" meme, in which a horse is standing before the sea in an apparent contemplative stance. Heather declared the basis of Gen Z humor as "low quality images that are oversaturated," while Sheldon added that it is imbued with about five layers of irony related to politics, culture, and the like. He said that even the font used in the "Man" meme we were discussing is used ironically because it is "Boomer font." Heather then showed me a similar "Sea Horse" meme that had the same image, a horse standing right on the shoreline, to highlight the difference: the "Sea Horse" meme is "teacher humor" or millennial humor. What this exchange made clear is that the participants, all members of Gen Z, often rely upon metaphors as the basis of their digital humor, implying a cultural understanding of, as well as a Gen Zer's colloquial recognition of, the metaphor.

WRITING VS. WRITER

The participants' use of metaphor seemed to highlight areas where student language capacity would indicate a necessity for creative language in order to relay abstract ideas. In other words, this creative language usage perhaps revealed a linguistic flexibility and creativity as a

means of relaying new experiences with complexity. One such complex concept emerged as some students tried to distinguish between their self-perceptions of *writing* and themselves as *writers*. This distinction seemed to run along the boundary lines of skills vs. mindset, as the students most often discussed, either directly or indirectly, individual writing skills or tasks and a writer's mentality or mindset. It is important to note here that the participants rarely acknowledged a perception of themselves as *writers*, and even when they did, it was often synonymous with their definitions of *writing*. Yet, a look at several of the participants throughout the semester allowed several points of difference to surface through the coding process.

These subtle points of difference among participants prompted a shift in my analytical framework for this code. The interplay between the two coding terms *writing* and *writer* were often not distinct enough throughout the participants' discussions for me to justify a separation. Further, the shift in analytical framework here is to preserve the participants' voice in allowing their discussion of their *writing,* as it impacts who they perceive themselves to be as *writers,* to be portrayed holistically as a unified snapshot of their self-perceptions. To parse these discussions out into thematic sub-codes could cause a distraction from these self-perceptions and undermine a goal of this study, mainly to highlight the "complexity of views" offered through student voices that are often inaccessible to our composition research community (Creswell 24). For these reasons, I have chosen to outline the following coded results by participant rather than theme or sub-code.

HEATHER

Heather, Student Director of the high school's Writing Center and one of the key voices in class discussion within DE English, views herself as a novice when it comes to writing. In her interview, she offered casual definitions of different types of writing, mainly "little kid writing"

as commonspeak and "fancy" as academic writing. Within the interview, she mostly discussed *writing* as a series of assigned tasks that she must prioritize and dedicate time to, relegating the identity construct of *writer* to less than the task of writing. For example, she applies feedback on papers to future writing tasks, rather than applying it to who she is as a writer. The exception was when she was in the position of reader. When she read personal writing, such as narratives from her classmates, specifically those not at her honors table, she said she learned something about the author of the paper, demonstrating a consciousness of the concept of *writer*: "… you know, it helps you get to know your classmates better, too, if you don't already. I remember [Chrissy's] was really good. I remember that… 'cause we're friends and everything, but we're not super close. So it was like, 'Oh, hey. New thing about Chrissy.'" So, as a reader, it seems that she is aware of how a writer often imbues herself within her writing but does not necessarily acknowledge herself as a writer in turn.

Yet, by the end of the semester, Heather displayed more of a merging of the two concepts of *writing* and *writer*. She was able to discuss the interplay of writing skills and writer's mindset. She references "introspection" in her interview as "a new skill" that serves both her writing and her identity as a writer. She later follows up on this skill in her final reflective essay by connecting it to a habit of mind: "Through the introspective nature of the 'So What' question, I have been able to practice one of the habits of mind: metacognition. Through metacognition, I was able to express my passion for each topic, which improved my writing." Her reference to "metacognition," one of the eight habits of mind put forth in the *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing,* which was given to each student at the beginning of the semester, highlights her connection of a mental process to her writing, demonstrating a development in her self-perception as a writer.

SHELDON

  Sheldon is somewhat a counterpart to Heather when it comes to writing and, well, everything really. In fact, Sheldon even acknowledged this dichotomy in his interview:

> She is a very tuned person, and she's tuned the opposite way I am… And so, if my perspective, and my ability to interpret reality is skewed one direction, hers is skewed the other, and so of course the midpoint between that is closer to reality than either of us could get. So, I feel like we cancel each other's perspectives, biases, out, and we approximate reality a little better together… we challenge each other, I mean, Heather throws something out, I throw it out, we talk about it, we poke fun, we have a good time. And I mean, half of the process is knowing that Heather and I disagree on practically everything. And the other half of the process is knowing that Heather and I enjoy talking about practically everything. So it creates this infinite loop of conversation that we can kind of just throw ourselves into… I think it's just a matter that Heather and I have opposite perspectives that attract one another and then incite debate. It's just a circumstance of our personalities, that our personalities have fit together like they do.

While Sheldon highlights a unique friendship (and perhaps reveals a bit of a crush), he also suggests the power and importance of dialectical exchange for his writing process. He strives to write in a manner that he sees as aligning with reality — that is, facts and truth.

  What is so fascinating about Sheldon is that he depends on a scientific approach for nearly all interactions, including with his own writing. Sheldon has an obsession with accuracy, right, and factual information, which leads him to try to take a scientific approach to his writing

process. For example, Sheldons's writing process is scientific in that he seeks to find a mean within the feedback he receives. In his interview, when asked how he typically responds to feedback on his drafts, he responded as such:

> I like to get feedback from a bunch of people, and I like to accumulate feedback, and then I like to address feedback — all of the feedback — together. So, for example, when we did revisions in here, I would get revisions from my table mates, then I would go to you, and I would get special revisions for specific things I was concerned about. And when I went through my paper, I would read all of the revisions and kind of melt them together and kind of make a mean or an average of what they had to say. And I think that's because every different person is different. You know there is something wrong with your paper when there's a common consensus that it is wrong… And so that's how I kind of deduce what points are major and what points need to be addressed.

His use of terms like "mean" and "deduce" is revelatory as to his approach to the writing process: it's a sort of scientific process for him. He is comfortable within the realms of math and science and likely seeks ways to scaffold his English learning through those language lenses and processes.

Similarly, Sheldon approaches the research phase of his writing process in a scientific manner. While most participants would claim a belief in objective truth because of the religious institutional context in which this study took place, Sheldon is even more black and white in his approach to truth:

> I don't want to lean in on the postmodernist instinct that there is no truth, reality is entirely objective, because it's not; there is an objective truth, and things are

objectively right or wrong. The question then becomes, how do you acquire

knowledge of what is right or wrong? And maybe, maybe it's one of those things

where, maybe it's like my drafting process, where you take an average of

everything they're saying, and if you find common points, that must be the truth.

Maybe that's it.

This belief in an objective truth leads him to a scientific process of reading and analyzing

multiple voices in order to deduce a mean, an embedded part of Sheldon's process when it comes

to sources. Because Sheldon doesn't really trust himself to know objective truth or to see the true

picture of reality, he relies upon external experts almost entirely.

Because of Sheldon's reliance upon multiple expert voices, the writing process for

reflective writing is especially difficult for him. While most of the other participants declared

reflective writing to be quicker and easier to write, Sheldon is an anomaly in that he goes through

more drafts for his reflective writing than his researched writing:

I'm not certain that I'm accurately representing things. And I want to accurately

represent things… it makes me read my writing, and it's like, "Is this really true?

Is it an accurate representation, or is this just hot air?" … I'll start writing, and I

think I have nothing to say, and then as I write, maybe I'll remember something

or maybe I'll notice a pattern in it, and then I'll kind of make order out of chaos

and pull a common thread… This last reflective paper, I went through six full

drafts… 'Cause I'd read it, be like, "That doesn't seem accurate," and then I'd

throw it out, and then I'd write it again, and then I'd be like, "That still doesn't

seem accurate," and so I'd throw it out, and so eventually, my final paper, what I

did was effectively pull a little bit from all those that seemed somewhat

representative of how I remembered it, and then I kind of made an average of

those, a general approximation of what they had to say into my final paper… So I

had… to make an amalgamation of those writings.

What this detailing of Sheldon's writing process could reveal is a continual interplay between

Sheldon's writing and himself as writer. No other participant gave such a detailed account of

their writing process that disclosed this dance of the task of writing and the mindset of the writer:

in Sheldon's case, a mindset bent on objectively representing reality through a scientific

approach to writing his reflective essay.

TIMOTHY

Timothy was an interesting participant in that he was working on average 20-25 hours a

week, which complicated his time management and perhaps was the source of some of his

frustration and ultimately a loss of confidence in himself as a writer. He truly wanted to be a

good writer, but his schedule was more than he was equipped to handle: "It [his effort to get

work done well and on time] got worse towards the end [of the semester] as more stuff started

piling on, and then I started getting a lot better hours at work. Just, it got hard to… [manage] my

time." His math teacher recommended "an Eisenhower schedule" to help Timothy "kind of chart

out the stuff I need to do throughout the day," which helped, but was too late to recover from his

writing frustration. The final line of his reflective essay reads as follows: "Although some

smaller fixes such as better use of the sandwich method are seen in my most recent papers,

mistakes such as weak topic sentences and grammatical mistakes have continued to beat down

both my grade, and my confidence as a writer." For Timothy, his grades directly impacted his

perception of himself as a writer and ultimately his writing confidence, yet his schedule just did

not seem to allow him to be successful according to these metrics.

Timothy did not seem to be able to distinguish between *writing* and *writer*. While he likened his confidence to himself as a writer, this seemed to be solely connected to his grades, thus defining himself as writer to extrinsic factors. When I asked him directly in the interview about himself as a writer, he in turn asked if I was referring to the "skill," implying a schism between perceiving himself as a writer and the writing tasks he performed using a skill set. Yet, within his final reflective essay, he was able to discuss specific writing skills, such as utilizing the sandwich method for organization, employing strong topic sentences for focus, and editing for "grammatical mistakes." He further showed an awareness of the reader: "In my second paper of the year, paragraphs were weakly introduced by short topic sentences. This hurts the overall flow of the paper and discourages the reader from finishing the page." This connection does imply a burgeoning recognition of himself as a writer addressing a reader, rather than a student performing writing tasks. In his interview, he also highlighted a distinction between "just looking for a source" versus "really trying to learn about it [a research topic]," the latter implicating a mentality in approaching research and therefore perhaps a move towards viewing himself as a writer.

CHRISSY

Chrissy and Timothy are dating and their overall attitudes towards the DE English class and their writing parallel one another. In short, neither feel they have progressed much in their writing. In fact, Chrissy titled her final reflective essay "Stagnant Writing" because she does "not feel as though I have a solid basis as a college-level writer." This harsh assessment of herself is probably because of her perfectionistic nature and insecurities when it comes to letting others down. In the focus group discussion early in the semester, she claimed, "I think I'm a pretty good student. I try to be, as best as I can, so that I can please the teacher, not always, I guess for

myself, for my learning, but kind of like, it's a status thing." Later in her interview towards the end of the semester, she reiterated, "I still heavily want to please the teacher, but I'm working on trying to like, become smarter myself." So, like Timothy, her assessment of herself as writer is largely correlated to extrinsic measures like grades, which she likely translates as the teacher's assessment of her writing and, in turn, herself as a writer.

Yet, she showed a higher level of awareness than Timothy in distinguishing between the skills of *writing* and the mindset or mentality of a *writer*. She wrote in her final reflective essay that "While my writing demonstrates an improved understanding of conciseness and grammar compared to the beginning of the semester, my ability as a writer has largely remained the same." This shows a distinction between *writing* and *writer* by highlighting that her writing has improved, yet she feels she is stagnant as a writer. Later in the essay, she flips her assessment to privilege growth in herself as a writer: "… I feel like my ethos and engagement as a writer have become more defined, and I am more efficient because I understand my writing style more thoroughly than before." This shows her perceiving her writing through the lens of herself as a writer as she connects to a habit of mind and an understanding of her writing, both mental practices. Her mention of "ethos" also shows an increase in her perceived credibility as a writer and perhaps an expanded view of herself as a writer, beyond the extrinsic markers of grades and teacher perceptions inferred from grades.

LILLY

Lilly is perhaps the key to understanding how DE English students might perceive and define *writing* and *writer*. Lilly is a very intentional and thoughtful writer from a teacher's perspective. In fact, her work ethic and attention to detail lead her to the honor of salutatorian. Just to paint a picture of her writing abilities, the Academic Dean at Lilly's high school said that

Lilly's salutatorian address made her cry. So, Lilly's distinctions between these two key terms *writing* and *writer* may unveil some intricacies that other participants were unable to achieve or at least were not able to verbalize. Firstly, Lilly was very conscious of the goals of the course: "The goal of Dual-Enrollment English 106 is to persistently commit to growing as a reader, writer, thinker, and community member." While she certainly could have been writing rhetorically to her audience, in this case her teacher, the framing of her final reflective essay through the lens of the course goals shows an awareness of writing as rhetorically situated, an understanding that most of her peers did not grasp.

Lilly was also able to highlight deeper differences in her evolving mentality as a writer. In her final reflective essay, she emphasizes her shift in mindset from student to writer:

> During the first semester I spent in a college English class, I began to transition *from thinking like a student to thinking like a writer*. I no longer try to shove all the information I learned into a thousand words. Instead, questions such as the following flow through my mind: Is this necessary? Does this add anything to my paper? Is my claim supported? Are the paragraphs connected to my thesis? *Starting to write quality content over a quantity of content* allowed me to take my biggest *steps as a writer* in only five months… Although I still have improvement to make in areas such as engagement and preparation, *I have grown into the mind of a writer* this year and *made advancements in grammar and in simplifying my writing. I have learned to be more open to others' views and interests, and also expand my own*. [emphasis added]

She defines this mental shift into "the mind of a writer" as a move away from completing a writing task (ie. "try[ing] to shove all the information I learned into a thousand words," which

implies a reference to an assignment's word requirements) to a writer's emphasis on "quality…

of content." This evolving mentality seems to compel her to say something meaningful with her

words as well as consider the words of others as more meaningful, even if their perspectives

differ from her own.

Lilly further offers a definition for writing. When she reflects specifically on the move

from a high school English class to a college class, she says, "For me, the most challenging part

of writing is knowing *what* to write and *how* to write it [emphasis added]." For Lilly, the topic

(the "what") and the writing style (the "how") seem to encompass the skill set of writing. In

addressing the "what," she adopted the following approach to topic selections: "I feel like I'm

interested in this [topic of eating disorders], so I feel like it will be easier [to write about]." She

attempted to select topics throughout the semester that were of direct interest to her: the nature

vs. nurture psychological debate (her intended field of study), the impact of eating disorders (her

friend suffered from an eating disorder), and the correlation between gun laws and mass killings

(her brother is in the military and has been criticized for his pro-gun beliefs). These topics

impacted the development of her understanding of the "how to write." For example, her biggest

writing improvement in this semester was her ability to be more concise: "[This] college class

allowed me to make improvements such as learning how to be concise in my wording. I want to

put every detail possible in my paragraphs. This often leads to repetitive and wordy sentences…

Although I still struggle with being repetitive, I have learned to recognize where my sentences

become wordy and improve them." For Lilly, writing is focused on two aspects: "knowing *what*

to write and *how* to write it."

MADDY

Maddy was an excited but nervous student entering DE English. She did not take the

honors English 11 course but she aced all papers (largely creative in nature) in the regular

English 11 class, prompting her teacher to encourage her to take DE English in her senior year.

Because of this, her go-to writing style was creative, regardless of the writing assignment. While

Maddy did not speak much to her perceived identity as a writer, she did discuss skill sets she saw

as important to the writing process by the end of the semester:

> I learned that researching topics I have an interest in helps me to enjoy the
> writing process and be more persistent… I have learned that directly organizing
> my topic sentences helps my audience to understand the main points of my paper
> and the intentions of my writing… While writing, rather than including biased
> language, I have learned that I need to rely on more credible voices… I have
> improved my writing skills overall. In my future, my college professors will see
> complexity, conciseness, and intention in my writing….

These excerpts from her reflective essay highlight her expansion in defining writing as more than

creative: she can systematically organize her writing process and her writing voice according to

certain skill sets, such as research, organization, and appropriate diction.

KRISTIN

Kristin did take Honors English in her Junior year of high school, so she exuded more of

a confidence entering DE English in fall of her senior year. She did discuss both herself as a

writer and her writing. For example, in her final reflective essay, she wrote, "This year I have

been introduced to new tools I can use in my writing to become more credible and interesting as

a writer." One of these "tools," as defined later in her essay, is her move away from "a short,

uninformative three-point thesis" because it "seems to interrupt the flow of the essay and reads

like you are trying to complete an assignment rather than inform your readers." She also claims

that "[o]bstacles with my writing… have pushed me to become more a [sic] effective writer." These obstacles were associated with time management: "I juggled the responsibilities of having a lead role in the Fall play, having a small painting business, and the workload of multiple honors classes. This year has had its ups and downs, but I feel like I have grown and matured as a person and as a writer because of it." It is interesting that she connected her responsibilities outside of English class to her development as a writer, perhaps showcasing her ability to see herself holistically rather than in fragmentation.

WES

Wes, an inconsistent student who missed the 8:00am DE English class often because he was up late editing videos for his side job, discusses mainly *writing* in his final reflective essay, titled "Slow and Steady; My Progression As a Writer." While he frames the paper in language of his "improve[ment] as a writer," he really speaks only of writing skills:

> In order to further evolve my writing, I had to realize my most common mistakes: not developing a good writing strategy, making broad claims, and not fully supporting my arguments with enough evidence to convince a reader… I realized that I was doing this broad grouping technique and saw how it was hurting my writing and making my statements or arguments less credible. The last way that I had to improve my writing was by not fully supporting my arguments with enough evidence.

He is showing an awareness of writing for a reader as he mentions the credibility of his claims, which is likely a demonstration of his mentality as a writer who is writing for an audience. However, most of his discussion focuses on writing skills like narrowing claims, providing adequate support, and organizing.

EXPERIENCE

As students discussed their self-percetions of their *writing* and themselves as *writers*, their reliance upon *experience* became evident. While it seemed insignificant at first —— mainly because all people interact with the world and others through experiences —— second round coding brought to my attention just how much the participants' individual and collective experiences shaped their approaches to their writing processes, their perceptions of themselves as writers, and their engagement with the DE discourse community. In fact, several participants answered interview questions and engaged primarily through their recounting of lived experiences.

Participants were impacted both by specific experiential moments as well as connected experiences across longer stretches of time. For example, David's experience as a football player seemed to be his primary identity construct. When asked to describe himself as a student, he responded with a recap of his daily schedule:

> I also feel like I'm a pretty good student. I feel like I'm really good with time commitment because through my whole high school career, I've always had something going on. I don't think there's ever been a day in my high school career where I've just gone straight home after school… I've always had something going on, whether it's football or actual work or something like that. So I really had to manage my time and put my priorities first. Once I get home, I get my work done instead of just, you know, going to play video games or whatever. Like, I gotta get my stuff done.

David's work ethic in the English classroom appears to directly correlate with the disciplined schedule he was used to maintaining through his experiences as a student athlete. Kristin

similarly was defined as a student to some degree through her extracurricular commitments: "I juggled the responsibilities of having a lead role in the Fall play, having a small painting business, and the workload of multiple honors classes." It was the busyness of these experiences that seems to have helped her develop a sense of responsibility as a student. Lilly's secondhand experience with eating disorders through her friend's battle impacted her deeply and inspired her topic selection for a problem-solution proposal essay: "I feel like I'm interested in this [topic of eating disorders], so I feel like it will be easier [to write about]." What each of these snapshots seems to relay is that personal experiences inspire a real-world relevance for the participants that compels a sense of curiosity and engagement.

SHELDON

While all participants either directly recounted personal experiences or alluded to specific, defining experiential moments, a few students stood out to me, as they seemed to bear reflections of their lived experiences within their identity constructs. As discussed above, Sheldon depends upon a scientific approach for nearly all aspects of his writing process. This methodical mindset extended to his experiences with his peers. Sheldon observes his peers in order to deduce socially acceptable methods of behavior. Throughout our casual conversations, Sheldon revealed that he has always struggled to fit in with his peers, a struggle he attributes to changing schools seven different times from sixth to tenth grade. Because of this, he resorted to a sort of scientific approach in his peer interactions, even assessing how much laughter he would receive for certain jokes. This frustration with having to work so hard to deduce patterns in his peers' behavior perhaps evoked this comment in class one day: "My identity is going to be how much I hate identitarianism, so my identity is going to be an anti-identitarian identity." His

experiences with isolation through so many school transitions seem to have culled this "in-opposition-to" identity.

Sheldon also interacts with texts in a scientific manner, mainly because he does not trust a human's ability to relay experiences accurately. In our interview, when asked about some takeaways from the different perspectives he encountered through published texts and his classmates' writings, he disclosed that he reads (or views) in search of the mean experience or perspective in order to deduce some sort of truth:

Human experience is not a good reflector for reality because everyone's human experience differs. Therefore, you cannot trust human experience… Because… there's obvious conflict, … you come to the problem of, who… is correct? … The question then becomes, how do you acquire knowledge of what is right or wrong? And maybe, maybe it's one of those things where, maybe it's like my drafting process, where you take an average of everything they're saying, and if you find common points, that must be the truth. Maybe that's it. But obviously, humans aren't supercomputers. We can't analyze things that in-depth… So, when I read each one [a text], I guess what I'm trying to do is I'm trying to imagine myself as the individual and see how I could interpret that situation to be truth. 'Cause a lot of the times, I don't agree with what they have to say… so when I'm reading it, I try to put on those tainting lenses that give their writing that color and that perspective, and I try to imagine how I could interpret reality as they interpret reality… So it's just understanding that even though they're not entirely representing reality, they're representing reality as they see it. So, I guess that was one where I had to more analyze the circumstance.

This excerpt from our interview discussion reveals that he is fairly black and white in his thinking, mainly that there is objective truth; yet, he doesn't really trust himself to know it. He relies upon external experts almost entirely to trace some sort of truth among the experiences offered up through his interactions with the texts.

While Sheldon was seemingly negatively affected by his experiences with transferring schools so many times throughout his adolescent years, he was perhaps positively impacted by his experience at Brown University's pre-college preparatory summer program he attended one summer. This program exposed him to students from all over the world, breaking him out of his nearly singular experience bubble in the religious South. In a casual conversation after a Writing Center appointment, Sheldon recounted the languages he heard, the foods he tried, and the cultural nuances he learned about through conversations with his roommates and fellow program attendees. He also described this experience as the first time he was around people his age who were truly smarter than he was. This experience impacted how he in turn viewed his peers back home and perhaps perpetuated an air of elitism, most often demonstrated through his lofty vocabulary and scholarly hobbies, such as teaching himself Japanese.

Sheldon also claims a directional impact from his father's lived experiences. His father owns his own business and works a full-time job. This means that his dad works Monday through Friday, often putting in overtime hours, and then spends most of the weekend managing his own business. By Sunday afternoon, he is so tired that he usually naps on a recliner in the living room while the television boasts a show he is too exhausted to watch. Sheldon relayed these details about his familial life with a tone of disappointment, abandon even. Yet, he spoke excitedly in following up with how happy his father was during the one or two week-long vacations his family takes annually. These experiences have shown Sheldon that the career path

his father has taken is not a means to contentment, something that Sheldon craves out of his working life. He says he wants to be a father above all else and knows that he wants to derive contentment from that role, which will require a work-life balance to allow for time with his family. Like with anything else, Sheldon's deductive approach to analyzing his father's experiences and the resulting lack of contentment allowed him to conclude that chasing the American dream, at least in a similar way to his father, was not the path he intended to take. He plans to move to Japan for his working years.

HEATHER

Sheldon's closest friend in the DE English class is Heather, who also had some perspectival transforming experiences outside of the culture of the private school context in which this study occurred. In fact, it seems that experiences, mainly her experiences outside of the institutional community in this study, are a driving force for Heather in her decision making. One of the early experiences that Heather often referenced was her involvement in community theater. She wrote her first essay, an experiential narrative, for DE English about the experiences of some of her castmates and the ensuing perspective changes she underwent as a result of these experiences. She also used these experiences as the key narrative moment in her senior speech, a long-anticipated moment for each senior to address the high school body with a message or challenge, and then again in several of her college admissions and scholarship essays.

When she began community theater at the age of ten, she was introduced to the Jewish culture and traditions through a conversation with a castmate about American Girl dolls:

> Rachel confessed that her favorite doll was Rebecca, explaining, 'She's Jewish, too.' I had never heard of Judaism; religion isn't the kind of conversation to have over square pizza and milk cartons. After she taught me about her older sister's

"super cool" thirteenth birthday party and other Jewish traditions, I impatiently

rushed through my audition and exited the Theatre Centre on a quest for

knowledge. I excitedly googled *Judaism* on the family computer, which gave me

an overwhelming amount of search results. I wasn't intimidated; rather, I felt

inspired by what I learned. Most importantly, I discovered the persecution that

Jewish people still face, which motivated me to show Rachel acceptance and

support. At that moment, I discovered that the Theatre Centre was not only a

place to perform, but also an avenue to pursue knowledge as I connected with

others.

This worldview-broadening experience was followed by another transformative experience when

Heather was in middle school: one of her castmates came out as transgender. This experience

seemed to break down more walls of "normalcy" in Heather's world and her curiosity led her to

even more Google searches and many conversations with this castmate in an effort to

demonstrate acceptance well. She saw how harshly this castmate was treated and vowed then to

her middle school self to always fight for people suffering from injustices.

That vow in middle school led to an interest in politics and Heather's experiences

throughout high school in the Chattanooga Mayor's Youth Council. This program allows "area

high school students [to] share their ideas and their concerns about issues young people face

today. From advising the Mayor on key priorities to acting as a liaison between the school hall

and City Hall, the Mayor's Youth Council works together to give a voice to young people across

our community" ("Mayor's Youth Council"). Heather details the impact of these experiences in a

supplemental essay for her Wake Forest University application:

On the Chattanooga Mayor's Youth Council, brief conversations with other

council members are called speed dates, and each discussion has contributed to

my love for public servantry. Our council is a diverse, driven community… As a

member, I've collaborated with others to organize a gun violence awareness

event, spoken to state representatives on behalf of the council, and initiated efforts

to make a more eco-friendly City Hall… I know that I will continue to create

change by fostering conversations with others.

These experiences of actively collaborating with other like-minded teenagers, who are passionate

about injustice in their community, prompted many of Heather's essay topics, ranging from

disproportionate poverty levels among disabled persons in American and how political parties

can impact healthcare for those living in poverty. They also prompted her to volunteer to work

the voting polls during the November 2020 election, yet another experience solidifying her

decision to choose political journalism as her intended field of study in college.

Yet, through all these experiences, Heather acknowledged that she rarely takes the time

to reflect upon how those experiences impact her. In a focus group discussion, I asked the

participants how they approached reflective writing assignments. The two participants, Heather

being one, replied as follows:

Lilly: "It sucks because we almost don't reflect on what happens to us."

Heather: "I, last year, something had literally happened to me on, like, a Monday,

and I was initially sad about it, but I was, like, 'I'll deal with it later,' and then

Friday, I got into bed, I was laying down, and I was like, 'I forgot to deal with

that' … It's like you know so much about you until somebody says… 'What are

you all about?' And you're like, 'Um, you know…"

These two participants maintained packed schedules, and seemingly even reflection is governed through the funnel of expediency and time management. Yet, Heather's career path and her essay topics reveal that her experiences have greatly impacted her, whether she has taken the time to actively reflect upon their influence or not.

TIMOTHY

Timothy is quite different from either Sheldon or Heather in that he is not an honors student. He took a few honors classes, but he did not pack out his schedule year after year with them as many other participants did. Timothy was the only student in the DE class who worked a traditional minimum wage job in the fall semester when this study took place[23]. He worked for Publix, a grocery store, so his schedule outside of school was mostly determined for him. His work week was typically around 20-25 hours a week, which is quite a bit when his track and drama practice schedules are factored into his weekly schedule. This experience of "more stuff… piling on" encouraged him to try out "an Eisenhower schedule" at the urging of his math teacher: "so there's like, four chunks. The top left chunk is *has to be done immediately*, and then there's *needs to be done, but can wait*. There's *doesn't necessarily need to be done* [and] *stay away from*, so I've been using that to kind of chart out the stuff I need to do throughout the day." This scheduling tool has "been a big help for sure," as experience seems to have taught him that time management is a necessary skill set in order to both work and take a DE class.

Timothy also stood out to me because of his experience with family abuse. Early in the semester in which this study occurred, the students were assigned to read an excerpt from J.D. Vance's *Hillbilly Elegy.* The following class, students watched a TEDTalk in which Vance

---

[23] Other students worked summer jobs or got jobs in late spring in order to secure summer employment for after graduation. One other student did maintain an Etsy shop, so had work from time to time as she opted. Another student did some freelance videographer work with a friend, but his work schedule was largely self-determined so he could choose not to work.

discusses some of the backstory for his memoir. Within this talk, Vance mentions ACEs (adverse childhood experiences), so students were instructed to pull up a ten-question ACEs quiz and encouraged to take it to familiarize themselves with some of the most common categories of ACEs. This was used as a launching point for discussing the importance of connotation for diction choices (ie. *trauma* and *ACEs* sound more sterilized than *abuse* or *murder*). Three hours after this class activity, Timothy approached me, his DE instructor, a bit shaken and said that I shouldn't have had them do the ACEs quiz in class because it brought up a lot of "stuff" for him he didn't want to think about during class. He then went on to explain the death of his father and his ongoing situation with his abusive stepfather, which has spurred his mom to leave the marriage, taking Timothy and his younger sister with her, and to take out a restraining order against their stepfather.

Surprisingly, these experiences with loss and abuse appeared the following week in Timothy's experiential narrative essay titled "Living with Wounds." The essay was vulnerable and raw and possessed a power in the emotional context of his narrative. Part of his introduction reads as follows:

> Despite what I had been through, like losing my dad when I was three, only to have him be replaced by a man who scarred my family both physically and mentally, I always managed to elevate another less fortunate individual or group as 'worse off than me.' Sure, I knew that some of the things I had experienced were things that others never have, but I didn't let it get to me… I pushed down the negative experiences in an attempt to minimize them… I never let myself think that it could have any effect on my life. It wasn't until my english teacher had us look at how victims of Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE's) faced

greater statistical odds of dropping out of school, facing incarceration, and even of

continuing the trend of abuse that I understood that what I had been through is

more serious than I had let myself believe… From looking at the stories of

victims and how they struggled, I understood that one of the things that I had

always feared might just come true — no matter what happens in my future, there

will always be events from my past that define me. I realized that I was wounded.

Within Timothy's essay, he demonstrates the power of reflecting upon experiences, both his own

and those of others he encountered through texts. He also exuded a confidence in his writing

voice that was absent when he discussed these experiences verbally with the instructor. His

writing about his experiences seems to have given him the freedom to evaluate what happened to

him, as well as how it may have impacted him, without feeling powerless to his past.

SUMMARY

In this chapter, I presented the results of my coding proesses in the data analysis phase of

this study. Five codes emerged as significant. *Grades* and *teacher expectations* were dominant

external factors impacting these DE students' self-perceptions of writing and of themselves as

writers. *Metaphors*, both metaphors of progress and cultural or colloquial metaphors, were a

commonly employed linguistic device, as the DE participants seemd to lack the language to

discuss some abstract concepts, such as the difference in the skillset associated with writing and

the mindset associated with themselves as writers. This led to another code: *writing vs. writer.*

Finally, I snapshotted some key *experiences* that emerged as significant to these DE students as

writers and in their writing.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION, SUMMATION, AND SUGGESTIONS

REVIEW OF THE RESEARCH GOALS AND QUESTIONS

In previous chapters of this dissertation, I have sought to snapshot the lived experiences

of the DE participants under study; to highlight relevant findings related to their perceptions of

themselves as writers and the various conflicts associated with the DE context; and, as a means

of reciprocity, to give voice to these DE students as an under researched population of FYC

students. These goals were governed by the following research questions: 1) How do dual

enrollment composition students perceive themselves as writers? 2) What conflicts do they

experience in their self-perceptions as writers in the DE context? Students' perceptions were

collected through focus groups, interviews, and reflective essays. Further, I maintained an

observational journal and engaged in reflective and generative memos throughout the process of

data collection and analysis. While the results of the study have been discussed in previous

chapters, I aim in this final chapter to synthesize the data in a manner that is useful for thematic

discussion, praxis considerations, and future research agendas.

MAJOR FINDINGS

GRADES: AN ECONOMIC EXCHANGE

It is no secret that higher education has been impacted by political and economic

agendas. The now infamous college admissions scandal of 2019, "Operation Varsity Blues," has

revealed the sad reality that economic gain is one of the leading decision making factors in

higher education. Neoliberalism, "a governing rationality that disseminates market values and

metrics to every sphere of life and construes the human itself as *homo economicus*," has

seemingly become the law of the land and the university is no exception (Brown 176; Slaughter

and Rhoades). So, when the governing ideologies on university campuses become primarily political and economic (Levin 12), what impact does this have on students attending these institutions?

Slaughter and Rhoades use the metaphor "academic capitalism" to describe what is happening within "the neoliberal university" (73). They argue that higher education institutions who "operate under a knowledge/education regime informed by academic capitalism… begin to see students as revenue sources and products… [and] refer to students as customers, [yet] the real customers are the corporations that employ the institutions' 'products'" (74). This redefining of students as "products" is in service of one goal: revenue generation. Students then become both consumers and commodities within "the neoliberal university" (Levin 13; Slaughter and Rhoades 73).

Course content that students are consuming has also been impacted by the broader neoliberal agendas that emphasize economic gains. John S. Levin writes that in many educational settings, "the entire curriculum has been narrowed to serve economic ends: a workforce for business, industry, and government. As a result, the institution operates in a less academic way, with decreasing attention to the development of critical, reflective learners" (24). Similarly, Slaughter and Rhoades claim that "[i]nstruction is redefined as workforce preparation more than as personally and socially enhancing education," as a traditional liberal arts education once emphasized (74). The primary product that student consumers are purchasing, a curriculum aimed at knowledge gains, has been redefined to train students in the language and values of the workforce.

With curricular focuses skewed away from knowledge for civic and personal betterment, performance becomes a primary means of exchange. Becker, Geer, and Hughes highlight the fact that students within a setting such as the neoliberal university are trained to perform:

> We do not argue that nothing goes on in college classes beyond the exchange of the proper performance for a grade. But we do emphasize that the exchange of performance for grades is, formally and institutionally, what the class is about. Changes in personality or values may indeed take place, but they are not directly affected by the institutionalized system of value and reward. (79)

This performance-based approach to learning undermines intrinsic motivation and identity work for community betterment. In other words, our "students… become consumers and debtholders rather than beneficiaries of enlightenment" because, in many cases, that is what our curriculum has taught them through such a system of "value and reward" (Fish).

Within the larger neoliberal world of higher education, composition classrooms exhibit their own neoliberal practices through performance-based approaches to writing, evidenced through perceptions of writing as performance rather than writing as a means of being in the world. Yagelski claims that "writing is an ontological act," yet the most common approaches to teaching composition are fragmented and diminish our connections to others and the world around us (ix). In short, writing is most often taught "as a communicative and cognitive tool," not as "a way of experiencing" the world as "interconnected" beings (xv, 144). This undermines "the transformative power of writing" for the more economic goal of "textual production" (xiv). Writing as an ontological act demands that we pay attention to the act of writing — not the production of writing for a certain communicative end and to a specific reader — for writing is a present moment and, as such, evokes an effect on the writer in the moment they are writing. Yet,

paradoxically, the very nature of connectivity that a writer has to potential readers and to the world around themselves "affect[s] the experience of writing and thus the writer" (107).

Yagelski's ontological view of writing is in direct opposition to the neoliberal purposes for the DE composition classroom, which drive students to write not for self-awareness or even readers, but rather for a grade in order to gain the necessary college credit and GPA to move more quickly through the educational pipeline and into the workforce. The kairotic moments of self-awareness that come from a focus on writers' writing is undermined by the DE context in which these FYC students engage with the act of writing. Yagelski highlights the significance that context has on the "cumulative" effect on a writer's sense of self as being connected to "something larger" (112, 122). So, what then is the cumulative effect of the constrained DE context in which some of our most vulnerable writers find themselves learning about the act of writing?

Unfortunately, the DE context connects students not to an ontological sense of self, but to the larger neoliberal worldview that touts education as an economic means to an end. This context furthers a redefining of DE students as products, consumers, and commodities. Levin argues that the inevitable "neoliberal restructuring" can be found within our institutional infrastructures (12). I would argue that this is perhaps most evident through the neoliberal machine that is Dual Enrollment. A 2010 collection edited by Hansen and Farris aptly declares such a relation through its very title: *College Credit for Writing in High School: The "Taking Care of" Business.* If the primary tenets of neoliberalism are efficiency, productivity, and competition (Levin 12), then DE could be the institutional poster child for such an agenda. What's more efficient than knocking out two required courses, one for high school and one for college, at once? Isn't marking off two items from a to-do list the epitome of productivity? After

all, only high school students with a diverse array of difficult courses, like DE college courses, are competitive in the cut-throat arena of college admissions, right?

The proof that DE students have unfortunately internalized the marching orders that neoliberalism has handed down to them is in their obsession with grades. Most participants in my study at some point revealed their motivational connections to their grades (see pgs. 123-126, 143-145). However, some students, such as Timothy and Chrissy, demonstrated an obsession with grades (see pgs. 143-145). Ironically, this obsession appears to be formed through an ontological understanding of writing as being. In other words, they do view writing as experiential: their writing is often based on their own experiences with the world and others, as well as the experiences of others they have observed. Take Lilly, for example: she wrote about eating disorders as she had observed her best friend suffer from one (see pgs. 112, 147). And what these experiences have shown these DE students is that "writing is a procedure rather than a way of experiencing themselves as beings in an inherently interconnected world" (Yagelski xv). So, their experiential definition of their writing is mostly extrinsically motivated by grades and a desire for people-pleasing, mainly the instructor, as they perform the necessary procedures required of them. In short, for many DE students, writing is performing, as their existence within the neoliberalism context of DE has experientially taught them that performance is their primary means of being within "academic capitalism." Grades, and therefore the teacher's response to their writing, are dictating their future success within this ontological framework.

TEACHER EXPECTATIONS AND THE UNDERGROUND DE STUDENT NETWORK

Because DE students are often fixated on grades, they fervently seek to decipher teacher expectations because therein lies the key to good grades. However, a gap often exists. Students' perceptions, both those of DE and traditional college students, of teacher expectations often

differ from what they may actually be. According to Thaiss and Zawacki, this gap can, at least in part, be attributed to ambiguity on the part of teachers. A schism exists between what teachers believe they are relaying to students, as far as clear and explicit instructions and expectations for coursework, and what students translate to be vague and even idiosyncratic differences from teacher to teacher, especially across disciplinary boundaries. The issues often lie within usage of similar terms and language, specifically related to writing assignments, which in actuality "mask distinctions" that would be expected for each disciplinary discourse (87). The pervasive ambiguity of teacher expectations is often due to two main issues: a vague understanding on the part of the instructor about what they expect (ie. they know it when they see it but can't verbalize what it is exactly they are looking for) and/or a gap between and among contextual expectations related to academic, disciplinary, subdisciplinary, local/institutional, and idiosyncratic or personal (60). Most instructors will only define expectations for one to two of these contexts, as the others are internalized to the point that they may not even be apparent to the instructor.

Habits of mind are one example of these expectations that Thaiss and Zawacki reference that are often not made explicit to students. Dawn S. Opel launched a case study at a large university with a research focus on metacognitive activities used for transfer. What she found, however, is that habits of mind commonly came up in teacher interviews, highlighting what teachers value in student writing and therefore their classroom activities. For example, several teachers emphasized the value of *creativity* as they linked it to multimodal composition activities. Others stressed a value on *persistence* in their emphasis on process-based writing and building in graded process activities, like *collaborative* planning, in order to de-emphasize the grade on the product. Many shared a value in *responsibility*, as was evidenced in the attendance policies; a push towards reading the textbook; and "360-evaluations," which allow the teacher,

peers, and the student writer a voice in the evaluation process emphasizing a value on shared responsibility (99). Opel's study makes clear that disciplinary documents, such as the *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing*, can be useful in relaying more clearly to students what we as instructors value and expect, specifically related to the five contexts that Thaiss and Zawacki discuss.

Not only are DE students subjected to disconnects in the five contextual layers of expectations laid out by Thaiss and Zawacki and to oft hidden expectations such as habits of mind, but they also experience a disconnect between high school and college expectations. Denecker highlights this disconnect: "The dual enrollment composition classroom provides a unique space where students simultaneously experience both high school and college expectations. As a result, it is in this space that the tensions and inconsistencies between secondary and post-secondary writing instruction have the potential for becoming more clearly defined" (29). Sometimes, these "tensions and inconsistencies" in expectations are related to state and national standards, but more likely, they are a result of the abrupt shift "from doing slavish or derivative thinking to doing real, engaged thinking of one's own" (Denecker 32; Weinstein xi). Dramatic as this comparison may seem, the K-12 culture of standardized testing does, at least on the surface, appear to prioritize "derivative thinking." So, when suddenly tasked with engaging in higher level discourse and analysis that requires independent interpretations, it can "result in quite a jolt for dual enrollment students who feel that the rules of writing have been changed when they enter the college composition classroom and are expected to analyze information rather than report on it" (Denecker 35).

Several of my participants demonstrated that they were well acquainted with this "jolt" as a result of the tensions and disconnect in expectations. For example, many equated time spent on

papers with grades, meaning they felt cheated if they spent a lot of time on a paper and did not receive a high grade. Take Timothy for example: "There is nothing more frustrating than putting effort into a paper only to have it graded at a less than ideal grade. It hurts when the work you put in is not reflected in the end result" (Timothy's reflective essay). In other words, in the neoliberal environment of DE, many students, like Timothy, expect time spent to correlate with a direct payout: for them, this is often grades. Within my study specifically, several of my participants did not really view their DE courses as college courses, but rather as high school honors classes (see pgs. 121-123). Because of this perception, they claimed to put in more work, not because it is a college class, but because the teacher expects more. So, for these DE participants, their perceptions of their teachers' expectations directly impacted the amount of time they invested in their coursework. Yet, the resulting tension is that time spent does not always equate higher grades, if course objectives and assignment expectations are not met.

My participants also described a gap in their perceptions of disciplinary differences in teacher expectations, much as Thaiss and Zawacki conclude. A classic example of this is the connection of grammar to English teachers: English teachers are focused on "grammatical errors" and "sound[ing] nice" (Caroline's interview). Because most of the students in my study are aware of these disciplinary differences in expectations, they have learned how to network in order to decipher teacher expectations. Sheldon and Heather are a great example of this: they discussed their ideas for every paper together, English and other disciplinary writing assignments, in order to merge the teacher feedback they had each gotten from previous assignments.

DE students also often rely upon lore passed down from upper classmen or from details relayed by peers to help them draw conclusions about what exactly a certain teacher expects,

specifically when it comes to writing projects. For example, does their history teacher require MLA format and certain types of research? Or does the science teacher care about grammar and thesis construction? Many of my DE participants had older siblings who had some of the same teachers during their high school tenure, so they would provide advice about what each teacher expects in assignments and classroom performance. These gaps in expectations, often unintentionally perpetuated by teachers, have given rise to DE student discourse communities as a means of "negotiat[ing] between the resources of their previous writing expectations and the expectations of new academic contexts" (Reiff and Bawarshi 313). In other words, DE students develop a skill set of networking information regarding teacher expectations, through informal and sometimes "underground" channels of communication, that serves as a survival mechanism within these liminal DE spaces.

STUDENTS' METAPHORS AS HEURISTIC

Because DE students are often left to decipher ambiguous teacher expectations through informal networks of other students' experiences, many participants within this study seemed adept at utilizing metaphor to describe everything from their own writing process and progress to what they have deduced to be expected of them. Because the liminality of the DE space produces gaps and disconnects in these areas of expectations as well as experience, metaphor becomes a creative linguistic means for negotiating such a space. As students move into new and unfamiliar discourse areas, they often rely upon metaphors, both culturally and personally constructed, to relay their learning levels and to further their understanding. Is metaphor a means for transfer of knowledge? Or is it solely a developmental phase for students? In what ways can metaphor mask reality for both student and teacher?

Colomb points out the dangers of cultural metaphors when applied to our students. Linear metaphors, such as construction and "growing up," plot students on a sequence of either progressing or regressing, which can jeopardize student agency (11). Several participants in this study employed these types of linear metaphors in their end-of-semester reflective essays. Lilly, for example, used a metaphor of growth in her essay's title, "Growth as a Reader, Writer, Thinker, and Community Member." She also declared the goal of the course "is to persistently commit to growing as a reader, writer, thinker, and community member" (see pgs. 131-136 for more examples). What this seems to show is an internalizing by some DE students of the cultural, linear metaphor of growth as goal: always moving forward. This implied forward movement undermines the discursive process inherent to writing and perhaps limits the potential for linguistic creativity, ultimately impacting DE students' self-perceptions as writers.

Similarly, Nedra Reynolds sees potential danger in employing metaphor as it can minimize agency. She claims that imagined metaphors, such as lower division composition as rhetoric and composition's frontier, are essentially fallacious claims of transparent space and time-space compression (33). Such metaphors can foster or hide inequities. Further, broad imagined metaphors, such as cyberspace, give an illusion of having more time. The Internet has afforded students constant access, but at the cost of work-life balance for both instructors and students. These metaphors can enhance subversive politics of space and ultimately hide diversity. One example from this study is the metaphor of the American Dream. So common to our vernacular, the American Dream is rarely unpacked as a metaphor. However, one DE student participant was acutely aware of how he did not want to replicate the time-space compression that the American Dream can hide, such as the long work hours and diminished family time (see Sheldon's discussion on pgs. 136-147, 151-154).

More broadly, DE represents a time-space compression that is often not accounted for in curricular models for the DE composition classroom. Students are literally compressing two years of education into one, often regurgitating the common DE economic metaphor "bang for your buck" as their rationale for such a choice. DE students are also engaging in identity negotiation work that is not common to the secondary space context. For example, the DE participants within this study are metaphorically "at the top," as they represent the honors class of students. Yet, as college freshmen, they are also metaphorically and simultaneously "at the bottom," in that they would traditionally be starting over in a new educational institution and in turn renegotiating what that means as far as their identity self-perceptions.

Reynolds argues that smaller-scaled, localized metaphors can begin to reconnect space and practice and, in this way, resist the pitfalls of transparent space and the negative effects of time-space compression (30). Within the DE context then, this would necessitate an overcoming of the most popular economic metaphors that compress time and space through language of commodity. For example, the metaphor of more "bang for your buck" boasts a positive connotation: you are getting more educational credit for less time and money. Yet, the cost of such a time-space compression is often evidenced through DE students' identity perceptions. There is a distinct confusion in their role within the DE FYC classroom: are they burgeoning collegitate writers or secondary students performing collegiate writing tasks?

Lakoff and Johnson's experientialist myth may just offer a means of creating such localized metaphors for DE contexts, as metaphors within the lens of this myth would be constructed organically out of unique DE student experiences. As the students within this study demonstrated, they possess a linguistic creativity when it comes to relaying certain aspects of their DE experience, such as their writing processes or their self-perceptions as writers. Timothy,

for example, described his generative process for settling on a writing topic as metaphorically akin to starting a fire (see pg. 130). When asked to describe herself as a writer, Heather similarly employed an original metaphor likening herself to a "huge skyscraper… without a foundation" (see pg. 132). When viewed through Lakoff and Johnson's experientialist myth, these organic metaphors can be analyzed as a DE student's means of relaying their experiences, in turn elevating student metaphors to a valuable heuristic for instructors (39).

Philip Eubanks further sees value in utilizing certain metaphors, like the Conduit Metaphor. By arguing that conceptual metaphors are systematically related and rhetorically situated, he highlights the metalinguistic interconnectivity of metaphors as tools for cognition with positive ontological and ethical implications. Ultimately, Eubanks does agree that language has baggage. But language is "fundamental to thought" rather than mere ornamentation, and the success of metaphor is given through its defining of failure (104). For example, when we tell a DE student that her words are too vague to make her message clear, this failure also points to a means for success: a change in diction. So, while metaphors should not be employed easily or without ethical consideration, we cannot dismiss them either because they are integral linguistic constructs that DE students can utilize productively.

So, what does this mean for students who rely upon metaphor for cognition? Constructivists Sherry Booth and Susan Frisbie argue that metaphor should be an integral part of the rhetorical classroom because it is an important creative and ideological aspect of language. In fact, it is a foundational element of language, which we consistently rely upon in order to communicate with others. Building upon I.A. Richard's and Kenneth Burke's claims of metaphor as "natural and 'omnipresent'" and "'perspectival incongruity'" respectively, Booth and Frisbie define metaphor as "a process of creation and association that involves developing or

recognizing a fundamental but not necessarily obvious link between two elements…" (as qtd. on 165, 166). For DE students, these two elements may be writing, as they have come to define it through their high school experiences, and the new collegiate definitions that emphasize analysis and interpretation. So, metaphor can help breach these definitional gaps, which can dramatically impact new knowledge gains through "mapping" and other learning processes (167). However, "metaphors can be extremely problematic," so students must have the rhetorical and cognitive tools necessary to critically analyze metaphors (171).

If Booth and Frisbie are correct, then metaphors have generative power[24] and can be a developmental phase for students, as Thaiss and Zawacki found in their George Mason University study[25]. Should teachers then provide metaphorical frameworks or allow students to develop their own as they develop as writers? Lad Tobin would argue that allowing students to craft original metaphors is better pedagogy. This conclusion is the result of his collection of over 500 student metaphors, which highlights that what students have to say about their writing and the writing process holds value for writing instruction. Student metaphors can act as heuristics, not because they are accurate but because they are useful (446). They can provide the composition instructor with insight into how students perceive themselves, their teacher, texts, and the writing process.

Most metaphors that Tobin's FYC students submitted highlight a frustration centering on powerlessness and obligation (447). Students don't feel agency in the learning process. At best, some students acknowledge value in writing assignments akin to the obligatory value of going to the dentist. Within my own study, DE student metaphors creatively gave voice to their

---

[24] as Donald Schön famously claimed in relation to social policy.
[25] While Thaiss and Zawacki's study did not include DE students, this finding related to metaphor as a key part of a developmental phase for students does have implications for DE students.

perceptions on their writing frustrations (see Chrissy's metaphors of "wrestling" and the "abyss" on pg. 130-131) and their approach to collaboration (see Timothy's metaphor of "fire" on pg. 130), as well as more broadly of their perceptions of themselves as writers (see Heather's metaphor of a "skyscraper" on pg. 132). While not all negatively associated, each did provide insight into the DE participants' feelings of being overwhelmed with the difficult work of striving to become a writer in the DE classroom context.

Lakoff and Johnson provide a framework for connecting the above discussions on metaphor through an experientialist lens, for "[i]t is as though the ability to comprehend experience through metaphor were a sense, like seeing or touching or hearing, with metaphors providing the only ways to perceive and experience much of the world. Metaphor is as much a part of our functioning as our sense of touch, and as precious" (239). Through this experientialist lens, DE students' use of metaphor becomes more than cognitive: it is a part of their identity, or at minimum a part of their identity expression. Just as our senses allow us to take in information about the world around us, metaphor usage can increase experiential knowledge about the world around us. If perceived as "a matter of *imaginative rationality*… [,] metaphor is not merely a matter of language. It is a matter of conceptual structure" (235). Such a "conceptual structure" may help DE students make sense of a liminal space rife with ambiguity and layered with new expectations where structure seems to have eluded them.

Metaphor then can contribute to the development of certain habits of mind, mainly that of creativity and flexibility (Booth and Frisbie; Lakoff and Johnson 231-232). The DE participants in this study often demonstrated habits of mind but overall lacked the language to discuss them as such. Metaphor could allow them a means to relay "the nature of unshared experience" to an instructor, as well as others unfamiliar with the experiences common for DE students living

within the above-mentioned gaps and disconnects related to their positionality within a liminal space (Lakoff and Johnson 231). As such, metaphor can be used as a form of scaffolded learning as a DE student moves into a new area of learning, whether it is formally in a classroom or informally through interpersonal interactions or experiences with the world. So, as Tobin argues, student metaphors should be perceived as heuristics that can equip DE composition instructors with insight that may allow for more intentional instruction that bridges gaps in expectations, cognitive and linguistic development, and ultimately students' perceptions of their abilities as writers.

EXPERIENCE: CULTURAL AGENCY

If we as composition instructors perceive students' usage of metaphors as a heuristic, perhaps one insight gained is how integral lived experience is to our students' perceptions of themselves as writers. Lakoff and Johnson marry *metaphor* and *experience* through their experientialist myth, which emphasizes understanding that emerges from interactions with our physical environments and other people, both of which evoke "mutual change" and create "gestalts" that allow categorical understanding (230). Within this myth, "[w]e understand experience metaphorically" as we move from one experience into less familiar experiences (230). As a move away from the absolute truth claims of objectivism and an overreliance upon personal feelings and imagination common to subjectivism, the experientialist myth seeks a middle ground. In short, this third-choice myth synthesizes reason and imagination through an emphasis on "the way we *understand* the world through our *interactions* with it" (194). The dominant language tool available to us through this experientialist myth is metaphor, which only reinforces Tobin's claim that student metaphors can be a powerful heuristic for instructors. Student metaphors can provide snapshots of the lived experiences students are most strongly

impacted by, as well as their interpretations of those experiences, and ultimately lead to understanding.

While a lack of life experience is an oft quoted slight against high school students engaging in collegiate coursework through DE programs, the participants in this study showed me quite the opposite. They draw from a rich well of lived experiences, both their own and those of others in their communities. From situations of abuse to familial pressure, family connections provided most of the experiences that these DE students shared throughout the semester. Others highlighted experiences with community theater groups or scholastic programs that allowed engagement with people from diverse backgrounds. Yet, where nearly all participants merged was in their drawing from experience when it came time to write. Some learned from direct experience that putting the proverbial pen to paper allowed them a means to name experiences while others showed an expansion in their self-perceptions as writers as a result of experience with diversity.

Pragmatist John Dewey champions the role of experience in progressive education perhaps more than any other noted scholar or philosopher adopted into our rhetoric and composition ranks. According to Louis Menand, Dewey utilized the term *experience* in the same way that Oliver Wendell Holmes did: to equate "culture" (437). In other words, the very definition of lived experience could simply be *culture*. The participants within this study embraced life through a cultural lens that only lived experience can yield. Their work ethic, career plans, identity perceptions, and interpersonal relationships define for them how to be in this world. For, a cultural definition of *experience* allows a holistic approach to both writing instruction and practice that ultimately allows DE students to "achieve agency" (Jones 218).

When agency is prioritized within our FYC classrooms, both DE and traditional, experience must be foundational to our pedagogies because it is the very foundation of our students' existence within our academic spaces.

Elevating the DE students' experience ultimately means prioritizing metaphor as a primary means of acknowledging experience and using it as a means for growth, both scholastically and personally. As the DE student becomes better able to reflect upon their lived experiences, they develop their understanding of self in relation to the world and others (see Yagelski discussion on pg. 164-165). And metaphor becomes a linguistic tool to form relationships between experiences that allows for growth as a writer and in their personal identity perceptions. By providing more room for messy and sometimes vague metaphors to emerge in the DE students' own language and through their own perceptions, we demonstrate that their lived experiences matter for their writing and for their development as writers, and in doing so, we give more room for student agency.

WRITING VS. WRITER: THE DE DUALISM

Where the participants' experiences became most obvious was in their writing, particularly in their experiential narrative at the beginning of the semester and in their reflective essay at the end of the semester. Ironically, this represents a schism in their perceptions of themselves as writers, for they discussed, most directly and most often, their writing as a series of tasks that required certain "tools" or "skills" (see pgs. 137-150 for specific examples). Yet, their writing was imbued with their experiences, showcasing a pouring of themselves into their writing. In other words, the utilization of experience within their writing shows an overcoming of this dualism of writer and writing, yet they did not seem fully aware of this connection. While they seem to perceive of themselves as students doing writing, their writing is full of self-

representations of who they are as writers, mainly through the relaying of their lived and learning experiences.

This dualism demonstrates the problematic nature of terminology that is often applied to our student writers attempting college-level writing. As Denecker bluntly points out, there is "no universal definition [that] clearly delineates what it means to be a 'college level writer' or what even constitutes 'college-level writing' for that matter" (*Toward Seamless Transition* 23). As I briefly brought up within my discussion of the problematic terminology of *writerly identity* in the introduction chapter of this dissertation (see pg. 9), scholars often wind up defining writerly *moves* over *identity*: "Writing is an act of identity… [that] involves a series of complex writerly moves as well as nuanced and evolving understandings of writing as a representation of the self within specific social contexts" (Pratt 232-233). These social contexts, which rhetoric and composition scholars have become increasingly aware of as vital to gains in writing skill sets, are essentially the environments which give rise to experiential interactions. Denecker claims that "one element of a student's writerly identity on the college level will be to exhibit the ability to think independently as well as critically and experientially and then translate those thoughts into written form" (*Toward Seamless Transition 24*). What the results of this study reveal is that *experiential* thinking is vitally important for DE students, particularly in negotiating the many dualisms in which they contextually find themselves, for it is their experiential thoughts that both provide confidence as well as content for them as burgeoning writers and is ultimately what brings their papers to life for readers.

The pragmatist notion of overcoming dualisms is useful here. The schism between writer and writing, as Yagelski points out, is "in short… a dualistic way of being in the world" (3). The DE participants are well-trained in finding boundary lines that carve out new and deep fracture

lines that perpetuate these dualisms. For example, the rigid clique lines between the students coming to DE from the Honors English 11 class and those coming from the non-honors English 11 could be a result of this poorly-aligned ontology (or lack of ontology at all!) that governs writing pedagogy that perpetuates a dualistic worldview and relays "problematic lessons about the self, its relation to other selves and to the wider world, and how we know ourselves and the world around us" (3). In short, some of our DE pedagogical approaches could be sparking Othering habits in our students. Within this study, for example, as the participants engaged in peer reviews, they were often comparing and contrasting their writing skills with those of their peers (see pgs. 101-102, 121-122). They were essentially reifying the honors/non-honors divide throughout this process.

As Yagelski eloquently puts it, "… the transformative power of writing… lies primarily in the writer *writing,* not the writer's writing" (xiv). This subtle yet paradigmatic shift brings into focus an ontological difference between a DE student's perception of themselves as a student performing tasks for extrinsic motivators like grades and a writer introspectively engaging with the world around them. Most of the DE participants within this study still largely viewed themselves as students pursuing grades by the end of the semester, yet some did begin to show a shift in perspectival focus from performing skills to developing a mindset. This mindset was made more obvious through habits of mind like metacognition and flexibility, perhaps revealing a heuristic value in embedding habits of mind into our DE course designs in an effort to help overcome this DE dualism. Documents such as the *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing* offer a shared language as far as the eight habits of mind that are listed and defined and could provide a framework for a DE course design with embedded habits of mind.

THE FRAGMENTED DE STUDENT EXPERIENCE

Cumulatively, the above findings highlight one overarching theme: DE students have a fragmented learning experience. This reality of educational fragmentation is not a new phenomenon, as the very nature of "[s]chooling… fosters a way of being in the world that is characterized by disconnection" (Yagelski xiii). From disciplinary disconnects to a schism between writing and writer, DE students are in learning spaces that are perhaps classified as *fragmented* above any other descriptors. Within rhetoric and composition specifically, we are well acquainted with fragmentation. Louise Wetherbee Phelps argues that Writing Programs are fragmented because any "programmatic structure" that "facilitate[s] the practice and learning of writing" is encompassed within the definitional boundaries of a Writing Program ("Matching Form to Function"). This "create[s] a fragmented, incoherent experience of writing and learning for students" ("Matching Form to Function"). DE further expands the physical boundaries of a Writing Program and thusly further fragments the learning experience for DE students. Yet, as accustomed to fragmentation as we as rhetoric and composition teacher-scholars may have become, we cannot allow ourselves to overlook the DE student's agency that is jeopardized through the "altering of the human experience of space," in this case the space in which writing instruction takes place (Geisler 11).

As DE has become a permanent aspect of our educational landscape, scholars have been looking for the positive aspects and possibilities within this neoliberal extension of our fragmented departments. To this end, Melinda Mechur Karp argues that DE can serve as a means for college retention:

> When well implemented, dual enrollment fundamentally changes how education is
>
> structured, the relationship between institutions, and even how institutions are organized.

> Dual enrollment improves our fragmented educational system by streamlining the process of students moving from secondary to postsecondary school… [by] essentially creat[ing] linkages between the secondary and postsecondary sectors that reduce the fragmentation of the two and create stronger, smoother pathways from high school to college for participating students. (106, 104)

Yet, Karp's whole argument for DE rests upon her employment of the neoliberal metaphor of the "The College Completion Pipeline" that leaks students at each transition (105). As Reynolds reminds us, metaphors such as these can be problematic because they undermine human agency: in this case, the agency of the DE students who are reduced to a plumber's fix for faulty hardware.

So, if, underneath these problematic metaphors, fragmentation exists within the DE student experience, is there an inherent need for reconstruction? There are ethical considerations surrounding the DE student identity, their fragmented learning environments, and the assumed need for reconstruction. As stated earlier in this dissertation, most DE students fall into the developmental stage of "identity vs. role confusion" (Block). It is in this phase, commonly stretching from ages twelve to nineteen[26], that students "develop a sense of self and personal identity [in which s]uccess leads to an ability to stay true to oneself, while failure leads to role confusion and a weak sense of self" (Block)[27]. This pursuit of success often translates to a DE student's pursuit of grades, which requires clear expectations and curricular alignment (discussed later, see pg. 184). As DE students exist in limbo between the familiar identity role of a high

---

[26] While Sternberg ends this phase at eighteen, Block has extended it to nineteen, which I feel better aligns with the extended adolescence of our current society.

[27] Other psychosocial factors encompass this developmental stage but are outside the scope of this discussion.

school student and the analytical college writer, tensions emerge that complicate this stage of identity formation; for, as the above definition of this developmental phase suggests, DE students demonstrate a binary perception of their writing abilities along the lines of "success" or "failure." This binary perception of ability could impact identity self-perceptions and construction.

Jane Flax argues that "[o]nly when a core self begins to cohere can one enter into or use the transitional space in which the differences and boundaries between self and other, inner and outer, and reality and illusion are bracketed or elided" (218-219). Phelps relates this logic to rhetoric and composition: "By the same token, only a field with a relatively secure sense of core disciplinary identity (reinforced by institutional acceptance) can afford to play with the idea of being fragmented and decentered" ("Postscript"). This same logic can be extended to the DE student's identity. Based upon their developmental phase of "identity vs. role confusion," we can assume they are not in a place of coherence as far as understanding their "core self." As Phelps argues, security of self is a prerequisite "to play with the idea of being fragmented" ("Postscript"). The burden then for the fragmented nature of the DE student experience must fall upon those with a stronger sense of self. It must fall to the instructors, Writing Program Administrators, Department Heads, and policy influencers. We must absorb the pressures of the inherent fragmentation produced by the neoliberal machine of DE.

One simple step is naming the beast: DE students exist within a reality of fragmentation. This reality needs to be uncovered from *metaphors*, such as the educational "pipeline," that overemphasize external markers like *grades* and ultimately mask the impact of fragmentation on DE students. It needs to be revealed through the sharing of the lived *experiences* of DE students, as Larracey and Hassel push for an "assembling [of] a picture of the dual credit experiences of students, teachers, and program administrators" (5). It needs to be made apparent to the DE

students themselves living and learning within these fragmented realities, moving between perceptions of themselves as burgeoning *writers* with a voice *versus* students simply performing *writing* tasks.

Van Waes and Schellens provide one means of being more transparent with students: utilize clearly named writing profiles (845). While writing profiles could have unintended consequences of further marginalizing student writers, it does at least make a move towards explicitly naming the fragmentary context for DE writers and perhaps can better align *expectations* between DE students and instructors. These steps will by no means resolve the fragmentation that is inherent to DE programs, yet they can foster an awareness of this reality for DE students and can remind those of us in less vulnerable positions to assume at least some of the burden for "the anxiety induced by disorder and irresolvable conflict" (Flax 11).

PRAXIS IMPLICATIONS

As a practitioner who daily engages with DE students, this research has served as a reminder for me of the necessity of awareness. The moment I lose sight of my DE students' lived experiences and resulting conflicts related to their self-preceptions, my impact, both instructionally and otherwise, is limited. While I teach and research in part because I care about the content, I chose my professional arena for the students. For these reasons and based on this research, I see two goals for rhetoric and composition teacher-scholars who wish to address these issues of fragmentation in the DE experience: awareness and mitigation. Firstly, all stakeholders from students to administration need to be made aware of the matters of fragmentation and the implications for our DE students. Secondly, those in positions of authority need to act to mitigate the burden of fragmentation, which is largely being passed along to DE students currently. In order to strive for these goals of awareness and mitigation, I see three areas of praxis that need

consideration if we who work within the DE realm are going to alleviate some of the tensions of these liminal spaces: collaboration, habits of mind, and reflection.

COLLABORATION

As the scholar-practitioners presented within the literature review of this dissertation make clear, consistent and intentional collaboration among secondary instructors and their collegiate counterparts is crucial to impacting change in DE partnerships. It is no secret that "college theory and high school practice differ greatly" (Mosley 60). From national and state mandates to schedules that are at the mercy of a myriad of factors from intruder drills to pep rallies, the ebb and flow of daily practice in secondary schools is subject to disruptions and pressures that are not always considered in collegiate theoretical approaches to FYC curriculum offered to DE students. This reality can only be made known through open and consistent channels of communication between the secondary DE instructors and the collegiate instructors, WPAs, and Department Heads.

Yet, dialogue alone is not enough. Collaborative professional learning is key to curricular and instructional change that is meaningful for DE students. As this study reiterates, gaps can exist when it comes to teacher expectations. This is a prime example of necessary professional learning opportunities to align expectations (Denecker "Transitioning Writers" 43). While it may seem somewhat intuitive and inherent to what we as rhetoric and composition practitioners do in the classroom on a daily basis, making expectations known to ourselves is the starting point to being able to relay these expectations clearly to DE students. For example, we need clearer definitions of basic terminology, such as *college level writing*:

> Since composition theory has demonstrated that engaging in process can help students
>
> think more deeply about what they are communicating in their writing and how they are

communicating, then it is reasonable to assert that clear definitions of and instruction in the process of writing may improve student transition from high school to college-level writing expectations. (Denecker "Transitioning Writers" 40)

Collaboratively discussing and defining something as foundational to our FYC classrooms as *writing* will in turn allow us to establish clearer expectations for DE students.

Collaborative professional learning will also allow for a more intentional alignment of not only expectations but also curricular and instructional priorities and processes. Natasha Jankowski, educational consultant, argues that student engagement can be fostered with critical classroom elements such as alignment:

Learning environments are successful depending on the degree to which the various elements are aligned, such as content, instructional design, pedagogical approaches, assignments, and evaluative criteria. Alignment provides a means to counteract incoherence and fragmentation of the college experience. Undergraduate students need strategies in place that reverse curricular fragmentation and connect their learning for increased student success. (iii)

While this executive summary is written to encompass a more traditional undergraduate environment, DE students need alignment among these elements perhaps even more because of the additional layers of disconnect brought about through a different campus and an abrupt threshold crossing. One such strategy that could help align expectations and "reverse curricular fragmentation" is a "rhetorical awareness": "… students must gain a rhetorical awareness… in order to don the writerly identity of a college student" (Denecker "Transitioning Writer" 41). One student author defined this rhetorical awareness as an awareness of the "rules that govern language in order to communicate ideas" (Winalski 307). This concise definition necessitates

that the governing "rules" be aligned through collaboration in order to overcome the dualism of collegiate theory and secondary practice.

Syracuse's "Project Advance" is one such model of intentional collaboration that exists for the purpose of productively merging theory and praxis across the K-16 threshold. The program's primary purpose is to align expectations and to foster "a community of like-minded professionals dedicated to teaching, learning and inspiring others" ("Our Instructors"). The secondary teachers become certified through collaborative professional learning opportunities and serve as Syracuse University adjunct instructors, which can help align the curricular experiences for DE students as the instructors have had collaborative experience with their collegitate faculty counterparts. One factor contributing to the growth and sustainability of "Project Advance" is the ongoing collaboration that is fostered through this program. Secondary instructors not only participate in initial training through a Summer Institute, but also regularly attend collaborative special topics workshops, led by college faculty, each semester they are involved in DE instruction. This makes ongoing collaboration the heart of the DE partnership and aids in the alignment of expectations across the institutional contexts.

HABITS OF MIND

A somewhat controversial area of praxis that this study elevated as significant is habits of mind. While obvious limitations, such as assessment and cultural impositions, exist, habits of mind as dispositional expectations are nonetheless a backdrop to our curricula. As the *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing* outlines, some habits of mind are expected through the very nature of our courses. From research to writing to discourse, we expect students to demonstrate practices according to the expectations of our syllabi and the general institutional environment in which our courses occur. Habits of mind such as persistence, responsibility, and

open-mindedness not only need to be made apparent to DE students up front, but they also need to be reminded of them throughout the semester through explicit references and explanations in assignment guides and discussions. This is because students' "incomes, or the 'discursive resources' that students bring with them" to the DE classroom often do not align with academic expectations (Reiff and Bawarshi 313). So, just as we define *genre* and other rhetorical terminology, naming and defining habits of mind is actually helpful for DE students as it demystifies expectations and in turn alleviates some of the burden of negotiating new academic terrain.

In broader terms, habits of mind could serve as a connection between the curricular and the extracurricular to overcome the fragmentation of DE students' learning experiences. Kurtyka argues that habits of mind "are a flexible tool that can be applied productively to a variety of learning experiences," which would allow an honoring of the social nature of learning and the inclusion of DE students' public identities (115). This expansion of habits of mind throughout a DE student's academic experiences could foster a creativity and flexibility that Lakoff and Johnson deem necessary to "[t]he experientialist approach to the process of self-understanding" (233). This self-understanding through the experientialist approach is commonly expressed through metaphor, so an expanded view of habits of mind might also increase the DE student's employment of "new alternative metaphors" that can ultimately serve as a learning and identity heuristic for DE instructors (233).

REFLECTION

Developing habits of mind, like much of what we do in the FYC classroom, requires time and space for reflection. Reflection has readily been adopted as a primary means of fostering intentional identity work in many rhetoric and composition classrooms, as the theoretical and

pedagogical conversations have been robust. For example, Kara Taczak and Liane Robertson challenge teachers to encourage students to "identify themselves as writers who create knowledge" and to maintain "identities as reflective writing practitioners" (43, 46). These scholars as well as Kathleen Blake Yancey offer reflective assignments as integral in promoting the identity constructs of *novice, creator of knowledge,* and *reflective writer.* Yancey provides three definitions for "reflection," all of which could guide reflective practice in DE classrooms:

- *reflection-in-action*, the process of reviewing and projecting and revising, which takes place within a composing event;

- *constructive reflection*, the process of developing a cumulative, multi-selved, multi-voiced identity, which takes place between and among composing events; and

- *reflection-in-presentation,* the process of articulating the relationships between and among the multiple variables of writing and the writer in a specific context for a specific audience. ("Introduction" 4)

These definitions connect reflection to metacognition, a habit of mind that is often elusive for DE students. Of all my participants, Heather was the only one who perceived metacognitive capacity in herself by the end of the semester (see pgs. 138-139). Yet, it is arguably the most important habit of mind for academic success.

As with any shift in praxis, an emphasis on reflection within the DE classroom requires a reflective and critical awareness on the part of the instructor. Asao B. Inoue and Tyler Richmond question whether reflection is a "racialized discourse… [for t]he way a writer is constructed in a reflection is a consequence of a reading by a reader — an assessment — which means the discourse of whiteness embodied by the traditional reflective assignment (and teachers' reading practices) always constructs part of any student's reflective selves" (132). In short, pedagogical

shifts towards reflection must be filtered through a lens of critical awareness of the issues our DE students face, as well as the consequence of our DE course designs, in order to avoid further fragmenting the DE student experience.

LIMITATIONS

This qualitative study in which I employed ethnographic methods is, by definition, limited in scope. It focuses on only one DE composition course on one secondary campus, and not all DE students enrolled in the course opted to participate in the study. The campus is also private and religious, which does not parallel many DE contexts. The patterns that have emerged and have been highlighted above represent this shared culture's identity perceptions as they relate to the DE context. Therefore, the learning and experiential patterns could be unique to the private, religious secondary classroom context and the DE FYC class being on a high school campus. There are also inherent biases, both acknowledged and unknown, in my role as DE composition instructor in this community under study. While this may have yielded more robust responses from students, it also may have swayed the interviewees if they felt a need to falsify parts of any response in order to secure a grade or to ingratiate me. Lastly, while several areas emerged as of at least minor significance through data analysis, some had to be relegated to footnotes or left out altogether as they are outside the scope of the research goals and questions as stated above. Nonetheless, this study holds value as an experiential account of DE students and their evolving perceptions of themselves as writers, an understudied area within rhetoric and composition.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

While this study is limited largely because of the small, institutionally localized scope, several areas for further research emerged. Each of the major findings above needs more

research that specifically highlights the DE student experience. Firstly, while grades are key motivating factors for DE academic performance, what other extrinsic motivators impact DE student performance, both academic and even identity performance? For example, the DE students who participated in this study seem to be people-pleasers, as the results chapter snapshots. Is instructor praise one such extrinsic motivator? Secondly, while this study hinted at a DE student underground network, mainly utilized to gather information about teacher expectations, more research is needed to truly describe this network: how does it practically function, what are the impacts on students' performances, and how does involvement within this network influence DE student identity self-perceptions?

Thirdly, this study only took a cursory look at the value of student metaphors as a heuristic for instructors. It could be a valuable tool for informal assessment and instructional change, but a usable heuristic informed by a vast collection of student metaphors that extends Lobin's research is needed. Fourthly, while this study pinpointed experience as a key influencer of DE perceptions of themselves as writers, experience is an expansive multidisciplinary topic that would essentially require multiple research agendas with interdisciplinary collaboration and perhaps a longitudinal lens. The last area of extended research derived from this study's major findings is related to the defining of key terms like *writing* and *writer*. While these conversations have permeated rhetoric and composition from its inception, it would be useful to revisit all definitions and key conversations through the lens of DE specifically. Do the definitions as they exist now, albeit through ambiguity, fit DE learning contexts? Do we need to more readily admit the nuance inherent to these terms like *writerly identity* and perhaps even do away with such ambiguous terms that can jeopardize the unique experiences of each student writer?

Several minor findings also emerged through the coding processes that are worth mentioning here for areas for future research. We don't really know a lot about the writing processes of DE students specifically. What mediums do they employ throughout their writing process? Heather, for example, would use a voice memo app on her drive home from school to brainstorm and prewrite. Sheldon actually preferred paper and pencil with a clipboard to write out drafts. Are these differentiations in writing process mediums paralleled in traditional FYC students? The issue of time management related to writing projects also proved to be a factor for DE students. Most students carried a course load of seven classes, which is obviously more than a typical collegiate semester schedule[28]. How does course load impact time management? Or impact disciplinary fragmentation?

Finally, a few minor categories emerged as possibly impacting DE student identity as well. The study took place on a religious secondary campus through a DE partnership with a religious university. How does the layered religiosity impact DE students' worldviews and ultimately their identity constructs? Does the course content influence this worldview or vice versa? And how then does such content impact DE student identity? Within this study specifically, the DE participants spoke often through binaries of what is right or wrong with their papers. Is this an extension of a worldview that rests upon similar binaries? This study also did not look at how reading, whether it be for academic purposes or pleasure, might impact DE student identity. In sum, rhetoric and composition researchers need to not only look at these issues that might be specific to DE contexts but also revisit many, if not all, major conversations related to FYC through a lens of the unique transitional space of DE.

---

[28] DE students take ENGL 106 in the fall and ENGL 110 in the spring, resulting in six composition credit hours by the end of the academic year.

FINAL THOUGHTS

The very name of the neoliberal machine "Dual Enrollment" locks in a dualistic approach for the students and teachers involved in the hamster wheel of college credits. Yet, ambiguous expectations and vague definitions further an unconscious portrayal that a dualistic worldview is the only worldview available to our burgeoning student writers (Thaiss and Zawacki; Yagelski). Writing is something that is necessary for DE FYC courses, for other courses, and for the world beyond the classroom — yet, we too often fail to relay that "writing is an ontological act… a way of being in the world… [as] it shapes and reflects our sense of who we are in relation to the world around us" (Yagelski 3). Perhaps this is because we have come to embody any number of dualisms ourselves.

Rhetoric and composition scholar-practitioners have always demonstrated a scrappy and resilient purpose in merging theory and praxis for the goals of bettering our students' learning experiences, our communities, our scholarly contributions, and, in turn, ourselves as scholar-practitioners — goals all linked together with the human element of *identity*. As rhetoric and composition is yet again in flux because of the continued fragmentation of our writing programs, it is once again time to turn our attention to identity, yet this time with a focus on the identity constructs and perceptions of our DE students. "Identity is a negotiated experience," and DE students are forging skill sets to aid in the difficult work of negotiation on a daily basis through their very existence within liminal spaces (Wenger 149). This reality necessitates a more intentional equipping of our DE students with negotiation skills that can in turn provide support for the resulting identity reconciliation work.

Wendy Bishop provides a reminder worth ending with here: "While these [DE participants']… stories might prompt further research or might result in future theories of

instruction, most immediately they will be worth listening to if they tell us about our own teaching and our own writing classrooms" (13-14). One truth they told me is that the lived DE experience of being both within and outside of two institutional and instructional spaces is complicated and taxing. They are weary. Yet, they crave the tools necessary for the messy, discursive work of overcoming dualisms through a codified perception of themselves as a writer. May we continue fighting against the fragmentation that fractures identities and prioritize restoring connections between writers and the world around them.

WORKS CITED

Abdi, Ali A. "Identity in the Philosophies of Dewey and Freire: Select Analyses." *The Journal of Educational Thought*, vol. 35, no. 2, Aug. 2001, pp. 181-200. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23767154.

"About the Book." *The Circle Maker,* https://thecirclemaker.com/about.

"About Lee University." *Lee University,* https://www.leeuniversity.edu/about/.

"About SUPA." *Syracuse University Project Advance,* https://supa.syr.edu/about-supa/.

"About Us." *College Now*, https://k16.cuny.edu/collegenow/about-us/.

"About Us." *NACEP*, https://www.nacep.org/about-nacep/.

ACT. "Using Dual Enrollment to Improve the Educational Outcomes of High School Students." *ACT,* Dec. 2015, https://www.act.org/content/dam/act/unsecured/documents/UsingDualEnrollment_2015.pdf.

"Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, and Dual-Enrollment Courses: Availability, Participation, and Related Outcomes for 2009 Ninth-Graders: 2013." *Web Tables*, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, NCES 2019-430, Aug. 2019, https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2019/2019430.pdf.

"Afford Your Education." *Lee University,* https://www.leeuniversity.edu/undergraduate/afford-your-education/#:~:text=Lee%20is%20committed%20to%20low,colleges%20with%20the%20lowest%20cost.

Althusser, Louis. "From *Ideology and State Apparatuses." The Norton Anthology of Theory and*

    Criticism, 2nd ed., edited by Vincent B. Leitch, et al., W.W. Norton & Company, 2010,

    pp. 1335-1360.

An, Brian P., and Jason L. Taylor. "Are Dual Enrollment Students College Ready? Evidence

    from the Wabash National Study of Liberal Arts Education." *Education Policy Analysis*

    Archives, vol. 23, no.58, 2015, http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v23.1781.

Applebee, Arthur N. *Curriculum as Conversation: Transforming Traditions of Teaching and*

    Learning, University of Chicago Press, 1966.

Aristotle. *The Nicomachean Ethics.* Translated by David Ross, Oxford University Press, 2009.

Becker, Howard S., et al. *Making the Grade: The Academic Side of College Life.* John Wiley &

    Sons, Inc. 1968.

Behm, Nicholas, et al. "Introduction." *The Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing:*

    Scholarship and Applications, edited by Behm, Nicholas N., et al., Parlor Press, 2017, pp.

    xxi-xxxii.

Berger, Andrea, et al. "The Early College High School Initiative: An Overview of Five

    Evaluation Years." *Peabody Journal of Education*, vol. 85, no. 3, 2010, pp. 333-347.

    https://www.jstor.org/stable/25759032.

"Best Hamilton County Private Schools (2021-22)." *Private School Review,*

    https://www.privateschoolreview.com/tennessee/hamilton-county.

"Bill Lee, 50th Governor of Tennessee." *TN Office of the Governor,*

    https://www.tn.gov/governor/about-bill-lee.html.

Bishop, Wendy. *Ethnographic Writing Research: Writing It up, Writing It down, and Reading It.*

    Boynton/Cook Publishers, 1999.

Bizzell, Patricia. "Cognition, Convention, and Certainty: What We Need to Know about Writing." *Pre/Text: A Journal of Rhetorical Theory,* vol. 3, no. 3, 1982, pp. 213-243. Rpt. in *Cross Talk in Comp Theory: A Reader,* 2nd Ed. Edited by Victor Villanueva, National Council of Teachers of English, 2003, pp. 387-411.

Bizzell, Patricia, and Bruce Herzberg. "Hugh Blair." *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present,* edited by Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg, Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001, pp. 947-949.

--. "Quintillian." *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present,* edited by Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg, Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001, pp. 359-364.

Block, Michael. "Identity Versus Role Confusion." Encyclopedia of Child Behavior and Development, edited by S. Goldstein S. and J. A. Naglieri J.A., 2011, Springer, https://doi-org.proxy.lib.odu.edu/10.1007/978-0-387-79061-9_1447.

Booth, Sherry, and Susan Frisbie. "(Re)Turning to Aristotle: Metaphor and the Rhetorical Education of Students." *Rhetorical Education in America,* edited by Cheryl Glenn, et al. The University of Alabama Press, 2004, pp. 163-178.

Brewer, Elizabeth, et al. "Creating a Culture of Access in Composition Studies." *Composition Studies*, vol. 42, no. 2, 2014, pp. 151-154, https://www.jstor.org/stable/43501861.

Brown, Wendy. *Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism's Stealth Revolution.* Zone Books, 2015.

Bruffee, Kenneth A. "Collaborative Learning and the 'Conversation of Mankind.'" *College English,* vol. 46, no. 7, Nov. 1984, pp. 635-652. Rpt. in *Cross Talk in Comp Theory: A Reader,* 2nd Ed. Edited by Victor Villanueva, National Council of Teachers of English, 2003, pp. 415-436.

Burke, Kenneth. *A Rhetoric of Motives.* University of California Press, 1969.

Calhoon-Dillahunt, Carolyn. "2018 CCCC Chair's Address: Returning to Our Roots: Creating the Conditions and Capacity for Change." *College Composition and Communication,* vol. 70, no. 2, Dec. 2018, pp. 273-293.

Carillo, Ellen C. "A Place for Reading in the *The Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing:* Recontextualizing the Habits of Mind." *The Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing: Scholarship and Applications,* edited by Behm, Nicholas N., et al., Parlor Press, 2017, pp. 38-53.

Carter, Joyce Locke. "2016 CCCC Chair's Address: Making, Disrupting, Innovating." *College Composition and Communication,* vol. 68, no. 2, pp. 378-408, https://www.jstor.org/stable/44783568.

"Church of God International Offices." *Church of God,* https://churchofgod.org/contact/.

Clifford, James. "On Ethnographic Authority." *Representations*, no. 2, 1983, pp. 118-146, http://www.jstor.com/stable/2928386.

Coleman, Taiyon J. "Conclusion: Joyfully Tearing It Down: A Conversation at the May Day Coffee Shop." *Working toward Racial Equity in First-Year Composition,* edited by Renee Delong, et al., Routledge, 2019, pp. 139-149.

"College Now." *CUNY, The City University of New York,* https://www.cuny.edu/about/administration/offices/evaluation/areas-of-focus_1/college_readiness/college-now/.

Collins, P. Hill. *Black Feminist Thought.* Unwin Hyman, 1990.

Colomb, Gregory G. "Where Should Students Start Writing in the Disciplines?" March 19, 1988, pp. 2-15.

Costa, Arthur L. "Habits of Mind." *The Institute for Habits of Mind*,

https://www.habitsofmindinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Habits-of-Mind-w-icons-and-eduplanet.pdf.

Council of Writing Program Administrators, et al. "Framework for Success in Postsecondary

Writing." Jan. 2011. http://wpacouncil.org/files/framework-for-success-postsecondary-writing.pdf.

Creswell, John W. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches.*

3rd. ed., Sage, 2013.

Crowley, Sharon. *Composition in the University: Historical and Polemical Essays*. University of

Pittsburgh Press, 1998.

CWPA, NCTE, and NWP. "Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing." 2011.

http://wpacouncil.org/files/framework-for-success-postsecondary-writing.pdf.

Davis, Diane. "Identification: Burke and Freud on Who You Are." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly,*

vol. 38, no. 2, April 2008, pp. 123-147, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02773940701779785.

"Dear Colleague Letter: Transgender Students." *US Dept. of Justice,*13 May 2016,

https://www.justice.gov/opa/file/850986/download.

Delong, Renee, et al., editors. *Working toward Racial Equity in First-Year Composition,*

Routledge, 2019.

Denecker, Christine. "Closing the Gap? A Study into the Professional Development of

Concurrent Enrollment Writing Instructors in Ohio." *Teaching English in the Two-Year*

College, vol. 48, no. 1, Sept. 2020, pp. 66-87.

--. *Toward Seamless Transition? Dual Enrollment and the Composition Classroom.* 2007.

Bowling Green State University, PhD Dissertation. *Proquest.*

--. "Transitioning Writers across the Composition Threshold: What We Can Learn from Dual Enrollment Partnerships." *Composition Studies,* vol. 41, no. 1, 2013, pp. 27-50.

Dewey, John. *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education.* The Free Press, 1916.

"Dual Enrollment Grant." *TN.gov,* https://www.tn.gov/collegepays/money-for-college/tn-education-lottery-programs/dual-enrollment-grant.html.

Du Bois, Barbara. "Passionate Scholarship: Notes on Values, Knowing and Method in Feminist Social Science." 1983. *Theories of Women's Studies,* edited by Gloria Knowles and R. D. Klein, Routledge, 1983, pp. 105-116.

Ebert, Joel. "Tennessee Gov. Bill Lee Signs Bill Allowing Adoption Agencies to Deny Gay Couples." *USA Today,* 25 Jan. 2020, https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2020/01/24/tennessee-gay-adoption-gov-bill-lee-signs-anti-lgbt-measure/4570788002/.

"Education Theory: Constructivism and Social Constructivism." *UCD Dublin,* http://www.ucdoer.ie/index.php/Education_Theory/Constructivism_and_Social_Constructivism.

Ellis, John M. *The Breakdown of Higher Education: How It Happened, the Damage It Does, and What Can Be Done.* Encounter Books, 2020.

"Employee Handbook." *Silverdale Baptist Academy,* 2021-2022.

"Employment Opportunities." *SBA,* https://www.silverdaleba.org/employment-opportunities.

Eubanks, Philip. "Understanding Metaphors for Writing: In Defense of the Conduit Metaphor." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 53, no. 1, 2001, pp. 92-118.

Everson, Barbara J. "Vygotsky and the Teaching of Writing." *The Quarterly,* vol. 13, no. 3,

    1991, pp. 8-11.

    https://archive.nwp.org/cs/public/download/nwp_file/789/Vygotsky.pdf?x-r=pcfile_d.

Farris, Christine R. "Minding the Gap and Learning the Game: Differences That Matter between

    High School and College Writing." *College Credit for Writing in High School: The*

    "Taking Care of Business," edited by Kristine Hansen and Christine R. Farris, NCTE,

    2010, pp. 272-282.

"Fast Facts." *SBA,* https://www.silverdaleba.org/who-we-are/fast-facts.

Felton, Emmanuel. "The Difference between Being Eligible for College and Ready for College."

    The Hechinger Report, 2 March 2016, https://hechingerreport.org/the-difference-

    between-being-eligible-for-college-and-ready-for-college/.

Fish, Stanley. "Neoliberalism and Higher Education." *The New York Times,* 8 March 2009,

    https://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/03/08/neoliberalism-and-higher-education/.

Fishman, Stephen M. "Explicating Our Tacit Tradition: John Dewey and Composition Studies."

    College Composition and Communication, vol. 44, no. 3, Oct. 1993, pp. 315-330,

    http://www.jstor.org/stable/358986.

Flax, Jane. *Thinking Fragments: Psychoanalysis, Feminism, and Postmodernism in the*

    Contemporary West, University of California Press, 1990.

Fleming, David J. "The Very Idea of a 'Progymnasmata.'" *Rhetoric Review,* vol. 22, no. 2, 2003,

    pp. 105-120. *JSTOR,* www.jstor.org/stable/3093032.

Flower, Linda, and John R. Hayes. "A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing." *College*

    Composition and Communication, vol. 32, no. 4, Dec. 1981, pp. 365-387. Rpt. in *Cross*

Talk in Comp Theory: A Reader, 2nd Ed. Edited by Victor Villanueva, National Council
of Teachers of English, 2003, pp. 273-297.

Foucault, Michel. "From *The Order of Discourse.*" *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present,* edited by Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg, Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001, pp.1460-1470.

Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing. WPA, Council of Writing Program Administrators, 2011,
http://wpacouncil.org/aws/cwpa/pt/sd/news_article/242845/_parent/layout_details/false.

Freire, Paulo. *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* Bloomsbury, 1970.

Freire, Paulo, and D. Macedo. *Literacy: Reading the World and the Word*. Bergin & Garvey, 1987.

Freud, Sigmund. "Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego." 1921. Reprinted in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, *Volume XVIII (1920-1922): Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, *Group Psychology and Other Works*, pp. 65-144.

Gee, J. P., et al. "Discourse Analysis." *The Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education,* edited by M.D. LeCompte, et al., Academic Press, pp. 227-291.

Geisler, Cheryl. "How Ought We to Understand the Concept of Rhetorical Agency? Report from the ARS." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, vol. 34, no. 3, 2004, pp. 9-17, DOI:10.1080/02773940409391286.

Gilbert, Erik. "How Dual Enrollment Contributes to Inequality." *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* 5 Nov. 2017, https://www.chronicle.com/article/How-Dual-

Enrollment/241668/?fbclid=IwAR2a7VrygoPQSfXD0sc0c-gPL_Yt27aU1DGpw_zl7rGrQ_XR1ULetL7FYiw#.XSvj9oylAjM.facebook.

Giroux, Henry A. *Neoliberalism's War on Higher Education.* Haymarket Books, 2014.

Grant, Kathrine. "The Development of Concurrent Enrollment at the University of Connecticut."

UCONN, Jan. 2019, https://ece.uconn.edu/about/history/#.

Hammersley, Martyn. "On Feminist Methodology." *Sociology*, vol. 26, no. 2, May 1992, pp. 187-206, http://www.jstor.com/stable/42855003.

Hansen, Kristine. "The Composition Marketplace: Shopping for Credit versus Learning to Write." *College Credit for Writing in High School: The "Taking Care of" Business*, edited by Hansen and Farris, National Council of Teachers of English, 2010, pp. 1–39.

--. "The Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing: Better Than the Competition, Still Not All We Need. *College English*, vol. 74, no. 6, 2012, pp. 520–553, https://www.jstor.org/stable/23212914.

Hansen, Kristine, and Christine R. Farris. "Introduction: The 'Taking Care of' Business." *College Credit for Writing in High School: The "Taking Care of Business,"* edited by Kristine Hansen and Christine R. Farris, NCTE, 2010, pp. xvii-xxxiii.

Hansen, Kristine, and Christine R. Farris, editors. *College Credit for Writing in High School: The "Taking Care of" Business.* National Council of Teachers of English, 2010.

Harris, Joseph. *A Teaching Subject: Composition Since 1966*. Utah State University Press, 2012.

Hart, Lisa K. "*Three Quarters College Student": A Multiple Case Study of Dual Credit at a High School Site and on a College Campus.* 2019. Kent State University, PhD Dissertation. *Proquest.*

Hatch, John R., et al. "Does Holistic Assessment Predict Writing Performance? Estimating the

    Consistency of Student Performance on Holistically Scored Writing Assessments."

    Written Communication, vol. 17, no. 1, 2000, pp. 3-26.

Hauser, Gerard A. "The Most Significant Passage in Aristotle's Rhetoric, or How Function May

    Make Moral Philosophers of Us All." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, vol. 12, no. 1, 1 Jan.

    1982, pp. 13–16. https://www.jstor.org/stable/3885697.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Phenomenology of Spirit.* Translated by A.V. Miller, Oxford

    University Press, 1977.

Herndl, Carl G. "Writing Ethnography: Representation, Rhetoric, and Institutional Practice."

    College English, vol. 53, no. 3, March 1991, pp. 320-332,

    http://www.jstor.com/stable/378107.

Herrick, James A. *The History and Theory of Rhetoric: An Introduction*. 6th ed. Routledge,

    2018.

Hickman, Larry A. "Introduction." *Reading Dewey: Interpretations for a Postmodern*

    Generation, edited by Larry A. Hickman, Indiana University Press, 1998, pp. ix-xxi.

"The History of the IB." *International Baccalaureate Organization,* 2017,

    https://www.ibo.org/globalassets/digital-toolkit/presentations/1711-presentation-history-

    of-the-ib-en.pdf.

Horning, Alice S. "Enhancing the *Framework for Success*: Adding Experiences in Critical

    Reading." *The Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing: Scholarship and*

    Applications, edited by Behm, Nicholas N., et al., Parlor Press, 2017, pp. 54-68.

Hughes, Gerard J. *Aristotle on Ethics.* Routledge, 2001.

Inoue, Asao B., and Tyler Richmond. "Theorizing the Reflection Practices of Female Hmong College Students: Is Reflection a Racialized Discourse?" *A Rhetoric of Reflection,* edited by Kathleen Blake Yancey, Utah State University Press, 2016, pp. 125-145.

Isocrates. "Against the Sophists." *Isocrates II*, edited by Jeffery Henderson, Harvard University Press, 1929, pp. 163-177.

--. *Antidosis. Isocrates II*, edited by Jeffery Henderson, Harvard University Press, 1929, pp. 179-365.

Jankowski, N. "Unpacking Relationships: Instruction and Student Outcomes." *American Council on Education (ACE)*. 2017, White Paper.

Jensen, Darin L. "Tilting at Windmills: Refiguring Graduate Education in English to Prepare Future Two-Year College Professionals." Diss., U of Nebraska–Lincoln, 2017. ProQuest, https://search-proquest-com.mutex.gmu.edu/docview/2011264199?accountid=14541.

Johnson, Kristine. "Beyond Standards: Disciplinary and National Perspectives on Habits of Mind." *CCC,* vol. 64, no. 3, Feb. 2013, pp. 517-541.

--. "Framing the *Framework*." *The Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing: Scholarship and Applications,* edited by Behm, Nicholas N., et al., Parlor Press, 2017, pp. 3-20.

Johnson, Sarah Z., et al. "Joint Position Statement on Dual Enrollment from CCCC, TYCA, WPA, NCTE." Jan. 2020, *Teaching English in the Two-Year College,* vol. 47, no. 4, May 2020, pp. 11-15.

Jones, Donald C. "Dewey's Progressive Pedagogy for Rhetorical Instruction: Teaching Argument in a Nonfoundational Framework." *Trained Capacities: John Dewey, Rhetoric,*

and Democratic Practice, edited by Brian dJackson and Gregory Clark, The University

    of South Carolina Press, 2014, pp. 216-232.

Jones, Joseph. "The Beginning of AP and the Ends of First-Year College Writing." *College*

    Credit for Writing in High School: The "Taking Care of Business," edited by Kristine

    Hansen and Christine R. Farris, NCTE, 2010, pp. 43-67.

Kapanke, Susan, and Melissa Westemeier. "The University of Wisconsin Oshkosh and Area

    High Schools Strike a Partnership." *Teaching Writing in High School and College:*

    Conversations and Collaborations. Ed. Thomas C. Thompson. NCTE, 2002, pp. 153-

    168.

Karp, Melinda Mechur. "Dual Enrollment, Structural Reform, and the Completion Agenda."

    New Directions for Community Colleges, vol. 2015, no. 169, 2015, pp. 103–111.

Kates, Graham. "Lori Loughlin and Felicity Huffman among Dozens Charged in College Bribery

    Scheme." *CBS News*, 12 March 2019, https://www.cbsnews.com/news/college-

    admissions-scandal-bribery-cheating-today-felicity-huffman-arrested-fbi-2019-03-12/.

Katz, Jack. "Ethnography's Expanding Warrants." *The Annals of the American Academy of*

    Political and Social Science, vol. 642, July 2012, pp. 258-275,

    http://www.jstor.com/stable/23218476.

--. "On the Rhetoric and Politics of Ethnographic Methodology." *The Annals of the American*

    Academy of Political and Social Science, vol. 595, Sept. 2004, pp. 280-308, DOI:

    10.1177/0002716204267475.

Khost, Peter H. "The *Framework as Success* as Rhetorical Common Denominator." *The*

    Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing: Scholarship and Applications, edited

    by Behm, Nicholas N., et al., Parlor Press, 2017, pp. 136-153.

Konrath, Sara H., et al. "Changes in Dispositional Empathy in American College Students over

      Time: A Meta-Analysis." *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, vol.15, no. 2, 2011,

      pp. 180–198, DOI: 10.1177/1088868310377395.

Kurtyka, Faith. "Messy but Meaningful: Using the Habits of Mind to Understand Extracurricular

      Learning." *The Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing: Scholarship and*

      Applications, edited by Behm, Nicholas N., et al., Parlor Press, 2017, pp. 102-117.

Lacan, Jacques. "The Instance of the Letter in the Unconscious." *Ecrits: The First Complete*

      Edition in English, W.W. Norton and Company, 1966. pp. 412-444.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By.* The University of Chicago Press,

      1980.

Larracey, Caitlin, and Holly Hassel. "Foregrounding Access, Recognizing, Hybrid Identities, and

      Building Alliances." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College,* vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 5-10.

Leake, Eric. "Writing Pedagogies of Empathy: As Rhetoric and Disposition." *Composition*

      Forum, vol. 34, 2016, http://compositionforum.com/issue/34/empathy.php.

"Lee University." *U.S. News and World Report,* https://www.usnews.com/best-colleges/lee-

      university-3500.

Leff, Michael. "Isocrates, Tradition, and the Rhetorical Version of Civic Education." *Isocrates*

      and Civic Education, edited by Takis Poulakos and David Depew, University of Texas

      Press, 2004, pp. 235-254.

Leitch, Vincent B., et al. "Jacques Lacan*." The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism,* 2nd

      ed., edited by Vincent B. Leitch, et al., W.W. Norton & Company, 2010, pp. 1156-1163.

Levin, John S. "The Business Culture of the Community College: Students as Consumers; Students as Commodities." *New Directions for Higher Education,* vol. 129, 2005, pp. 11-26.

Lindquist, Julie. *A Place to Stand: Politics and Persuasion in a Working-Class Bar.* Oxford University Press, 2002.

Long, Katherine. "At 25, Running Start Is a Success. Now It Must Attract Students Who Need It the Most." *The Seattle Times,* 30 March 2018, https://www.seattletimes.com/education-lab/at-25-running-start-a-success-but-how-to-bring-in-more-minority-and-low-income-minority-students/.

Maxwell, Joseph A. *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach.* 3rd Ed. Sage, 2013.

"Mayors Youth Council." *Chattanooga.gov,* https://chattanooga.gov/mayors-youth-council/.

McCrimmon, Miles. "Contesting the Territoriality of 'Freshmen English': The Political Ecology of Dual Enrollment." *College Credit for Writing in High School: The "Taking Care of Business,"* edited by Kristine Hansen and Christine R. Farris, NCTE, 2010, pp. 208-226.

McLeod, Saul. "Likert Scale Definition, Examples and Analysis." *Simply Psychology,* 3 Aug. 2019, https://www.simplypsychology.org/likert-scale.html.

McWain, Katie. "Finding Freedom at the Composition Threshold: Learning from the Experiences of Dual Enrollment Teachers." *TETYC,* vol. 45, no. 4, May 2018, pp. 406-424, https://library.ncte.org/journals/TETYC/issues/v45-4.

Menand, Louis. *The Metaphysical Club: A Story of Ideas in America.* Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2001.

Moreland, Casie. "Chasing Transparency: Using Disparate Impact Analysis to Assess the (In)Accessibility of Dual Enrollment Composition." W*riting Assessment, Social Justice,*

and the Advancement of Opportunity, edited by Mya Poe et al., WAC Clearinghouse and

    UP of Colorado, 2018, pp. 173–201, https://wac.colostate.edu/books/assessment/.

    Perspectives on Writing.

Mosley, Milka Mustenikova. "The Truth about High School English." *What is College-Level*

    Writing? Edited by Patrick Sullivan and Howard Tinberg, National Council of Teachers

    of English, 2006, pp. 58-68.

Myatt, Alice Johnston, and Ellen Shelton. "Applications of the *Framework for Success in*

    Postsecondary Writing at the University of Mississippi: Shaping the Praxis of Writing

    Instruction." *The Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing: Scholarship and*

    Applications, edited by Behm, Nicholas N., et al., Parlor Press, 2017, pp. 187-203.

Naples, Nancy. "A Feminist Revisiting of the Insider/Outsider Debate: The 'Outsider

    Phenomenon' in Rural Iowa." *Qualitative Sociology,* vol 19, no. 1, 1996, pp. 83-106.

"A Nation at Risk." April 1983, https://www2.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/risk.html.

National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP). "Fast Facts about Dual and

    Concurrent Enrollment." *NACEP,* www.nacep.org/research-policy/fast-facts/.

Nguyên, Ann Thúy, and Maya Pendleton. "Recognizing Race in Language: Why We Capitalize

    'Black' and 'White,'" *Center for the Study of Social Policy,* 23 Mar. 2020,

    https://cssp.org/2020/03/recognizing-race-in-language-why-we-capitalize-black-and-

    white/.

Oliphant, Robert. "Letter to a B Student." *Liberal Education,* vol. 72, no. 2, 1986, pp. 183-187.

    ERIC.

O'Neill, Peggy, et al. "Foreword: Then and Now, Reflections on the Framework Six Years Out."

  The Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing: Scholarship and Applications,

  edited by Behm, Nicholas N., et al., Parlor Press, 2017, pp. ix-xix.

Opel, Dawn S. "A Writing Program's Teachers Speak: Metacognition and the *The Framework*

  for Success in Postsecondary Writing." The Framework for Success in Postsecondary

  Writing: Scholarship and Applications, edited by Behm, Nicholas N., et al., Parlor Press,

  2017, pp. 85-101.

"Our Instructors." *Syracuse University, Project Advance,* https://supa.syr.edu/hs-instructors/.

"Our Mission." *Lee University,* https://www.leeuniversity.edu/about/mission/.

"Outdoor Education." *SBA,* https://www.silverdaleba.org/outdoored.

Parent and Student Handbook: 2021-2022. Silverdale Baptist Academy, 2021.

Phelps, Louise Wetherbee. "Postscript. Settling for Good-Enough: 'The Hedgehog and the Fox'

  Revisited." 2004. Chapter in *Poetics of Composition: Footprints of an Intellectual*

  Journey, work in progress.

--. "Matching Form to Function in Writing Program Design," Michigan State University, 2002.

Piazza, Carolyn L., and Carl F. Siebert. "Development and Validation of a Writing Dispositions

  Scale for Elementary and Middle School Students." *The Journal of Educational*

  Research, vol. 101, no. 5, 2008, pp. 275-285, DOI: 10.3200/JOER.101.5.275-286.

Pilgrim, Kristyn. "Everything You Need to Know about CLEP Exams." *College Finance,* 27

  Aug. 2020, https://collegefinance.com/exams/everything-you-need-to-know-about-clep-

  exams.

Poe, Mya, et al., editors. *Writing Assessment, Social Justice, and the Advancement of*

  Opportunity. The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado, 2018.

Post, Joanna Castner, et al. "Round up the Horses — The Carts are Racing Downhill!

    Programmatic Catch-up to a Quickly Growing Concurrent Credit Program." *College*

    Credit for Writing in High School: The "Taking Care of Business," edited by Kristine

    Hansen and Christine R. Farris, NCTE, 2010, pp. 165-188.

Poulakos, Takis. *Speaking for the Polis: Isocrates' Rhetorical Education.* University of South

    Carolina Press, 1997.

Powell, Rebecca. "Experience, Values, and Habitus: Twelfth Graders and the *Framework*'s

    Habits of Mind." *The Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing: Scholarship and*

    Applications, edited by Behm, Nicholas N., et al., Parlor Press, 2017, pp. 118-135.

Pratt, Leslie. *Inquiries into Writing and the Construction of Writerly Identity in a Twelfth-Grade*

    Classroom. 2011. University of Pennsylvania, PhD Dissertation. *Proquest.*

Quintilian. "From *Institutes of Oratory*." *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical*

    Times to the Present, edited by Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg, Bedford/St.

    Martin's, 2001, pp. 364-428.

Ratcliff, Clancy, and Daniel A. Smith. "Access and Stratification: One City, Two Dual

    Enrollment Programs." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College,* vol. 48, no. 1, Sept.

    2020, pp. 162-176.

Ratcliffe, Krista. *Rhetorical Listening: Identification, Gender, Whiteness*. Southern Illinois

    University Press, 2006.

Reiff, Mary Jo, and Anis Bawarshi. "Tracing Discursive Resources: How Students Use Prior

    Genre Knowledge to Negotiate New Writing Contexts in First-Year Composition."

    Written Communication, vol. 28, no. 3, 16 Aug. 2011, pp. 312-337, DOI:

    10.1177/0741088311410183.

Reinharz, Shulamit. *Feminist Methods in Social Research.* Oxford University Press, 1992.

Reisen, Richard A. *Piety and Philosophy: A Primer for Christian Schools.* ACW Press, 2002.

Reynolds, Nedra. "Composition's Imagined Geographies: The Politics of Space in the Frontier, City, and Cyberspace." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 50, no. 1, 1998, pp. 12-35.

Ridinger-Dotterman, Angela, et al. "Bringing the Community to the Classroom: Using Campus-Wide Collaborations to Foster Belonging for Dual Enrollment Students." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College,* vol. 48, no. 1, Sept. 2020, pp. 44-65.

"Running Start." *Wikipedia,* https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Running_Start#:~:text=4%20Criticism-,History,a%20huge%20increase%20in%20enrollment.

Russo, Robyn. "Dual/Dueling Identities: Helping Dual Enrollment Faculty Navigate a Complex and Contested Professional Space." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College,* vol. 48, no. 1, Sept. 2020, pp. 88-115.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism.* Pantheon, 1978.

Saldana, Johnny. *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers.* 3rd ed., Sage, 2016.

Schwalm, David E. "High School/College Dual Enrollment." *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, vol. 15, no. 1/2, 1991, pp. 51–54.

Shoenberg, Robert. "'Why Do I Have to Take This Course?' or Credit Hours, Transfer, and Curricular Coherence." *Association of American Colleges and Universities,* https://www.aacu.org/publications-research/periodicals/why-do-i-have-take-course-or-credit-hours-transfer-and-curricular.

"Silverdale Baptist Academy." *Private School Review*,

>   https://www.privateschoolreview.com/silverdale-baptist-academy-profile.

Slaughter, Sheila, and Gary Rhoades. "The Neo-liberal University." *New Labor Forum,* no. 6,

>   2000, pp. 73-79, https://www.jstor.org/stable/40342886.

Sommers, Nancy, and Laura Saltz. "The Novice as Expert: Writing the Freshmen Year. *College*

>   *Composition and Communication*, vol. 56, no. 1, 2004, pp. 124–149.

>   https://www.jstor.org/stable/4140684.

Steinberg, Laurence. "Chapter eight: Identity." *Adolescence.* 11th ed., McGraw-Hill Education,

>   2017, pp. 208-234.

Stokdyk, Joshua, et al. "Finding Value, Building Value: A Dual Enrollment Model That

>   Works." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College,* vol. 48, no. 1, Sept. 2020, pp. 116-

>   143.

Strachan, Wendy. "Talking about the Transition: Dialogues between High School and University

>   Teachers." *Teaching Writing in High School and College: Conversations and*

>   *Collaborations*. Ed. Thomas C. Thompson. NCTE, 2002, pp. 136-150.

"Summary for: All Contests, All Districts, All Counting Groups Official Results Hamilton

>   County, TN November 6, 2018 Federal and State General Election, Election Summary."

>   *Hamilton County Election Commission,* 16 Nov. 2018,

>   https://elect.hamiltontn.gov/Portals/12/Archives/2018/1811%20Federal%20and%20State

>   %20General/1811%20Official%20ElectionSummaryReport.pdf.

Taczak, Kara, and Liane Robertson. "Reiterative Reflection in the Twenty-First-Century Writing

>   Classroom: An Integrated Approach to Teaching for Transfer." *A Rhetoric of Reflection,*

>   edited by Kathleen Blake Yancey, Utah State University Press, 2016, pp. 42-63.

Taie, Soheyla, and Laurie Lewis. "Dual or Concurrent Enrollment in Public Schools in the

    United States." *National Center for Education Statistics,* Institute of Education Sciences,

    Dec. 2020, https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2020/2020125.pdf.

Terrier-Dobrioglo, Jordan, and Vicki Tolar Burton. "Mapping Dual Credit for College Writing:

    Signposts from the Oregon Trail." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College,* vol. 48,

    no. 1, Sept. 2020, pp. 144-161.

Thaiss, C., and T.M. Zawacki. *Engaged Writers and Dynamic Disciplines: Research on the*

    Academic Writing Life. Heinemann, 2006.

Tinberg, Howard, and Jean-Paul Nadeau. "What Happens When High School Students Write in a

    College Course? A Study of Dual Credit. *The English Journal,* vol. 102, no. 5, May 2013,

    pp. 35-42, https://www.jstor.org/stable/24484090.

Tobin, Lad. "Bridging Gaps: Analyzing Our Students' Metaphors for Composing." *College*

    Composition and Communication, vol. 40, no. 4, 1989, pp. 444-58.

Turner, Viktor. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure.* Routledge, 1995.

"2021 Most Conversative Colleges in America." *Niche,*

    https://www.niche.com/colleges/search/most-conservative-colleges/.

TYCA Research Committee. "TYCA White Paper on Placement Reform." National Council of

    Teachers of English, Apr. 2016,

    https://cdn.ncte.org/nctefiles/groups/tyca/placementreform_revised.pdf.

US Department of Education. "Dual Enrollment Participation and Characteristics." *Data Point,*

    Feb. 2019, https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2019/2019176.pdf.

Valentino, Marilyn. "2010 CCCC Chair's Address: Rethinking the Fourth C: Call to Action."

> *College Composition and Communication,* vol. 62, no. 2, Dec. 2010, pp. 364-378,

> https://www.jstor.org/stable/27917900.

Van Waes, Luuk, and Peter Jan Schellens. "Writing Profiles: The Effect of the Writing Mode on

> Pausing and Revision Patterns of Experienced Writers." *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol. 35,

> no. 6, 2003, pp. 829-853. *Elsevier*, DOI: 10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00121-2.

Walton, Judy. "Chattanooga Remains Most Churched City in U.S." *Chattanooga Times Free*

> *Press,* 18 June 2017, https://www.timesfreepress.com/news/local/story/2017/jun/18/still-

> bucklechattanoogremains-most-churched-c/433880/?bcsubid=a20e1f80-b072-469e-9109-

> 62ea0d2e5a7f&pbdialog=reg-wall-login-created-tfp.

Wardle, Elizabeth, and Nicolette Mercer Clement. "Double Binds and Consequential

> Transitions: Considering Matters of Identity During Moments of Rhetorical Challenge."

> *Critical Transitions: Writing and the Questions of Transfer,* edited by Chris M. Anson

> and Jessie L. Moore, Parlor Press, 2017, pp. 161-180.

Wecker, Erin Costella, and Patty Wilde. "Neither Here nor There: A Study of Dual Enrollment

> Students' Hybrid Identities in First-Year Composition." *Teaching English in the Two-*

> *Year College,* vol. 48, no. 1, Sept. 2020, pp.16-43.

Weinstein, Larry. *Writing at the Threshold: Featuring 56 Ways to Prepare High School and*

> *College Students to Think and Write at the College Level*. Urbana, Illinois: NCTE, 2001.

Wenger, Etienne. *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity.* Cambridge

> University Press, 1998.

"Who We Are." *SBA,* https://www.silverdaleba.org/who-we-are.

Winalksi, Amanda. "Bam." *What is College-Level Writing?* Edited by Patrick Sullivan and

    Howard Tinberg, National Council of Teachers of English, 2006, pp. 302-308.

Wolf, Joan S. and John Geiger. "Concurrent Enrollment: A Program to Foster Educational

    Excellence." *The High School Journal*, vol. 69, no. 3, 1986, pp. 218-221,

    https://www.jstor.org/stable/40364931.

Writing Assessment, Social Justice, and the Advancement of Opportunity, edited by Mya Poe, et

    al., WAC Clearinghouse and UP of Colorado, 2018, pp. 173–201,

    https://wac.colostate.edu/books/assessment/. Perspectives on Writing.

Yagelski, Robert P. *Writing as a Way of Being: Writing Instruction, Nonduality, and the Crisis

    of Sustainability.* Hampton Press, Inc., 2011.

Yancey, Kathleen Blake. "Introduction: Contextualizing Reflection." *A Rhetoric of Reflection,*

    edited by Kathleen Blake Yancey, Utah State University Press, 2016, pp. 3-20.

Yancey, Kathleen Blake, et al. *Writing across Contexts: Transfer, Composition, and Sites of

    Writing*. Utah State University Press, 2014.

APPENDIX A

ENGL 106 SYLLABUS

ENGL 106: College English
Dual Enrollment @ SBA in partnership with Lee University

Instructor: Sarah Johnson, Ph.D. Candidate
Email: sjohnson@silverdaleba.org

> **TEXT:** Graff, Gerald, Cathy Birkenstein and Russel Durst. *They Say, I Say with Readings*. 4th ed. Norton, 2018. (**NOT the high school edition)
>
> **Additional readings chosen by instructor.

UNIVERSITY MISSION STATEMENT:
Lee University seeks to provide education that integrates biblical truth as revealed in the Holy Scriptures with truth discovered through the study of the arts and sciences and in the practice of various professions. A personal commitment to Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior is the controlling perspective from which the educational enterprise is carried out. The foundational purpose of all educational programs is to develop within the students knowledge, appreciation, understanding, ability, and skills which will prepare them for responsible living in the modern world.

CATALOG DESCRIPTION:
A writing course in which students develop strategies for thinking critically, reading analytically, and writing rhetorically-informed prose. Students will analyze and compose a variety of texts for diverse rhetorical situations with the goal of developing a recursive, transferable writing process suitable to academic writing. A grade of C or better in this course allows the student to enroll in Rhetoric and Research, ENG 110. Prerequisite: ACT English score of up to 24 or an SAT recentered verbal score of up to 569. **Three Credit Hours**
***IN ORDER TO RECEIVE CREDIT FOR THIS CLASS, you must earn a (college) grade of "C" or better. Any course average below a "70" will be considered failing the course.

> I. **PURPOSE**
>   This course focuses on developing critical thinking and writing skills including analytical reading, argumentation, and effective style.
>
> II. **OBJECTIVES OF THE COURSE**
>   A. **General Instructional Objectives**
>   This course seeks to:
>   1. Develop students' awareness of audience and purpose for their writing
>   2. Develop understanding of the process of writing, organizing and revising a college level essay
>   3. Introduce a variety of genres common in academic writing
>   4. Introduce effective strategies for argumentation
>   5. Develop skill in using the writing conventions and strategies appropriate to genre and rhetorical situation

6. Develop students' ability to integrate their own ideas with those of others
7. Develop critical reading and responding skills
8. Develop an awareness and understanding of cultural and individual diversity

B. Specific Behavioral Objectives
As a result of the activities and study in this course, the student should be able to:
1. Write papers incorporating various prewriting, writing and revision strategies
2. Write using a variety of rhetorical strategies appropriate to the genre and rhetorical situation
3. Create argumentative writing appropriate to academic genres
4. Summarize, paraphrase, and analyze secondary sources
5. Write prose that respects appropriate conventions for the genre and rhetorical situation
6. Critique their own and others' writing
7. Write texts that integrate the student's ideas with the ideas of others
8. Read and respond to texts written by authors representing various cultures and values

III.   TOPICS TO BE COVERED
A.   Purpose and audience
B.   Academic genres
C.   Strategies for argumentation
D.   Prewriting/invention strategies
E.   Organization/arrangement
F.   Development
G.   Unity and coherence
H.   Conventions of writing in specific genres
I.   Research and documentation

IV.   INSTRUCTIONAL PROCEDURES
A.   Reading and responding to texts and assigned readings
B.   Writing at the paragraph and essay levels
C.   Instructor-Student conferences
D.   Self evaluation, peer evaluation, and collaboration
E.   Revising and editing papers
F.   Lecture/teacher-directed activity
G.   Library research
H.   Supplemental Instruction – Writing Studios

V.   RESPONSIBILITIES OF STUDENTS
A.   Read and respond to texts and supplementary materials
B.   Write and present papers as assigned
C.   Revise papers in response to peer and instructor critique

D.   Complete in- and out-of class developmental practice exercises/activities

E.   Participate in group and collaborative activities and various evaluation procedures

F.   Schedule and attend individual conferences with instructor

G.   Attend Supplemental Instruction sections throughout the semester

VI. EXPECTATIONS OF STUDENTS

I will maintain high expectations for you as COLLEGE students and as community members. You are expected to be <u>respectful</u> at all times to your authority and your peers. You are expected to be <u>responsible</u> for your own education, meaning you are to stay organized, to focus, and to seek help as you need it. You are also expected to be <u>punctual</u> to class and in submitting assignments. The secret to success in my class is to turn in all assignments on time and be an active contributor in whatever we are doing in class.

One of my greatest expectations of you is to be an <u>independent learner</u>. This means coming to me if you have questions or need clarification. It also means that you take ownership of your education. If you are absent or tardy, it is your job to come to me and get the work you missed. As the student, it is your responsibility to own your education. You must make an effort to do your best, for I cannot reward laziness or apathy. Most importantly, you are responsible for your attitude. Learning can be tedious at times, but we can stay positive and work hard together as we strive to be better servants and scholars for the glory of God.

It is also vital that you are <u>a class contributor.</u> The atmosphere of our college class will be highly focused on class discussions of texts, which means that you must do the reading diligently and come to class prepared with some ideas, questions, and other discussion contributions. Please know that I am here to help you in any way that I can!

VII.   EVALUATION

A.   Components and relative weights:

Assignments	Percentages
Short writing assignments, in-class work, homework, quizzes, discussion boards	20%
Experiential Narrative	10%
Literature Review	15%
Critique & argument	15%
Problem-Solution Proposal	20%
Portfolio & reflective essay	10%
Supplemental Instruction: Student-Led Studios	10%

B.   Grading Scale:
A=92.5-100%
A-=89.9-92.4%
B+=87.5-89.8%
B=82.5-87.4%
B-=79.9-82.4%

C+=77.5-79.8%
C=72.5-77.4%
C-=69.9-72.4%
F=69.8 or below

C. *Late work policy*: Bring/upload all assignments on the due date. Homework must be completed **before** class begins. This means printed out, emailed, etc. **No late work will be accepted** as this is an SBA upper level honors course. If you have any type of emergency that would lead to an assignment's being late, communicate that to the instructor in writing.
Only extreme circumstances with documentation will serve to mitigate the late penalty.

D. *Assignment submission policy:* Your instructor will specify the format in which you should submit assignments (i.e. in print, via Moodle, or some other format). You may only submit assignments in the specified format. Do not email papers to your instructor unless specifically requested.

E. *Paper Guidelines & Modified Portfolio System*
All formal papers should be typed, double-spaced, and follow MLA guidelines. This includes Times New Roman 12 pt. font and one inch margins. You must submit your peer reviews along with your final draft. I will often ask you to submit your rough draft and other materials as well, so keep up with all drafting work throughout the writing process. There are MLA resources and examples for your benefit on the Writing Center website.

As our emphasis for this course will be on the composition process, I want to push you to have the best papers you can. This means that my comments will be broader in scope so that you are responsible for the revision work (i.e. Instead of marking missing commas, I may say "Watch comma usage after long introductory phrases."). The modified portfolio system allows you a chance to revise **two major essays** (assignment guide for each will specify) for a higher grade. You must submit your revision no later than one week after the paper has been handed back to you and it **must include a writer's memo** (to be explained) and the graded draft. **You will receive the **average** of the two grades!

F. *Makeup Work Policy*: You have two days per day you were absent to make up the work as long as you have been "excused" for your absence. **It is your responsibility to check Moodle/Canvas and get with me for any additional explanation for homework, activities, or quizzes you have missed and need to make up.** All make-up assessments must be completed in the learning lab with Mrs. Clanton. Once your allotted time for make up work is passed, you will receive zeros for missing work. Please remember that per

the SBA student handbook, you are not allowed to make up missed work for full credit for unexcused tardies or absences!

VIII. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

Lee University is committed to the provision of reasonable accommodations for students with disabilities as defined in Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Students who think they may qualify for these accommodations should notify their instructor immediately. Special services are provided through the Academic Support Program.

IX. ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

As a Christian community of scholarship, we at Lee University (and at SBA) are committed to the principles of truth and honesty in the academic endeavor. As faculty and students in this Christian community, we are called to present our academic work as an honest reflection of our abilities; we do not need to defraud members of the community by presenting others' work as our own. Therefore, academic dishonesty is handled with serious consequences for two fundamental reasons: it is stealing – taking something that is not ours; it is also lying – pretending to be something it is not. In a Christian community, such pretense is not only unnecessary, it is also harmful to the individual and community as a whole. Cheating should have no place at a campus where Christ is King because God desires us to be truthful with each other concerning our academic abilities. Only with a truthful presentation of our knowledge can there be an honest evaluation of our abilities. To such integrity, we as a Christian academic community are called.

> **Be sure to review SBA's definitions of and consequences for plagiarism in any of its forms: non-attribution, patchwriting, and stealing.

X. WEBSITE, EMAIL ACCOUNT, CANVAS, AND MOODLE ACCESS

The SBA Writing Center website has many resources for you. It also tells you how you can set up an appt. for feedback at any point in the writing process. You all have *silverdaleba gmail* accounts. I ask that you always use those when emailing me so your email is not blocked by the network. You also have a *Lee University email* account, which you should check regularly as any financial information regarding your Lee account comes through this account. Also, you should utilize the resources that are available to you through Lee University (ie. library databases, etc.). Make sure you know your Lee University ID information for logging into Moodle. You are responsible to contact their IT with any issues.

X. READING LIST

Aaron, Jane E., ed. *The Little, Brown Compact Handbook*. 4th ed. New York: Harper Collins, 2002.

Berthoff, Ann, et al. "Spiritual Sites of Composing." *College Composition and Communication* 45 (May 1994): 237-263.

Black, Laurel Johnson. *Between Talk and Teaching: Reconsidering the Writing Conference*. Logan, UT: Utah State UP, 1998.

Brandt, Deborah, et al. "The Politics of the Personal: Storying our Lives against the Grain." *College English* 64 (September 2001): 41-62.

Butler, Eugenia, et al. *Correct Writing*. Lexington, MA: Heath, 1995.

Campbell, Martha E. *From Paragraph to Essay*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1996.

Corbett, Edward P.J., Nancy Myers and Gary Tate, eds. *The Writing Teacher's Sourcebook.* New York: Oxford, 2000.

Despain, LaRene. *Writing: A Workshop Approach.* Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Co., 1992.

Elbow, Peter and Pat Belanoff. *Being a Writer: A Community of Writers Revisited.* Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2003.

Foehr, Regina Paxton and Susan A. Schiller, eds. *The Spiritual Side of Writing: Releasing the Learner's Whole Potential.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 1997.

Gibaldi, Joseph. *MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers*. 5th ed. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1999.

Graves, Richard L. *Writing, Teaching, Learning: A Sourcebook.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 1999.

Hacker, Diana. *Rules for Writers*. 4th ed. Boston, MA: Bedford Books, 2002.

---. *A Writer's Reference*. 4th ed. Boston, MA: Bedford Books, 2002.

Harnack, Andrew. *Online! A Reference Guide to Using Internet Sources.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 2001.

Hartwell, Patrick. "Grammar, Grammars, and the Teaching of Grammar." *College English* 47 (February 1985): 105-127.

Heffernan, James A.W., and John E. Lincoln. *Writing: A Concise Handbook*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1997.

Hjortshoj, Keith. *The Transition to College Writing.* Boston: Bedford/St. Martins, 2001.

Indrisano, Roselmina and James R. Squire, eds. *Perspectives on Writing: Research, Theory, and Practice.* Newark: International Reading Association, 2000.

Levin, Gerald. *Writing and Logic*. Atlanta: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1982.

Lunsford, Andrea, and Robert Connors. *Easy Writer: A Pocket Guide*. New York: St. Martin's, 1997.

Murray, Donald. *Expecting the Unexpected*. Portsmouth, NJ: Boynton/Cook Publishers, 1989.

---. *Write to Learn.* 7th edition. Fort Worth: Harcourt, 2002.

Richardson, Peter. *Style: A Pragmatic Approach*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 2001.

Silverman, Jay, Elaine Hughes and Diana Roberts Wiebroer. *Rules of Thumb: A Guide for Writers*. 4th ed. St. Louis: McGraw-Hill, 1999.

Skwire, David. *Writing with a Thesis: A Rhetoric and Reader*. 7th ed. Rev. by Sarah Harrison. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1999.

Spellmeyer, Kurt. "After Theory: From Textuality to Attunement with the World." *College English* 58 (December 1996): 893-913.

Tate, Gary, Amy Rupiper and Kurt Schick. *A Guide to Composition Pedagogies.* New York: Oxford, 2001.

Villanueva, Victor, ed. *Cross-Talk in Comp Theory: A Reader.* Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1997.

Wiley, Mark, Barbara Gleason and Louise Wetherbee Phelps, eds. *Composition*

in Four Keys: Inquiring into the Field. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield, 1996.

APPENDIX B

PARTICIPANT SURVEY

Instructions: Please answer the following questions honestly as best you can. Each question asks that you <u>mark one answer</u> as appropriate response. If you feel an explanation is needed, please use the space provided at the end to write your explanation. Information from this survey will be reviewed only by the researcher and her research advisory committee at Old Dominion University and no identifying material (ie. your email address or name) will collected. The questions in this survey are designed to help identify and better understand how Dual Enrollment students perceive their identities.

1. I desire to know more about the world.

    Always   *Very Often*   *Sometimes*   *Rarely*   *Never*

2. I have a willingness to examine my own perspectives on issues.

    Always   *Very Often*   *Sometimes*   *Rarely*   *Never*

3. I have a willingness to seek connections with others who differ in thought.

    Always   *Very Often*   *Sometimes*   *Rarely*   *Never*

4. I seek new meanings and connections through my learning.

    Always   *Very Often*   *Sometimes*   *Rarely*   *Never*

5. I act upon new knowledge I've discovered.

    Always   *Very Often*   *Sometimes*   *Rarely*   *Never*

6. I use methods that are new to me for generating writing ideas.

    Always   *Very Often*   *Sometimes*   *Rarely*   *Never*

7. I take risks when investigating ideas by exploring questions, topics, and ideas that are new to me.

    Always   *Very Often*   *Sometimes*   *Rarely*   *Never*

8. I can represent what I have learned in a variety of ways.

    Always   *Very Often*   *Sometimes*   *Rarely*   *Never*

9. I commit to exploring a demanding writing topic.

    Always   *Very Often*   *Sometimes*   *Rarely*   *Never*

10. I can grapple with challenging texts.

Always   *Very Often*   *Sometimes*   *Rarely*   *Never*

11. I follow through to complete short-term projects.

Always   *Very Often*   *Sometimes*   *Rarely*   *Never*

12. I follow through to complete long-term projects.

Always   *Very Often*   *Sometimes*   *Rarely*   *Never*

13. I take ownership of my role in learning.

Always   *Very Often*   *Sometimes*   *Rarely*   *Never*

14. I understand the consequences of my actions for myself.

Always   *Very Often*   *Sometimes*   *Rarely*   *Never*

15. I understand the consequences of my actions for others.

Always   *Very Often*   *Sometimes*   *Rarely*   *Never*

16. I can adapt to any learning situation.

Always   *Very Often*   *Sometimes*   *Rarely*   *Never*

17. I can adapt to any teacher's expectations.

Always   *Very Often*   *Sometimes*   *Rarely*   *Never*

18. I can adapt to the demands of any given course.

Always   *Very Often*   *Sometimes*   *Rarely*   *Never*

19. I reflect upon my own thinking about issues.

Always   *Very Often*   *Sometimes*   *Rarely*   *Never*

20. I reflect upon my writing done for a class.

Always   *Very Often*   *Sometimes*   *Rarely*   *Never*

21. I reflect upon audience expectations in order to determine my writing choices.

Always   *Very Often*   *Sometimes*   *Rarely*   *Never*

22. I listen to my peer's ideas of and responses to my writing.

Always   *Very Often*   *Sometimes*   *Rarely*   *Never*

23. I listen to my instructor's ideas of and responses to my writing.

Always   *Very Often*   *Sometimes*   *Rarely*   *Never*

24. I spend as much time as needed to find good information when gathering sources.

   Always   *Very Often*   *Sometimes*   *Rarely*   *Never*

25. I seek new meanings and connections through my writing process.

   Always   *Very Often*   *Sometimes*   *Rarely*   *Never*

26. I reflect upon my writing done outside of a course assignment.

   Always   *Very Often*   *Sometimes*   *Rarely*   *Never*

27. I apply what I learned from one writing project to improve my writing on the next project.

   Always   *Very Often*   *Sometimes*   *Rarely*   *Never*

APPENDIX C

FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS

**This focus group is entirely voluntary and all identifying information we receive will be kept confidential. We ask that you as a participant also keep identifying information and related comments confidential.

1. What prompted your decision to take DE English this year instead of English 12?

2. How would you describe yourself as a student?

    1. Follow-up: As a writer specifically?

3. Can you describe your writing process from the time an essay is assigned until the due date?

    a. Does your writing process change for writing assignments outside of English?

4. (If not discussed in #3) How do you come up with paper topics when given the freedom of topic selection?

5. How do you typically respond to feedback on your papers (ie. from peers in peer review or from your teachers)?

6. How do you approach a reflective assignment (ie. the personal mission statement assignment completed at the beginning of the semester)?

7. How do you feel about group work? (ask for follow up explanation for response)

8. As a writer, how would you rank yourself: 10 = "I'm an expert!" / 1 = "I a beginner with lots to learn." (ask for follow up explanation for choice).

9. Any pertinent follow up questions

APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. How would you rate your involvement in class this semester as reader? As writer? As community member (ie. participating in class discussions, groupwork, etc.)? As thinker?

    a. Is your engagement in this class different than your regular high school classes?

2. At the beginning of the semester, you described yourself as _____ . How would you describe yourself now as a student?

    a. Follow-up: As a writer specifically?

    b. Would you describe yourself differently in this class than in others?

3. At the beginning of the semester, you described your writing process as _____. Has it changed at all over the semester?

    a. for writing assignments outside of English / non-DE courses?

4. Have you chosen to write about topics outside of your comfort zone?

    a. If so, what topics? Why did you chose them?

    b. If not, why do you think you stuck to what is comfortable?

5. At the beginning of the semester, you said you typically respond to feedback (ie. from peers in peer review or from your teachers) on your papers as _____. Has that changed at all this semester?

6. You said you approached the initial reflective assignment (ie. the personal mission statement assignment completed at the beginning of the semester) in _____ way. Has your approach to the reflective essay here at the end of the semester been different?

    a. How did you approach the writer's memos throughout the semester?

7. At the beginning of the semester, you felt that groupwork was _____. Has that changed at all? Why or why not?

8. You have read a lot of texts from different perspectives, both from published authors and your classmates. What are some of your major takeaways from these readings this semester?

    a. Did any one text stand out above the rest? Why or why not?

9. At the beginning of the semester, you claimed you were a/an ____ writer (from scale 1-10). Do you still see yourself as that writer? Why / why not?

10. Any pertinent follow up questions.

APPENDIX E

WRITING SAMPLE: REFLECTIVE ESSAY ASSIGNMENT GUIDE

ENGL 106
Fall 2020
Formal Assignment: Portfolio Reflection Essay

<u>Audience</u>: An Academic Panel
<u>Length</u>: 600-800 words
<u>Format</u>: MLA (see Purdue Owl for specifics)

Portfolio Reflection Essay

Description: In the end your education is about you: the papers you write, the topics you research, the thoughts you express. Part of learning to write is learning to think about the process of writing and the effort, or craft, of your compositions. This essay is an opportunity to reflect upon the work you've done throughout the year. It is your chance to think through and state what you've learned; consider what you have done well and where you can improve. The essay should demonstrate and reflect upon the work of revision and writing as a process. Your portfolio is a place to record/document the most important concepts you have learned about writing and about yourself as a writer during this class.

Requirements: Be sure to include *specific examples* of your improvement over the semester. For example, do not just say, "I have improved my grammar." Instead, give specific examples: "I now know that every pronoun must agree in number with its antecedent. For example, *everyone* is singular and should not be followed with *their*."

>   **You should address your intellectual engagement (see PDF in Moodle near the top of the class materials).

Your Self-Reflective Essay should address the following areas:

- **An overview of your writing improvements. What skills have you developed in the areas of reading, research, and writing?**
    - **Some things to consider:** A description of your writing habits and processes. How do your habits differ from when you started this course? Discuss the choices you made in revising your work. Consider addressing the peer-review process as part of this section. What effort did you put into drafting, editing, and revising your papers? What was helpful in this process? What was missing that could have helped? How does the writing in your portfolio compare with writing you did in the past? What do you know now that you didn't know before about audience, claims, evidence, research, argumentation, rhetorical appeals, MLA formatting, etc.? What can you do that you couldn't do before? What do you feel is still a writing weakness for you?

- **Challenges: What was new and/or challenging, and how did the challenges push you to develop writing strategies?**
    - How have your study/writing habits changed? How has essay writing and research changed in your mind and efforts? What made a difference for you? What was helpful? What would you change?
    - What were the difficulties in being both a high school and a college student simultaneously? Were you able to overcome some of those and how?

- **What application do you see this class having to your life beyond this semester/year?**

Submission: You have two options for submission: printed (in a folder with all documents) or electronically (single document with essay first and all supporting documents after)**.** You need to have the reflection essay first and then all of your evidence (supporting writing assignments). The pieces of writing (both drafts and final copies) you include in your portfolio are the evidence to support the accomplishment claims you make in your reflection essay.

Assignment Expectations/Requirements:

For this assignment, you must:
- Support your claims. Be sufficiently detailed and utilize rhetorical modes, appeals, and devices as necessary for support.
- Include a meaningful title.
- Follow MLA guidelines for formatting, in-text citations, and Works Cited page.
- Stick to the length requirements. Don't resort to fluffy fillers. Strive to be concise and precise.
- Don't forget to open your introduction with an attention-grabbing hook
- To build your ethos, "prepare the context" for any quotations or paraphrasing you use
- Present a clear thesis.
- Avoid hasty generalizations and other writing fallacies (see handout).

Evaluation Criteria:

Value: 10%

I will consider (not limited to) the following when grading your essay:
-grammar and mechanics
-MLA format (formatting, in-text citation, Works Cited)
-audience awareness (answers "So What?")
-focus and organization of content (includes transitions)
-tone & style (are they appropriate and consistent?)
-appropriateness of content for overall purpose
-how many concepts you discuss within your essay (ie. Synthesis, mixed modes, etc.)

Due Date: Dec. 9 by 3:30pm (can be digital or hard copy)

APPENDIX F

INTELLECTUAL ENGAGEMENT CONTRACT

What is Intellectual Engagement?

To succeed in this course, it is important that you persistently commit to your growth as a reader, writer, thinker, and community member, both within and outside of our classroom; this commitment to growth is called your intellectual engagement. Intellectually engaged students are those who demonstrate the following attributes and meet the following expectations:

As readers, they . . .

- Thoroughly, thoughtfully read all the assigned texts, and
- Take notes while completing assigned readings, recording unfamiliar concepts, insightful thoughts, and/or questions they would like to bring up during class.

As writers, they . . .

- Welcome feedback from their instructor and peers,
- Substantially revise their work during each major assignment,
- Diligently complete all in-class and out-of-class writing assignments that accompany and/or bolster the major assignments of the course, and
- Reflect authentically on their work throughout the semester.

As thinkers, they . . .

- Engage in rhetorical reading, seeking not only to understand the texts assigned, but to analyze and synthesize the ideas therein,
- Approach each class meeting with a desire to share their own insights and questions,
- Take diligent notes during class lectures and discussions, always ready to learn from their instructor and peers, and
- Push themselves to consider new ideas, take on challenging topics, and ask for help along the way.

As community members, they . . .

- Attend class regularly
- Take responsibility for the success and productivity of each class session, understanding that they are an integral part of the overall learning environment and must enthusiastically participate in conversation by listening, engaging, and sometimes challenging the ideas being discussed,
- Seek to work with and grow alongside their peers during class discussions, structured writing review sessions, and all digital and face-to-face engagements during and outside of class,
- Refrain from any activities that might distract themselves or their peers during class meetings, and

- Adopt dispositions of open-mindedness, respect, and generosity during all interactions with their instructor and peers.

Recognizing that I am called to be the best student I can be for Christ, I _____ commit to be an intellectually engaged student in ENGL 106 (fall) and ENGL 110 (spring) according to the above actions with the understanding that my learning from these courses is dependent upon my assumption of these responsibilities.

_____   _____
Student Signature   Date

VITA
Sarah Crystal Johnson
Old Dominion University
5000 Batten Arts & Letters
Norfolk, VA 23529
sjohn021@odu.edu

Education

Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA. Doctor of Philosophy. English major
field area. Concentration field areas in Rhetoric/Composition and Pedagogy.

University of Tennessee, Chattanooga, TN. Master of Arts, English major field area.
Concentration field area in Rhetoric and Composition. May 2013.

Lee University, Cleveland, TN. Post-Baccalaureate Teacher Certification, Secondary English
Education (7-12). August 2011.

Tennessee Temple University, Chattanooga, TN. Bachelor of Arts. English Education major
field area. December 2009.

Professional Experience

Silverdale Baptist Academy, Chattanooga, TN
Writing Center Director/Writing across the Curriculum Coordinator (2017 –
present), **Department Head** (2011 – 2018) **Instructor** (2011 – present)

Lee University, Cleveland, TN
Adjunct Instructor of English (2016 – present)

Chattanooga State Community College, Chattanooga, TN
Adjunct Instructor of English (2013 – 2016)

Selected Publications & Presentations

"An Ideological Criticism of the Rhetorically-Constructed Identity of a Religious Learner."
Presented at the University of Tennessee Rhetoric and Religion in the 21st Century Conference,
Knoxville, TN. (2018, October 6).

"A Move towards Empathy: Identity-Focused Reflection in the Rhet/Comp Classroom."
Presented at the South Atlantic Modern Language Association "High Art/Low Art: Borders and
Boundaries in Popular Culture" Conference, Atlanta, GA. (2017, November 3).

"Towards Transfer: Identity (de)Construction in Writing Programs." Presented at Virginia
Commonwealth University Regional Conference on College Composition and Communication,
Richmond, VA. (2017, June 2).