

Fall 12-2022

ESL to Composition Transitions: Investigating the Differences in Disciplinary Values Among Two-Year College Faculty

Amy M. Flessert
Old Dominion University, fles0034@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/english_etds



Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Rhetoric and Composition Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Flessert, Amy M.. "ESL to Composition Transitions: Investigating the Differences in Disciplinary Values Among Two-Year College Faculty" (2022). Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), Dissertation, English, Old Dominion University, DOI: 10.25777/x5hr-jn77
https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/english_etds/148

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the English at ODU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in English Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ODU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@odu.edu.

**ESL TO COMPOSITION TRANSITIONS: INVESTIGATING THE DIFFERENCES IN
DISCIPLINARY VALUES AMONG TWO-YEAR COLLEGE FACULTY**

by

Amy M. Flessert
B.A. May 2008, University of Minnesota
M.A. August 2014, Marymount University

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
December 2022

Approved by:

Kevin E. DePew (Director)

Michelle Fowler-Amato (Member)

Abha Gupta (Member)

Gail Shuck (Member)

ABSTRACT

ESL TO COMPOSITION TRANSITIONS: INVESTIGATING THE DIFFERENCES IN DISCIPLINARY VALUES AMONG TWO-YEAR COLLEGE FACULTY

Amy M. Flessert
Old Dominion University, 2022
Director: Dr. Kevin E. DePew

In this qualitative methods study, I draw on Paul Kei Matsuda's 1999 article "Composition Studies and ESL Writing: A Disciplinary Division of Labor" to examine if, more than 20 years after its publication, there is still a significant disciplinary division between ESL writing and first-year college composition. I surveyed writing instructors from both ESL and ENG at Mid-Atlantic Community College (MACC) regarding what they value as "good" writing. I also worked with three faculty members – one in ENG, one in ESL, and a third who teaches in both departments, serving, in this study and the department, as a "bridge" between these disciplines. I implemented a case study approach that included methods such as observations and interviews as well as artifact collection to attempt to better understand the values that the three studied instructors hold for "good" writing.

After data collection, I drew upon Glaser and Strauss' constant comparative method, as well as Saldaña's coding methods for qualitative researchers to analyze the data. I identified core "concepts" that represent key themes in how faculty view good student writing. Then, I compared these values across three data chapters, locating areas of connection and disconnect between the concepts in the two departments as well as discussing how faculty fit in with current scholarly conversations in their fields of study.

This study then highlights the ways in which the disciplinary division still exists between these two departments at MACC. The major findings are that significant disconnections exist

between how ESL and ENG faculty approach accuracy/correctness, evidence use, and originality/self-expression, though other meaningful comparisons as well as connections are noted. Based on these findings, I conclude by making recommendations for ways that faculty in these two departments can potentially build bridges between how they present and teach these concepts so multilingual writers can ease their transition between these courses.

This study contributes to conversations in both writing studies and ESL/L2 writing regarding multilingual writers and their transition to college writing courses. It highlights the ways in which writing values have been articulated by both fields but not connected through a shared vocabulary or understanding of “good” writing, something that might benefit both faculty and students in these courses.

Copyright, 2022, by Amy M. Flessert, All Rights Reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank those faculty who responded to my initial survey and took the time to provide meaningful feedback on that work. I am even more grateful and indebted to Shu, Megan, and Lee, who were generous with their time, were open and willing, and have encouraged me throughout this process. I could not have done this without you, and you have been so inspirational to my own teaching and thinking.

My committee members, Michelle Fowler-Amato, Abha Gupta, and Gail Shuck – thank you for your feedback along this journey. Your kind words made this project more manageable, particularly your encouragement to keep writing while parenting in the middle of a pandemic. And to my committee chair, Kevin E. DePew – thank you for stepping in and helping me throughout this process. Your feedback was invaluable and helped me to shape this project into what it has become. Any time I felt lost you helped me see my way through the dark. I'm so grateful.

I am also thankful to my many wonderful colleagues who have encouraged me with this project along the way. I am particularly grateful for Cheri Spiegel who suggested that I undertake this journey and recommended me to the program, Jen Daniels who went above and beyond when I needed her assistance, Jay Steere who has listened to my concerns and complaints along the way, Cathy Gaiser who has always been a listening ear and good friend, and Karen Kusterer who has regularly checked in and encouraged me throughout this process.

I never would have considered undertaking this degree without the support and encouragement from my Marymount English community. In particular, Bess Fox and Tonya

Howe believed in my ability to continue my education and gave me the tools to do so. For that, I am so grateful.

I am also thankful to have met so many wonderful colleagues in the ODU English department. Working at a distance has been a challenge at times, but the bonds we've built will surely endure. Thank you to those I've relied on for moral support and advice, particularly Sarah Johnson, Nicole Hancock, and Cassie Book.

And, to my family. Thanks to my parents for instilling in me the value of hard work. To Cindy for supporting me in uncountable ways during my master's program. To Theo and Baxter, who have been my constant writing buddies since day one of this program. To my husband, Stew, who has been in my corner and encouraged me to never give up, even when things seemed insurmountable. Thanks for always taking my side. And finally, to my children, Jane and Charles – you have inspired me to be the best mom and human I can be. I studied for comps with Jane, and I started data analysis with Charlie. You both snoozed away in my lap as I worked through this program. You both gave me the strength to keep going. My love to you all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
LIST OF TABLES		ix
LIST OF FIGURES		x
Chapter		
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	PERSONAL AND INSTITUTIONAL BACKGROUND.....	4
	PURPOSE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY	11
	BACKGROUND AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	13
	RESEARCH OBJECTIVE AND QUESTIONS	27
	OVERVIEW OF THE DISSERTATION.....	28
II.	METHODOLOGY	30
	CONTEXT OF THE STUDY.....	33
	RESEARCHER POSITIONALITY	42
	IRB PROCESS.....	46
	PHASES OF RESEARCH OVERVIEW	47
	DATA ANALYSIS.....	61
	VALIDITY	68
	TRUSTWORTHINESS	69
	CONCLUSION.....	70
III.	ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE VALUES – “BUT YOU KNOW, TO BE REALLY HONEST, THE NITTY GRITTY FOR ESL IS IN THE GRAMMAR.”	71
	OVERVIEW OF VALUES	73
	VALUE: ACCURACY/CORRECTNESS	76
	VALUE: CLARITY.....	81
	VALUE: ORGANIZATION	86
	VALUES: EVIDENCE USE AND ORIGINALITY/SELF-EXPRESSION	95
	VALUE: AUDIENCE/PURPOSE.....	100
	ESL PRACTICE AND THE INTERPLAY OF THEORY	107
IV.	ENG VALUES – “I FOCUS A LOT ON THE PROCESS SO THAT, YOU KNOW, THEY RECOGNIZE THAT [WRITING] IS A WORK IN PROGRESS.”.....	110
	OVERVIEW OF VALUES	111
	VALUE: ACCURACY/CORRECTNESS	113
	VALUE: CLARITY.....	118
	VALUE: ORGANIZATION	123
	VALUE: EVIDENCE USE	129

Chapter	Page
VALUE: ORIGINALITY/SELF-EXPRESSION	135
VALUE: AUDIENCE/PURPOSE.....	141
ENG PRACTICE AND THE INTERPLAY OF THEORY	148
V. BRIDGE VALUES: “A LOT OF THE UNDERGRADUATE WORK IS ... IMITATION. A LOT OF LEARNING HOW TO TALK THE TALK OF THE ACADEMY.”	152
OVERVIEW OF VALUES	153
VALUE: ACCURACY/CORRECTNESS	155
VALUE: CLARITY.....	159
VALUE: ORGANIZATION	165
VALUE: EVIDENCE USE	170
VALUE: ORIGINALITY/SELF-EXPRESSION.....	175
VALUE: AUDIENCE/PURPOSE.....	178
BRIDGE PRACTICE AND THE INTERPLAY OF THEORY	183
VI. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS	187
KEY FINDINGS.....	189
IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	204
AREAS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	211
FINAL THOUGHT	213
WORKS CITED	215
APPENDICES	
A. SURVEY TO ESL AND COMPOSITION FACULTY.....	247
B. FIRST OBSERVATION INTERVIEW	248
C. SECOND OBSERVATION INTERVIEW	249
D. SHU WORD CLOUD.....	250
E. MEGAN WORD CLOUD.....	251
F. LEE WORD CLOUD	252
VITA	253

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Phases of Data Collection	32
2. Race and Ethnicity Distribution, Fall 2020.....	33
3. Example of Select Codes	63
4. Final Categories (“Concepts”)	65

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. ESL 51 – Composition III Course Outcomes	36
2. ENG 111 – College Composition I Course Outcomes	39

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Min is an international student at a large suburban community college in the mid-Atlantic region. She has been in the United States for two years, navigating an unfamiliar city on her own, taking courses instructed in English, her third language after Mandarin and Wu, two Chinese language varieties. Her goal is to earn a bachelor's degree in business administration and then return to China. However, after two years of study, she is not close to completing her associate degree. Her first year of study was solely dedicated to language study in the college ESL program. During her second year, she was able to take a few additional classes in math and science and a visual arts class, but her primary focus was still on college ESL. Min had a good experience in her ESL courses. She made friends with whom she continues to study, dine, and travel. She believes she gained a much stronger understanding of English grammar and the expectations for a variety of expository writing assignments in her ESL coursework.

In her third year of study, Min finally enrolled in college English. She co-enrolled in a section of College Composition 1, a requirement for her degree, with a developmental section called English Fundamentals. She was initially frustrated that she had to complete an additional developmental English class, but she saw the value in the extra time with her classmates and instructor. However, she was surprised to find that only about half the class was comprised of students from her ESL courses; the other half were native speakers of English. She sometimes found the conversation in class difficult to follow because the reading assigned in the course, including a recent article on racial justice protests, were topics she had only recently encountered. Although she read the assigned articles, she felt she did not know as much about the topic as some of her classmates who had personal experiences or appeared to have more

knowledge of the background issues and history of the movement. Therefore, Min felt self-conscious about speaking up and sharing her ideas in front of her classmates.

Min was also surprised by the feedback that she received on her essays and homework assignments. Her teacher, Pat, did mark some usage errors though Min was sure there were many more in her work, a concern given that the class essay rubrics graded her on her language use. Min also tried to understand source use. In her ESL courses, she wrote compositions with only her personal knowledge. Using and citing outside sources was a new concept to her and she worked hard to learn, in a very short time, how to find, read, summarize, and cite sources.

Min's teacher, Pat, believes that she is an extremely hard working and competent student. She was surprised that Min did not speak very frequently in class because she knows from Min's writing that she has strong ideas including new and personal insights that she could share. Pat knows that some of the articles she assigns include topics that are new to her students, such as the readings on racial justice protests, but she believes that college is a place to expand minds and she pushes the students to learn all they can about current events and investigate topics that matter to them. She does this by requiring outside source use for all the essays she assigns. Pat frequently praised Min for her ability to organize an expository essay, though she was concerned that Min tried to turn complex topics into five-paragraph essays, even if the organizational structure did not fit the assigned genre. She also acknowledged that she only marked some usage errors in Min's work. Although her course does cover a few English grammar concepts, Pat often recommends that students like Min visit the Language Center, where they can get specialized help for their "language troubles" and to improve their clarity.

Min ultimately worked hard and did well in the class, moving onto second semester composition. She is proud of her accomplishment but surprised by some differences between the

content in the college composition course and her ESL writing courses. She always thought writing was just writing! As she moves into her next composition course, she has a stronger sense that she now understands what she is “supposed to do.”

Min and Pat are composite characters. However, Min represents countless conversations I have had with student writers in my writing courses over my eight years teaching at a community college. Pat is reflective of conversations and survey data for this study that asked our faculty to speak about their experiences working with multilingual writers (MLW)¹. What Pat and Min’s experiences point to are the needs, desires, and hopes of our students and faculty - the need for help, the need to understand each other, the desire to belong, the desire to do well, the hope that we are giving or getting the right tools. I truly believe that all faculty are doing their best to transmit the knowledge and values of their field to their students. We *all* want students to succeed. We want them to both understand what “good” writing looks like and show us their “best” writing. We also believe that writing is fundamentally important and a crucial lifelong skill. While we may acknowledge that the “best” writing for one student may look different from that of another, we still expect a certain set of core values to underlie that work. These core values are what is at the heart of this project. Here is where my project begins: what expectations and ideas about writing does Min have when she enters college composition, and what expectations and ideas does Pat have about Min’s knowledge? Can and should we reconcile

¹ I will be using the term multilingual writers (MLW) to capture students often referred to alternately as ESL, ELL, L2, EL, Generation 1.5, and other variations on these terms. This decision is based on the Statement on Second Language Writing and Multilingual Writers set by the CCCC organization, a leader in standards for the field of higher ed. writing. This organization posits that “multilingual writers” is the preferred term because it better represents the complex literacies encompassed by this diverse group of students. For this reason, I too have chosen to use this term. The term ESL will represent the name of the department and the language courses. ESL/L2 writing represents the fields of study upon which much ESL instruction draws from.

differences if they exist, or are ESL writing and composition courses different from each other for necessary reasons? While all these questions are important and Min is central to this project in so many ways, this dissertation focuses on faculty, including the theory and pedagogy that informs teaching practice.

It was these questions that led to the qualitative study that informs this dissertation. It explores ESL and composition faculty perceptions of what makes writing “good.” It attempts to explore whether a disciplinary division of labor, defined as “the division of writing scholarship into first- and second-language components” (Matsuda “Composition” 701), exists between what we teach and value as instructors of ESL and composition at MACC. Finally, it will consider what, if any, bridges can or should be built between these departments to help faculty like Pat and students like Min find greater success in teaching and learning.

Personal and Institutional Background

My interest in examining if a disciplinary division of labor exists between ESL and college composition is part of my own scholarly and pedagogical journey over the last decade. In Fall 2014, I was hired as an English instructor at Mid Atlantic Community College (MACC)² in part because of my experience working with MLWs. This included two years teaching English as a foreign language to elementary-age students while living in South Korea, followed by two years teaching ESL to adult MLW students at a small college in Arlington, VA. These college students were seeking to improve their academic and conversational English skills in order to be successful in the degree programs offered by this college. These students came from dozens of countries and linguistic backgrounds. This situation is no different at MACC, a much larger educational institution in which over 150 countries are represented in the profile of international

² MACC, along with any MACC faculty names, are pseudonyms.

students and with approximately 66 percent of all students on campus being non-white (“OIR Factbook”). Because I had several years of experience working with MLW students in academic contexts, I was hired to teach composition, particularly composition classes considered paired with “developmental” sections, in which half or more of the students come from ESL sequences. These paired classes are meant to serve as a bridge between ESL courses and college composition; a sort of final developmental stage before these students are considered “ready” to take part in American academic discourse.

The idea of ESL courses and the initial sequence of English composition as “developmental” or “remedial” has a long history. As Mike Rose points out, through much of the 20th century, writing was seen as a skill, something from which error could be diagnosed. By devising drills and exercise to “fix” these errors, students could be sorted into groups considered fixable or not. Those who were not fixable were removed from the academic community (“The Language” 352). Through this lens, ESL courses and developmental English become an intensely important academic experience for MLW students, acting as an entryway or an exit for the rest of their academic careers. At MACC, success in college composition must be achieved if the students plan to obtain a degree, as nearly every degree or certificate offered requires a completed two-part college composition sequence. Therefore, for students who begin their academic journey in ESL courses, the writing curriculum and experiences set the stage for their later success in college composition. If ESL and composition courses are divided, success in developmental composition or “regular” composition have major implications for MLWs.

In examining whether this curricular divide exists at MACC, it is first important to look at how the ESL department functions and how it feeds students into composition courses. Many MLW students take the Accuplacer test to place into the appropriate ESL course. Accuplacer is a

very common placement test used in many high schools and colleges. Most of the multiple-choice questions seek to have students identify various linguistic features of a text or comprehend a passage. For example, there are questions related to grammar usage (Which preposition is correct? Which tense is appropriate?); word choice and vocabulary (Which other word means “punctual”? Would you use “much bigger” or “largest” here?); idioms (What is the meaning of “top price”?); and sentence combining. There are also reading comprehension passages asking students to show basic understanding or infer an implied meaning in a passage. After completing this exam, students test into a particular course level. The levels begin at 2x (low-intermediate English) and go up to 5x (college prep English). Courses designated with a 1 are writing and a 2 are reading; so, 51 is a writing course and 52 a reading course.

According to Diana³, a longtime faculty member in the ESL department, if the multiple-choice score on the Accuplacer puts the student over a score of 300, they are asked to provide a written essay, evaluated by one ESL faculty member, for placement into level 4x or 5x. Once the student is placed based upon the test, a first day diagnostic, which is a multiple-choice test on reading comprehension, main idea identification, and inference, and includes a written portion on summary writing, attempts to confirm the placement. The gateway courses to credit English are ESL 51 and 52. The writing course outcomes emphasize writing a thesis statement, outlining, writing, and revising, including outside supporting materials, and an ability to document sources. The reading course expects students to recognize main ideas in a reading, relate new information to prior knowledge, respond effectively to written texts, develop vocabulary, and locate information that was previously read.

³ Diana (a pseudonym) was not part of the larger case study for this dissertation. She provided needed background information on the ESL department and was knowledgeable on this topic due to her long standing in college ESL in various teaching and administrative roles.

Diana noted that the focus of these courses is often heavily geared toward language use, sentence structure, and academic English. She defines academic English as “language fluency,” noting that the upper-level ESL courses are attempting to prepare students for the academic English they will encounter in college courses: “Not having the language skills [necessary] will prevent them from achieving certain milestones.” She states that these courses teach the five-paragraph essay, a structure that students quickly learn and become successful with, but that sentence structure continues to be where students struggle in their ESL courses. Her belief is that the focus should be at the paragraph level, including language, clarity, grammar, and vocabulary. She reiterated that in these upper-level courses, “language trumps content,” because this is what composition faculty have been telling ESL faculty to make the focus of the 5x courses.

Diana said students are considered “ready” for college composition when they have passed both ESL 51 and 52. Students are required to pass an exit exam for them to move out of ESL coursework. For this exam, students write a five-paragraph essay that is read by two faculty members who did not teach the student in their own writing course. The faculty must agree whether the essay is a pass or fail, and if they do not agree, a third reader makes the final decision. The essay is based on a current event topic (for example, a recent exam asked students to write about gun violence and school shootings). There is no reading involved in the essay, with the assumption that if something has been in the news and people are talking about it, the student ideally knows enough to write about that topic. Here, the general principle is that language trumps content. Even if the content of the essay is not particularly strong, if the student demonstrates the linguistic competency seen as sufficient by the two readers, the student passes.

Most former ESL-course-taking students enter an ENG 111/ENF 3 course, which is College Composition 1 with Developmental English, a five-credit course that completes the first

semester of composition (three credits) with additional non-credit developmental hours (two credits). This course is taken by a mix of both MLWs and students with other developmental writing indices, such as a placement test score below the cutoff, a high school GPA below 3.0, an SAT score of 470 or below, or an ACT score of 17 or below. These are containment courses with only other writers designated as developmental in the courses. However, some MLWs are moved directly from ESL into three-credit College Composition. Diana mentioned that if the faculty scoring exit exams see a student who does particularly well on the exam, they can recommend the student bypass the five-credit course in favor of “regular” ENG 111, though this is rare. MLWs who are recommended for “regular” ENG 111 learn with mostly native speaking English students who are placed there through placement tests, high school GPA, or standardized test scores. Ultimately, placement in credit or developmental English comes down to ESL faculty decision.

Internal studies show that ESL-taking students who went onto complete college composition at MACC passed ENG 111 at a higher rate than those who had taken no ESL classes. According to 2015 internal statistics, 74 percent of non-ESL-course taking students passed ENG 111 with an A/B/C/D grade, while 96 percent of ESL-course taking students passed with those grades. However, these statistics account only for students who take ENG 111 within two years of completing ESL courses, which at MACC is only 51 percent of the total ESL-course taking population. This means 49 percent of all ESL-course taking students do not take ENG 111 within two years. It isn’t clear when or if these students attempt ENG 111, or if they withdraw or disappear altogether. According to Diana, what happens to these students is hard to discern, but losing nearly half of our MLWs before they get a degree is certainly something worth further investigation.

Because the connection between the ESL and composition course sequence is so closely tied together – that success in ESL 51 and 52 is *required* before students begin college composition, it seems clear that a disciplinary division could represent a challenge for the students and faculty – or, better yet, an opportunity for growth and connection. Right now, the connection between the departments is not seen by most faculty as strong. In a survey of 38 faculty members in the ESL and ENG departments at MACC, completed for this study between January-May 2020, the majority of faculty either believed that the relationship between the two departments was “good, but insufficient,” or simply said it was not close enough. For example, one faculty member in the ENG department said that “[w]e like each other, but we never really meet. ... There is very little exchange of good ideas...” Another ENG faculty member said we should share “new research on ESL teaching” and an ESL faculty member said that we needed “[m]ore collaborative efforts” to strengthen the relationship. While some faculty members mentioned past opportunities for collaboration, including times when there were joint workshops to “discuss and understand the transition from ESL to English 111,” a number of faculty mentioned difficulties in attending such collaborative work, such as “it is difficult to find the time” to meet. More disheartening were the number of adjunct faculty members who mentioned that they had no connection with faculty in the other department: “As an adjunct, I don’t have much contact and interaction with the ESL department for sharing ideas,” “...as an adjunct I know a limited number of English professors and really none of the ESL teachers,” “I teach part time and do not participate in many department meetings,” and “I am an adjunct instructor with no access to other instructors ESL or otherwise ... [and] I don’t expect it to happen.” Even *if* full time faculty collaborate, leaving out part time instructors means that faculty and students may be missing integral connections that would make both groups more confident.

Likewise, the training that faculty members have when they come into the teaching field is important for understanding some of the concerns over the lack of concrete connections between the departments. For example, while all ESL instructors who were surveyed believed that both their education and experience helped prepare them to teach their assigned courses, a number of composition instructors felt they were not prepared pedagogically to work with MLW students: “I didn’t receive a lot of specific instruction for ESL students,” “I feel underprepared to help ESL students with many of their writing problems,” and “Neither ... degree ... prepared me to face the students we have today, especially those who are English language learners.”

However, many ENG faculty note that they have learned through practice to work with MLW students: “...there’s no substitute for continual work with students and the trial and error of the classroom,” “I have learned what I know about teaching ESL students – all students – by experience, and by talking to other instructors,” and “[e]xperience has been the best teacher...”

What is clear from these responses is that there is some consensus that *how we teach* writing to MLW students has some differences from how we teach writing to native English speakers. There appears to be a process of negotiation and learning on the job for most composition instructors. However, what is left behind when we only think about how we teach MLWs is *what we teach*. When examining course content summaries (the official guidelines establishing the topics covered in a class) for ESL 51, the final ESL writing course, and ENG 111, the first composition course, there are several significant overlaps in the types of work that students are expected to perform at the end of the semester. For example, both courses expect grammatical/mechanical correctness; they want students to learn how to organize and develop ideas; they want students to locate and document outside sources; and they expect some form of

process writing, such as developing prewriting and drafting skills. Though the content summaries may be worded differently, the ideas are similar.

Although these outcomes appear to be similar in some ways, I have wondered, based on many conversations with students and faculty in both departments over the years, how these outcomes reflect classroom practice. As the theoretical framework below will articulate, as do the faculty comments noted above, years of disconnection in scholarship and relationships between the instructors in these two fields has affected what we teach and why we teach it. This project sets aside issues of *how* we teach writing (an important but entirely separate project) and instead focuses on *what* we teach – whether ESL and college composition believe in the same values and core ideas about what makes writing “good” and how we transmit those ideas through our practice. I was curious to examine this disciplinary division from a faculty perspective rather than a student one. What are my colleagues and I doing? Why are we doing it in this way? What informs our perceptions of good student writing? What, if anything, can we do to better support each other and our students? The section below will articulate why these questions are an interesting and important cross-disciplinary issue.

Purpose and Significance of Study

When I set out to begin this study, it was with a personal interest in trying to better understand how we are serving our MLW students when they matriculate from ESL non-credit courses into credit-bearing composition. This has led to years of study and attempting to understand the interplay of placement tests, course outcomes, textbooks, and instructor education on the placement and pedagogical practices of these two disparate yet interconnected fields. What I have discovered is that our fields, in the most generalizable way possible, often look at MLW students with a deficit mindset – “What do *they* need to be successful?” “How can *we*

support *their* success?” This deficit mindset shows up frequently in the literature, particularly in composition, when teachers design practices to “fix” their MLW students. As Canagarajah points out, the mindset in the writing classroom is that our MLWs are making “errors” rather than choices in their writing (“Toward” 602). Likewise, the idea that the oral communication of MLW students is often superior to their abilities to produce similarly sophisticated ideas in academic writing is pervasive (D’Alessio and Riley 81). Eckstein and Ferris describe the experiences of MLWs as “not equal,” noting their “complex and demanding” needs and the additional time required to do the same written work as their native English-speaking counterparts (138-139). These students likely experience such challenges in part because of their racial habitus, structures that affect the way they read, write, and interact in the world (Inoue *Antiracist* 43). MLW’s habitus is set outside white racial habitus, which often values standard Academic English (58), therefore setting these students up as inherently deficient.

Despite this deficit mindset, many scholars have also pushed back on the idea of the writing classroom as a monolingual space where writers need to be fixed. As Miller-Cochran notes, our institutions of higher education are becoming more diverse, and we cannot and should not expect our classrooms to be “linguistically monolithic” spaces (20-21). The statistics bear out the increasing diversity in higher education, with close to 70 percent of U.S. college students being white in 1995 to just over 50 percent in 2015 (“Race and Ethnicity”). However, most instructors, who have jumped through the academic hoops of graduate study, come to practice the types of writing that we ourselves learned. This project, then, seeks to understand, by looking at faculty rather than students, how our own educational institutions, educations, and pedagogical practices could be re-examined and connected. If a disciplinary division of labor exists, it is our job to consider what *we* can do better, rather than what our students are doing wrong. The

theoretical framework below articulates why this division exists and how it informs our classroom practices.

Background and Theoretical Framework

The history of undergraduate composition is one that many in the field know well: Composition began at Harvard in 1874, and it was designed to help students correct writing errors and bring poor writers up to “curricular par” (Rose “The Language” 346-349). After World War II, linguistic differences at colleges became dramatic, with veterans taking advantage of the G.I. Bill, and increasing numbers of international students entering college. Because composition teachers considered “writing well” during this period to be the “ability to produce English that is unmarked in the eyes of the teachers who are the custodians of privileged varieties of English,” anyone who did not fit this model was seen as less intelligent and therefore less worthy of education (Matsuda “The Myth” 640). Instead of changing the curriculum to meet the needs of these new populations, institutions provided additional instruction, such as remediation. However, even additional semesters of instruction were not enough to make these students fit the preferred linguistic model, so many schools began to make separate courses or tracks for these students. These classrooms served to keep “language differences out of required composition courses” (647). Composition, therefore, served a gatekeeper function at many higher education institutions by removing those with undesirable language from the student population.

Another way to divide students was through the creation of English as a Second Language (ESL) programs. ESL and composition became distinct fields in part because of containment practices that did not acknowledge, accept, or celebrate the linguistic diversity of students. The growing frustration of English faculty led, in part, to the professionalization of ESL, which first appeared at Michigan in the same post-World War II era in which the ivory

tower was opening up to many new populations. Previously, there was an assumption that anyone could teach ESL courses if they were a native speaker of the language. As a result, most teachers on university campuses who worked with MLWs were there to study something else, such as linguistics, literature, journalism, and creative writing. However, with the increasing influx of foreign students, it was clear that qualifications to teach these students were becoming necessary (Gray).

The initial effort to professionalize was through the Michigan English Language Institute (ELI), which was the first to create professional preparation programs for ESL teachers that focused on applied and structural linguistics as a way of teaching MLW students (Matsuda “Composition” 703-04). It was here that the “audiolingual” method for learning English was developed. The audiolingual method emphasized one-to-one transfer from the original language to the target language. Listening and speaking were learned first through dialogues and pattern drills to the detriment of written language, which was the last concept to be introduced. A common lesson would provide sentences with key linguistic structures that were analyzed and repeated in drills. These drills might contain new grammatical forms, change singular to plural, or substitute various vocabulary words (Richards and Rodgers 59-60). Audiolingualism was developed as a branch of structural linguistics, which posited that speech is the primary form of language that we learn as human beings. Structural linguists argue that “language is ‘primarily what is spoken and only secondarily what is written.’” This gave priority to spoken language (62-63), thus, when the ELI at Michigan was created, the initial intent was to focus on spoken English rather than written English.

The audiolingual method was part of a “modernist” approach that assumed students learned languages the same way (whether your native language was Spanish or Arabic) and that

“grammar was key to knowing a language” (Canagarajah “TESOL” 11). Language was made scientific, with each wave of modernism proposing new ways to introduce “grammatical properties” for “successful acquisition” (12). The modernist approach as a scientific method also separated language learning from “history, society, and politics” to make language more generalizable and draw conclusions that could be useful for all language learners (11).

Once this method and the field were established, journals that dealt with applied and structural linguistics began to emerge and additional graduate and certificate programs were developed to train those interested in teaching TESOL (Matsuda “Composition” 705). These scientific modes of language instruction overlapped in many ways with current-traditional rhetoric, the dominant practice in writing studies⁴ (Berlin 2). Current-traditional rhetoric was a form of writing instruction in which “modes of discourse” were taught and students would write in the five-paragraph mode on a chosen topic without opportunities to draft, receive feedback, or revise. The focus of evaluation was on grammatical usage, spelling, style, clarity, and the organization of paragraphs and sentences being emphasized (Matsuda “Process” 67, 70).

Despite some slight theoretical overlap, the continued professionalization of both fields further entrenched their split. By 1965, compositionists, who had wrung their hands for years over how to help MLWs in their classrooms, attended the yearly Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) conference and were told that MLWs *should* be taught in separate classes by specialists trained to teach them. As many teachers agreed, the decision was made across the two fields to “release composition specialists from the extra ‘burden’ of teaching ESL students in their classes” (Matsuda “Composition” 719-12). Matsuda

⁴ Throughout this dissertation, I will refer to the field of scholarship as “writing studies” and the course/subject as “composition.”

argued that it was this decision to separate students based on linguistic background that the “disciplinary division of labor was thus institutionalized” (“Composition” 713).

However, this division did not stop the two disciplines from overlapping in other ways. During the 1970s that the audiolingual method began to fall out of favor in ESL courses. Teachers in the field began to recognize that simply reproducing target language was not a particularly effective way of learning communicative competence, with Noam Chomsky arguing that humans do not learn language through imitation but rather through the knowledge of the “abstract rules” of that language; with these insights, the method gave way to new theories and practices (Richards and Rodgers 72). ESL instructors also began to focus more on writing, realizing that it had been long neglected because of the popularity of scientific language methods. ESL pedagogy also began to draw from trends in writing studies, which, earlier in the 1970s, had moved away from current-traditional rhetoric and towards the process approach.

The process approach, though it existed for most of the 20th century in some form, became the dominant theory in writing studies during the 1970s and 1980s. Donald Murray’s seminal 1972 piece “Teach Writing as a Process Not Product” argued that writing is always unfinished, and it is the process of invention and discovery that is at the heart of writing improvement. He suggested dividing writing into three stages: prewriting, writing, and rewriting. The teacher’s job becomes a listener and encourager; someone who allows students to use their own language and to write and re-write as much as necessary to “produce whatever product his subject and his audience demand.” Drafts remain ungraded and revision allows for whatever “other choices the writer might make” (3-6).

The process movement was further entrenched in writing studies after the 1976 creation of the Council of Writing Program Administrators (CWPA), which developed in part to set

guidelines to improve curriculum across developing composition programs (Anson 221). Graduate programs popped up and research exploded. Over the next two decades, many articles followed that argued for process pedagogy or added nuance to this conversation. As part of process pedagogy, faculty focused on “writing conferences, the use of student writing as the primary texts of the course, peer critiquing, [and] analytic evaluation tools” (Newkirk “The Politics” 119). Likewise, Nancy Sommers argued that teachers should encourage students to focus on different “levels” of revision during each writing cycle, saving minor syntactic concerns for the end, allowing for major changes in a particular piece to flourish across multiple drafts, as the writer narrows in on the goal of the writing (52). Robert M. Gorrell argued that we should not throw out product entirely when we use process, simply because product informs process in a recursive way (274). Central to most or all process scholarship, however, was the centering of the student writer as an “active participant in the creation of knowledge” allowing students to develop a written voice rather than a perfect product (Anson 217-18).

Additionally, as part of the process movement, prescriptive grammar was replaced with descriptive grammar – the practice of looking at language as it was used rather than the “rules” defining the ways in which language “should” be used (Matsuda “Process” 68). This pushback against grammar was further used to distance language teaching from writing instruction with Patrick Hartwell’s piece “Grammar, Grammars, and the Teaching of Grammar” in 1985, which argued that studies found “no correlation between the ability to state the [grammatical] rule and the ability to apply it correctly, either with native or nonnative speakers” (119). Likewise, Hartwell argued, because grammar teaching takes up additional time in a writing classroom, it might ultimately serve to make writing worse because the time is not spent on other tasks (105).

He also concluded that the issue ultimately came down to power – who has it and whom it is being kept from, suggesting instructors move away from grammar instruction entirely (127).

Despite academic additions, nuances, and fresh ways of thinking being added to these conversations, the central fact remained: process pedagogy dominated during these decades.

Matsuda quoted Tobin, who noted:

In the late 1970s and early 1980s you were either one of the process-oriented teachers arguing for student choice of topics and forms; the necessity of authentic voice; writing as a messy, organic, recursive form of discovery, growth, and personal expression; or you were a teacher who believed that we needed to resist process' attack on rules, conventions, standards, quality, and rigor. (qtd. in "Process and Post Process" 69)

The move towards process writing also became central to the formulation of the CCCC's 1974 document "Students' Right to Their Own Language." Though, as Matsuda made clear, the fields of TESOL and writing studies were well-established by this time, and language difference was often shuffled out of composition classrooms, the CCCC drafted a statement which asked educators to affirm students' rights to "their own patterns and varieties of language -- the dialects of their nurture or whatever dialects in which they find their own identity and style" (Conference 19). This resolution also asked teachers to seek training that would allow them to uphold and respect the cultural diversity of the students in their classrooms. The connection between the social action implications of "Students' Rights" and the process movement are made clear when "Smitherman notes, 'spelling, punctuation, usage, and other surface structure conventions of Edited American English (EAE) are generally what's given all the play (attention) in composition classroom[s].'" By focusing on what students *have to say* and less on *how they say it*, students can keep their individual cultural identities while also finding success in the writing

classroom (Coxwell-Teague and Lunsford xviii). This document was highly controversial at the time and while some pioneers applied its principles in their individual writing pedagogy practices, it was never universally adopted by the field⁵. As Mike Rose noted in 1985, many instructors still view writing as a skill that should be remediated if students do not fit into an ideal model of a college writer (“The Language” 341).

While process writing continued to dominate composition classes in the 1970s and ‘80s, TESOL scholarship, in breaking with previous ideas about language learning, began to return to writing instruction, soon developing ESL writing courses that drew heavily from writing studies’ embrace of process writing (Grabe 43). As Matsuda outlines, approaches to process writing can be seen in a variety of academic literature from these decades. Some ESL/L2 writing scholarship⁶ argued the value of freewriting and “quantity over quality.” Others noted that teachers should value feedback that focuses on improvement of the writer, rather than seeking perfection (“Process” 76-77). Buckingham and Pech argue that using process-like approaches is valuable to teaching writing in ESL classes because “there is nothing inherent in the ... approach itself which limits its use to either native or non-native speakers” (55). However, Matsuda also pointed out that process pedagogy never dominated the field the way it did in writing studies scholarship and that some authors and publishers even rejected process writing entirely (“Process” 78).

⁵ The marginalization of this statement has led to a growing movement in writing studies for linguistic justice, including “Antiracist First Year Composition Goals,” “Black Language Demands” by *Black Linguistic Justice* and the “CCCC Statement on White Language Supremacy.” These will be discussed in later chapters.

⁶ Throughout this dissertation, I will refer to this scholarship as ESL/L2 writing. For more on this decision, see footnote 12.

Alongside process pedagogy, the concept of genre also developed a great deal of scholarship in both ESL and writing studies pedagogy. Genre is defined as an understanding that the texts we read and write are “socially constructed” and to understand and participate in a particular discourse community means also knowing the differences between these contexts and their writing elements, such as style and content (Kessler 6). During the 1980s, John Swales introduced the concept to the field of applied linguistics (Kessler 7) while Carolyn Miller’s “Genre as Social Action” made the term prominent in writing studies. Genre has been seen by many scholars as a highly useful concept for writing courses because of its focus on teaching young writers why and how texts are created as they are over time (Wardle “Mutt” 768), and how to “respond appropriately to assigned situations” such as specific writing tasks (Devitt “Generalizing” 583).

Many early genre scholars in both fields viewed genre as incompatible with process writing. In ESL/L2 writing, Ken Hyland argued that process approaches did not help MLWs develop better writing because they fail to acknowledge the “socially constructed nature of texts,” as genre clearly did (“Genre-Based” 18), while Ann Johns disliked that language learners were pushed to be “authors,” a major emphasis in the process movement (“Genre and” 181). In writing studies, genre was seen as incompatible with process because of its “rigidity and formalist conventions,” something that process scholars rejected (Clark “Genre” 160). However, many scholars in both fields have now come to see the ways in which process and genre can be compatible (Badger and White; Dean; Devitt “Generalizing”; Racelis and Matsuda).

While genre studies made significant headway in both fields, there has been continuing conflict over how to introduce the concept in writing courses. Hyland outlines a continuum of genre teaching in ESL/L2 writing, from systemic functional linguistics (SFL) which focuses on

“broad rhetorical patterns” such as “arguments and expositions.” At the other end, the most flexible approach, called New Rhetoric, focuses on rhetoric and the “dynamic quality of genres” (“Genre and” 2361-62). SFL tends to be the most utilized form in ESL/L2 writing, and while it is meant to be flexible in form, genre can still be taught in “simplistic and reductive ways” in ESL writing classes (Racelis and Matsuda 388), with texts “memorized as rigid formats” (Johns “The Future” 62), such as when essay structures like compare/contrast are considered genres to be learned and transferred (Caplan and Farling 567). In writing studies, too, conflict has arisen because many instructors have focused on prescriptive forms of genre instruction, such as modeling and emulation, which can easily avoid the social context in which writing takes place (Pemberton 47), and can be used to wield power over students, who are forced to write in specific ways that give the teacher authority (Clark “Genre” 163). There has also been concern over “mutt genres,” genres created specifically for first-year composition, but which may lack transferability to other writing situations (Wardle “Mutt” 777). Despite the conflicts over why and how to use genre in writing courses, the concept continues to have significant scholarly influence in both fields and remains an integral part of the pedagogy in both ESL and college composition courses (Costino and Hyon 29-30).

While process and genre approaches continue to generate significant scholarship, both fields have continued to evolve. In the 1990s, each field shifted theoretically in new and dramatic ways. In writing studies, this change was referred to as the “social turn” and “post-process,” while in ESL, terms such as “post-method,” “post-modern” and “contrastive rhetoric” defined the decades that followed.

In writing studies, Trimbur defined the social turn as a theory in which a composition is “a cultural activity by which writers position and reposition themselves in relation to their own

and others' subjectivities, discourses, practices, and institutions" (109). In other words, writing is socially situated and constructed and cannot be removed from audience and culture (Fulkerson 116). This idea, coupled with the words "post-process" suggested one of two things: that either process was no longer the dominant or central model of teaching writing, or that these new theories of writing as culturally centered could become an extension of the process movement (Matsuda "Process" 73-74). Although the decades following the introduction and scholarly use of the term "post-process" did not find most teachers moving significantly away from process writing, the term did introduce new cultural, political, and social justice into the writing classroom (Anson 225). However, even this use of the term was dismissed by some scholars. For example, Fulkerson suggested that the social turn was part of a "critical/cultural studies" approach to teaching composition which focused only on "'liberation' from dominant discourse" (114) and would lead to student "indoctrination" (119) but would not improve student writing. Likewise, he entirely rejected the term post-process because it is defined by the idea that process writing is too formulaic and that process pedagogy denies that all writing is social, both of which he dismisses as untrue (123).

What Fulkerson says of the new century of writing studies scholarship is that it is defined by some with a critical/cultural studies approach but that the predominant methods involve rhetorical approaches. These approaches focus on "'situation and audience'" and value teacher modeling, student performance, critique, practice, and revision. Teacher feedback is written or oral, and reading is "not the center of the class activity" (124). The three rhetorical approaches are argumentation (teaching "claim, evidence, assumption, counterexamples, refutation"); genre, in which texts are "socially constructed" and must vary depending on situation and audience; and discourse community, in which students are entered into the academic community and must learn

the discourse moves and how to respond to them appropriately (through understanding how to respond to the target audience and using the “syntactic and organizational features” of that community) (128-130). Though he asserts that there is no ground for “proving” a specific approach to be “proper,” he does argue that writing programs should strongly consider choosing an approach because “some degree of commonality is likely to be required” (132). This is important because as writing studies professionalized, separating from both literature and ESL/L2 writing, these theories and practices have given structure to the work that takes place in a modern writing classroom, though the academic freedom at many institutions results in a wide variety of classroom practices.

The ESL field also underwent major changes in its theoretical underpinnings during these decades, though, similar to writing studies, defining these theories and practices is complex. In 2016 Suresh Canagarajah followed the trajectory of research and theory in the journal *TESOL Quarterly* over a 50-year period. He outlines how the field of TESOL changed during this time. In TESOL, the paradigm of “modernism” attempted to separate language from “history, society, and politics” (“TESOL” 11). This was part of the scientific view of language acquisition discussed earlier. However, by the 1980s and 1990s, some scholars began to embrace post-modernism, acknowledging that diverse communities of language speakers could not be separated from social relationships. The field started to see language as a social construct and language purity impossible, as each community has contact with other communities in which language mingles and changes (“TESOL” 13-14). Canagarajah also ties the movement towards post-modern to a “post-method condition” in which some scholars in the field challenged the idea of one method being “powerful enough to answer the various contingencies in diverse

learning contexts,” instead focusing on teaching practices that fit the community of practice in which the teacher resides (“TESOL” 20).

ESL/L2 writing scholars also connected genre theory to the term “contrastive rhetoric” (CR) in the 1990s. CR asked writers and communicators to consider issues of power inequalities and “negotiate rhetorical differences” through their own “intercultural awareness.” This also led to the examination of genre analysis as part of academic writing in which the writer considers the audience of their work and how to best enter those communities through textual conventions (Canagarajah “TESOL” 21-22). Genre theory continues to influence the field, but there has been pushback to the ideas of CR and social issues within ESL/L2 writing (Leki et al. 35). As Terry Santos argues, because ESL historically aligned more with applied linguistics and a “scientific orientation” of language learning (11), ideology is not a primary concern, and it simply isn’t necessary to try and teach “sociopolitical consciousness” (9). She also says that students have a right to their own language (a troublesome controversy in L1 writing, she believes), but that in ESL “[t]he point is how to help them become more proficient in English,” again showing disdain for social aspects of writing studies (10). She and other scholars argue for “academic communicative competence” (Swales 9) and rejecting the role of ideology in language learning. While there was both agreement and disagreement with Santos (Johns “The Future” 48), these social debates contributed to conflict over what ESL writing instructors *should* be doing.

One thing that most scholars in ESL/L2 writing agree upon is that there is not a simple theory of what ESL writing should look like or do in the classroom. Leki et al. argued that “L2 Writing curricula do tend to be informed by diverse conceptual foundations, but more in an ad hoc, eclectic manner, born out of pragmatic necessity, local influences, and affiliations with related fields such as English mother-tongue composition, applied linguistics, and minority

education” (72). Essentially, the field cannot be reduced to a simple formula or idea where practicing educators will find common ground. In fact, those who teach ESL might be “hard pressed to identify foundational concepts” at all, and that perhaps there cannot be a “single grand theory of L2 writing” because of the continually conflicting demands of diverse learners (Leki et al. 72). Grabe argues that while a theory of L2 writing is currently unsettled, it may eventually be done, but we “may need to wait until models of writing move beyond a descriptive stage of development,” something that is left to future study (54). Though Grabe made this argument in 2001, the 2016 piece by Canagarajah suggests the field is still “post-method” (“TESOL” 20) and Crandall and Christison suggest that most TESOL teacher training programs focus on theories later found unhelpful when instructors discover a gap between what they’ve learned in the classroom and their lived reality, ultimately emphasizing practice over theory (9-10).

These histories weave together in many interesting and unique ways. ESL/L2 writing and writing studies draw theory from each other and argue about the ways that they are different. Ironically, though both fields have prominent social movements, they take different names, reflecting the ways that the split between the two fields has created different discourse among their professionals. However, the two fields seem content, or even suggest a benefit to these divisions. As Grabe argues, “L2 writers are sufficiently different in nature – and they have legitimate rights to these differences – that teachers need to be appropriately prepared to teach them effectively and fairly” (46). L1 scholarship simply cannot be reproduced on ESL/L2 writing scholarship and effectively reach these writers (45). Such a statement posits that divisions exist for pedagogically sound reasons.

In 1999, Matsuda wrote how unfortunate this disciplinary division is, because while we “reinscribe the view that the sole responsibility of teaching writing to ESL students falls upon

professionals in another intellectual formation” we continue to face courses and institutions in which these writers make up a good percentage of students in composition classes, yet now we have no strategies to help them (“Composition” 700-701). Two years after Matsuda made this argument, in an effort to actualize his scholarship, he led the initial composition and ratification of the “CCCC Statement on Second Language Writing and Writers” (written in 2001, revised in 2009, reaffirmed in 2014, and revised again in 2020, with the addition of the word “Multilingual”) asked teachers and WPAs to offer preparation in working with MLWs, to acknowledge these writers in the classroom, and to discuss and develop theories and studies that would help compositionists further recognize and help these students. Like “Students’ Rights,” it is not clear what impact this document has had on composition pedagogy in practice. As Matsuda and Skinnell argue, the needs of MLWs continue to be frequently overlooked in composition classrooms. They point out that the WPA Outcomes Statement for First Year Composition focuses heavily on rhetorical issues which will be difficult for MLWs without strong guidance on academic English. They note that most courses focusing on rhetorical issues are likely to focus on “cultural and historical references with which [MLWs] are not familiar” and that these courses may be “designed with the monolingual norm in mind” (233-235). They argue that making these courses fairer for MLWs would involve integrating and addressing language issues (238), again, a controversy in the field, as these “issues” are relegated to another discipline - ESL.

What is clear from this brief history are the ways in which the trajectories of the two fields have created a split that has endured. It is a split that both fields acknowledge, accept and, in many ways, defend as necessary for MLW students to have college success. It is upon this

history that my own dissertation rests. This history provides the theoretical framework that I plan to examine and interrogate.

Research Objective and Questions

This study seeks to better understand how an ESL writing/composition disciplinary division of labor articulated above continues to exist more than two decades after Matsuda defined the split. The objective is to gain insight on that rift through a study of the faculty in these two departments at MACC. The ultimate purpose of this research is to consider how MACC and other colleges might build bridges between these departments to better aid our faculty and students in teaching and learning success. The implications and impacts of this issue are of crucial importance at MACC. ESL is the fifth most utilized course sequence on campus, with 22 percent of the student population being international as of 2019 (“OIR Factbook”), and with a composition sequence being required for completion of nearly every degree and certificate program at the college. Therefore, I will ask several questions:

1. What do the instructors who teach ESL and those who teach composition value, respectively, when teaching writing?
2. Why do the instructors in each department, as representatives of their field, value what they value? i.e.: What is the interplay of theory and practice here?
3. Do teachers in ESL and English departments perceive any effect on student outcomes resulting from students matriculating from ESL courses to English courses where there are disciplinary differences between how these courses are taught, based upon their knowledge of what makes a successful college writer?

Overview of the Dissertation

In this chapter, I shared how professional experience led to my interest in this project and research questions. I shared the institutional background for my research context, MACC. I also established a theoretical framework to guide my study by putting the history of the fields of writing studies and ESL/L2 writing into conversation with my research questions, explaining the relevance and importance of exploring a disciplinary division. Finally, I presented my research questions, which are answered in upcoming chapters.

In chapter two, I introduce the study's methodology, describing the affordances and limitations of the chosen methodology, the curricular context, my researcher positionality, my research protocol, which includes information on selection and recruitment of participants, and my data collection and analysis, including the change to my process brought on by the COVID-19 pandemic. I explain the core concepts that emerged from the data which are further explored in the remaining chapters.

In chapters three through five, I present the principal findings from the data collected. I outline each of my three case studies and incorporate other forms of data, including survey and artifact data. Chapter three articulates the values of ESL writing, chapter four articulates the values of ENG writing, and chapter five presents my "bridge" case, in which I examine a writing instructor who has taught in both ESL and composition classes. I organize my findings by the concepts found relevant to each discipline and bring in literature to explain the ways in which each instructor and department has connections and disconnections between their practice and the current literature in their field. I also examine the divisions and connections between the two fields, presenting more of this data in each subsequent chapter, as a fuller picture emerges.

Finally, in chapter six, I reflect upon the answers to my three research questions. I look at how these answers present specific disciplinary values at MACC and examine how these values fit into the scholarship and history of the fields I have presented here in chapter 1. I also consider the implications of these findings for both MACC and these two fields more broadly. I use these implications to make recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

In chapter 1, I established a theoretical framework to guide an exploration of writing values in the ENG and ESL disciplines. That framework looked at the history of college writing instruction and established the theory of a division of labor between these two departments. The central goal of this study is to examine what is being taught. Faculty are placed at the center of this study as I examine their goals and values of “good” student writing. Here, again, are the research questions that guide this study:

1. What do the instructors who teach ESL and those who teach composition value, respectively, when teaching writing?
2. Why do the instructors in each department, as representatives of their field, value what they value? i.e.: What is the interplay of theory and practice here?
3. Do teachers in ESL and English departments perceive any effect on student outcomes resulting from students matriculating from ESL courses to English courses where there are disciplinary differences between how these courses are taught, based upon their knowledge of what makes a successful college writer?

These questions attempt to glean faculty values while also centering the student experience as part of the outcome of this project. The ways in which faculty can better bridge a disciplinary division will ideally help students have greater success in college composition and beyond.

In this chapter, I present an overview of the study’s methodology. Table 1 describes the phases of data collection for this project. I then describe the methodological approach that I have chosen for this study, including an acknowledgement of its affordances for my research aims. I will also provide the curricular context and address my researcher positionality while studying

within my own teaching institution. I will highlight my Institutional Review Board process and address the revisions of the IRB as well as the limitations and affordances created by the sudden nature of the COVID-19 pandemic on my data-gathering. I will describe my research protocol, including the selection and recruitment of participants, and the data collection and analysis. I will also articulate the core concepts that came from the research, which will be discussed in further detail in future chapters.

Table 1*Phases of Data Collection*

Phase Sequence	Timeline	Data Collection Method
Phase 1: Survey	January-July 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sent survey to all ENG and ESL faculty • Created memos of initial patterns in a research journal • Started In-vivo coding • Created an initial set of themes/concepts
Phase 2: Selection and Recruitment of Participants	January 2021 (Maternity leave August-December 2020)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approached two candidates based upon survey data with one affirmative response • Approached two additional candidates based on criterion sampling with two affirmative responses
Phase 3: Interviews, Observations, and Learning Artifact Collection	February-May 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observed Zoom-recorded lectures • Conducted audio-recorded interviews • Collected syllabi, assignment sheets, classroom activities, textbook reading, and additional materials • Continued to memo and use constant comparison to analyze the data as the study continued. Used emerging themes as areas of investigation in further observations and interviews

Context of the Study

This research took place at my home teaching institution, Mid Atlantic Community College (MACC), where I am employed as a full-time faculty member in the ENG department. MACC is one of the largest academic institutions of higher education in the country. With more than 70,000 students spread across six suburban campuses and online, the college serves students not only in the region but around the world. The campus is racially diverse and is a minority-majority institution. Table 2 provides the race and ethnicity distribution of the college around the time the study was undertaken.

Table 2

Race and Ethnicity Distribution, Fall 2020

American Indian/Alaska Native	.3%
Asian	16.9%
Black/African American	15%
Hispanic/Latino	21.2%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	.3%
Not Specified	3.9%
Two or More Races	5.1%
Unknown	.6%
White	36.7%

The campus where I teach is the largest of the six physical locations. It is a suburban campus that served approximately 18,000 students in 2020, an average number, despite the virtual nature of almost all classes due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

The ESL department has traditionally been a robust department at MACC. At my campus, the number of faculty members before the pandemic (reduced during the pandemic due to several retirements) was approximately 35, including full- and part-time faculty. The ESL curriculum is broken up into two distinct tracks: The American Culture and Language Institute (ACLI) and college ESL. The ACLI has six levels, from “low beginning” through “high intermediate.” It is intended for students who are attempting to improve their English for study, work, or personal development. This is considered a full-time program in which students meet for several hours a day, four days a week as they work on reading and writing or listening and speaking. Many students take these courses concurrently, spending approximately 5 hours a day in the classroom.

Some students who complete the upper levels in this program then move on to college ESL. College ESL also draws international students and other college-bound students from local high schools and the community. These courses begin at the low-intermediate level, ESL 21, 22, and 24 (writing, reading, and listening and speaking respectively), and continue until ESL 51 and 52 (writing and reading respectively). Students are placed in these courses in a variety of ways. One is through Accuplacer, as discussed in Chapter 1. Other students, such as many international students, are placed with recent TOEFL or IELTS scores. Some U.S. high school graduates may also use SAT/ACT scores and high school GPAs as markers to whether they should enroll in ESL courses.

Once students are placed into ESL courses, they must complete all the courses at each level with a grade of “satisfactory” before moving onto the next level. They can, however, test out or be exempt from a given level with instructor permission. Before level 4x, students are expected to take only language courses, as their language is not considered proficient enough to handle any college credit coursework. Once students reach level 4x or 5x, they can also co-enroll in other introductory general education courses except for other English courses. As discussed in chapter 1, students enter college composition when they have completed ESL 51 and 52. An exit exam (in which the student writes a five-paragraph essay for which no advanced reading is necessary) is graded by two faculty members; if the consensus is that the student meets proficiency standards for the level, they pass the course. Because the courses are graded on a S/U (satisfactory/unsatisfactory) basis, there is more room for instructor judgement to make the final decision on college English readiness. Linguistic competency, in which language use trumps content, is seen as the final readiness indicator at this level rather than demonstration of higher-level thinking, such as inference, critical thinking, or source analysis. The course content summary that is relevant to this study, ESL 51, Composition III, is provided in Figure 1.

Figure 1*ESL 51 – Composition III Course Outcomes*

Course Description

Prepares for college-level writing by practice in the writing process, emphasizing development of thought in essays of greater length and complexity, and use of appropriate syntax and diction.

General Course Purpose

To prepare advanced ESL students for college-level writing.

Course Objectives

- Goal 1 - Students will be able to produce clear, logically developed essays using idiomatic English.
 - Given a topic, students will be able to: A. generate ideas B. make an outline C. write and revise a draft D. proofread and edit their own writing
- Goal 2 - Students will be able to use strategies for approaching a variety of writing tasks
 - Given a writing task, students will be able to: A. locate and use supporting material B. document sources C. paraphrase
- Goal 3 - Students will be able to formulate a thesis and develop it.
 - Given a topic, students will be able to: A. narrow the topic B. sustain an idea C. write thesis for different types of essays such as argumentative, summary/response, comparison/contrast, and cause/effect.

Major Topics to be Included

A. Prewriting skills B. Drafting C. Revising D. Editing E. Focusing, organizing, and developing ideas F. Discussing, analyzing, and responding to written materials G. Grammar as needed or grammar review as needed on an individual basis.

Once students complete their sequence of ESL courses, they begin credit-bearing English. This is typically ENG 111-ENF 3 (5 credits), or, if placed by the instructor, ENG 111 (3 credits). Most students are placed into ENG 111-ENF 3. This course is meant to be a final developmental “bump” for these students while allowing them to co-enroll with the credit course. Passing through this course is the final stage of developmental English that MACC offers.

Developmental English at MACC has a long history. During the 1970s, the college developed its own placement test. The test was developed by faculty who used a random sample of essays to determine “categories to describe the characteristics of papers” for classes such as ENG 111. Once the test was validated and viewed as reliable, all students were required to take this exam upon entering the college, with faculty reading and scoring student essays⁷. It was well-received nationally, with other colleges across the country using the model. At the same time, MACC was instituting a developmental class, then called “ENG 111 with Lab,” which was for students who just missed the cutoff for ENG 111 based on the placement test. This class was seen as part of a push to open the college to returning Vietnam veterans and international students during this decade. Students taking the placement test could place into either this remedial ENG 111, a choice of two first-semester composition courses (occupational English or transfer-level composition), or test directly into the second-semester course, ENG 112.

Later, due to the push for a standardized test state-wide, the Compass test replaced the instrument that was developed at MACC. This test separated students at the developmental level as needing additional remediation in reading and/or writing. Students could be placed in

⁷ This information was drawn from an internal MACC publication on the history of English at the college.

developmental courses in one or both subjects. In 2014, the developmental system was redesigned again with the implementation of a new statewide placement test, the VPT. This test didn't distinguish between the need for remedial reading or writing; thus, MACC created an integrated reading/writing remedial sequence, known as ENF 1, ENF 2, and ENF 3. ENF 1 and 2 are eight- and five-credit courses respectively and are not taken for college credit. Once students are enrolled in ENG 111-ENF 3, a five-credit course, they are finally earning college credit alongside two final remedial credits.

In the ENG department, ENG 111 is a three-credit writing course that is needed by nearly every degree program at the college. The areas of study at MACC include business; computer science, engineering and math; physical and life sciences; liberal arts, languages, and social sciences; visual, performing and media arts; applied technologies; education and public service; information technology; and nursing and health sciences. While a handful of certificate programs in specialized fields do not require ENG 111 to obtain credentials, all degree programs do. The wide variety of programs and certificates that require college composition for completion demonstrates the value the college places upon academic writing.

The outcomes for ENG 111 were written collaboratively by both writing studies specialists and faculty within the larger umbrella of English. Therefore, the outcomes were a negotiation by faculty who have varied degrees and educational histories. While there are applied associates degrees and certificates that are not intended for transfer, one of the central missions of a community college is to provide an affordable education for the first two years of study before students transfer for the final two years of a bachelor's degree. Therefore, ENG 111 course outcomes were created with MACC's transfer partners in mind. These transfer partners

believe that the outcomes for ENG 111 should be reflective of the WPA Outcomes Statement⁸, the field's standard. The course outcomes for ENG 111 are listed in Figure 2 below.

Figure 2

ENG 111 – College Composition I Course Outcomes

Course Description

Introduces students to critical thinking and the fundamentals of academic writing. Through the writing process, students refine topics; develop and support ideas; investigate, evaluate, and incorporate appropriate resources; edit for effective style and usage; and determine appropriate approaches for a variety of contexts, audiences, and purposes. Writing activities will include exposition and argumentation with at least one researched essay.

General Course Purpose

ENG 111 will prepare students for all other expected college writing and for writing in the workplace through understanding the writing process and creation of effective texts.

Course Objectives

- **GOAL ONE: THE PROCESS OF WRITING** - Students who successfully complete this course will be able to produce an effective essay through an organized and coherent process.
 - They will be able to develop a topic, draft an essay, revise the draft for improvement, and edit a final copy.
 - They will be able to incorporate reading and experience into their writing.
- **GOAL TWO: EXPOSITORY AND ARGUMENTATIVE WRITING** - Students who successfully complete this course will be able to explain, describe and inform in expository writing and will be able to identify the purpose of the mode of argument in persuasive writing.

⁸ This outcomes statement has been questioned by antiracist scholars. An alternate outcomes statement, “Antiracist First-Year Composition Goals,” in which the white language supremacy inherent in the WPA statement is challenged was published in 2021. See also Chap 1, footnote 5.

Figure 2 Continued

- They will be able to organize and explain ideas with clarity, vividness, effectiveness, and grammatical and mechanical correctness in expository essays.
- They will be able to use evidence in a thesis-driven essay argumentatively asserting one viewpoint over another. (A fuller and more robust study of argument is the province of ENG 112.)
- GOAL THREE: CRITICAL THINKING AND RESEARCH - Students who successfully complete this course will be able to analyze and investigate ideas and present them in well-structured prose appropriate to a particular purpose and audience.
 - They will be able to read, summarize, and respond to college level texts – their own and others--of varying lengths
 - They will be able to create unified, coherent, well-developed texts that demonstrate a self-critical awareness of rhetorical elements such as purpose, audience, and organization.
 - They will be able to employ grammatical and mechanical conventions in the preparation of readable manuscripts, including the documented research essay.
 - They will be able to use and evaluate outside sources of information, incorporate, and document source material and avoid plagiarism.
 - They will be able to produce 15-20 pages of finished, graded text, including a documented essay.

Major Topics to be Included

- Critical thinking
 - Selecting/Refining topics
 - Composing effective sentences and paragraphs
 - Developing, organizing, and supporting ideas
 - Investigating and evaluating resources
 - Incorporating appropriate resources into a text
 - Considering context, audience, and purpose
-

MACC considers a grade of “D” in ENG 111 to be a passing grade for degree requirements if a student maintains a minimum 2.0 GPA. The D grade in ENG 111 meets the prerequisite requirement for the second semester of composition – ENG 112. Faculty worked for several years to change this requirement through the Curriculum Committee, as internal statistics show that students who achieve a D grade in ENG 111 are rarely successful in ENG 112. However, the proposal was rejected; first by MACC’s Administrative Council, who did not want the requirement to be more difficult than the rest of the state, and later by the state council of deans. Moreover, students do need a C or higher to transfer to any partner institutions. Therefore, for many students, achieving a C or higher is a top priority.

MACC promotes academic freedom for ENG faculty. The course outcomes guide the work of the course and adjunct faculty are required to use certain common texts. Likewise, all faculty must assign 15 to 20 pages of polished writing and teach MLA-style citations. Full-time faculty members are exempt from using any specific texts and all faculty are free to assign any reading or writing assignments they choose. Based on a 2014 survey of MACC ENG faculty⁹, common types of writing assignments in ENG 111 are literacy or personal narrative essays, exploratory essays, annotated bibliographies, expository essays such as compare/contrast, rhetorical analyses, research papers, and argument/opinion/persuasive essays (“2014 Faculty”). With academic freedom, faculty approach course outcomes in a variety of different ways. The values of good writing that faculty espouse and how they impart those views to students is under discussion later in this chapter and further discussed in chapters 3-5.

⁹ This survey is an internal department document developed by two ENG instructors and was not collected as part of the data for this study.

Researcher Positionality

This is a qualitative research study that includes survey data and a case study approach including the collection of observations, interviews, and teaching and learning artifacts. As a student doing graduate work while also an employee at the research site, there were a unique set of affordances and ethical implications that needed to be considered when undertaking this research. One affordance of insider research is that it allows for “a new perspective, a hidden meaning, or a unique understanding that is not otherwise achievable by an outsider,” with outsider status “by its very nature, limiting in terms of understanding hidden meanings and achieving a deep level of trust” with participants (Labaree 103, 101). The insider knowledge of the culture and organizational structure of the college where I work, as well as my ability to know who to ask for information and materials, knowing that my status as a member of the group would facilitate access, was extremely helpful in making my research thorough and comprehensive. Additionally, I had a cordial relationship with each of my case study participants, allowing us easy rapport throughout the data collection phase. This openness allowed for access to data and insights an outsider may not have acquired. It also allowed the participants to speak in language that was familiar and comfortable to them, knowing that I would understand, and, crucially, be unlikely to misinterpret their meaning. All of this added richness to the data I gathered.

Despite these affordances, there were ethical considerations. The first were issues of power – as Creswell points out, the researcher must consider issues of power imbalance and vulnerable populations (44). In a college setting where I am a permanent faculty member studying those who work within the institution, I could be considered an authority figure by some at the institution. This relationship imbalance would be most acute if I worked with adjunct

faculty members, some of whom I have served above as a mentor or committee chair. In such cases of power imbalance, some faculty could hesitate to work with me, or I could attempt to take advantage of my authority to coerce participation in my data collection. I attempted to mitigate these power differentials in a variety of ways. The first was to allow any faculty member completing my survey to choose to include their name or to remain anonymous. This meant I could not track down faculty who had not completed the survey and ask them to complete it. Faculty were free to participate or ignore my request. Additionally, as I will outline when I discuss my case study selection process, I specifically chose to recruit full time faculty members; thus, those chosen were on equal footing with me in relation to our connection to the college. I was not a supervisor or subordinate to any. Adjunct faculty, whose anxiety over their role in the department was on display in their responses to my survey, were not considered for further study to relieve them of obligation to help me, though a number signaled a willingness to join in the case study. The selection of all participants was made with a mind towards equality of power in the researcher/participant relationship. Though I made this decision based on ethical considerations, inclusion of adjunct faculty would come with a set of affordances as well, such as better understanding issues of (in)equitable labor, as many adjuncts work multiple jobs. They would also provide a better understanding of experience-based practices, as many draw upon varied degree paths and professional experience when they enter the composition classroom.

During the data collection phase, there are also potential issues of power. Sometimes that relationship can be spatial – even the places where the researcher and participant sit during an interview can be fraught with power dynamics (Norton and Early 429-430). Simply configuring a space to be on equal footing with the participants, such as arranging a space where researcher and subject are facing each other from similar heights can “promote a greater comfort level

among participants” (429). Ironically, the need to enact such equalizing methods became irrelevant with the move to online learning during the 2020/2021 academic year. As I will explain in more detail below, interview and observation data were collected via Zoom video recording because of the pandemic, a practice that has changed the way I had to think about power and space. With all interviews conducted over Zoom, the issue of physical power was diminished. Each of the three participants and I participated in these conversations from home offices that appeared to be spaces that were converted for the purposes of online teaching and learning (for example, my at-home teaching space is a former guest bedroom-turned home office). The spaces these participants appeared in during interviews were the same spaces in which they conducted their Zoom-based lectures. As many teachers opened their homes in new and sometimes uncomfortable ways to their students and each other during pandemic learning, these interviews took place in spaces uniquely vulnerable to all four of us. While there was the potential for other disparities in this new medium, such as electronic connectivity issues, nothing of this nature was brought to my attention during this study.

Another issue of spatial power is related to the classroom observations that make up a large piece of this dataset. When this project was first envisioned, the course observations of the case study participants were intended to be in-person on the MACC campus. As such, I intended to take on the role of a participant observer with a peripheral membership role (Adler and Adler 36), which can have various ethical and power challenges (Ary et al. 443-44). However, the move to virtual learning meant that I was no longer acting with any sort of meaningful “observer” role. Because the faculty chosen for the case studies recorded their lectures on Zoom, I was able to “observe” these lectures after they were complete. One affordance of this method was the ability to stop the recording, rewind, listen again, and view a transcript of the class,

which made the process of transcribing important moments much simpler. An additional benefit was that I was not an active part of the class at all; I was not physically “present” in the Zoom space during the class and therefore did not influence the content of the course. Zoom, therefore, equalized the issues of spatial power that are traditional in a participant observation situation.

Another issue with participant observation is the Hawthorne effect, in which a subject changes their behavior because they know they are being observed and they want to act the way they are “expected” to act (Ary et al. 281). With the move to Zoom classes, two of the participants recorded their classes and I was able to choose which classes to observe. Therefore, they did not change their class materials to fit the observation and they were not aware until the time of the interview which classes I had observed. Shu, my ESL participant, did select classes for observation because she did not ordinarily record her classes. However, she once forgot to record an intended class meeting, so she simply recorded at the next opportunity, suggesting that she did not have a particular agenda in what she shared with me.

There are also effects of the switch to virtual learning on the classroom atmosphere. There is, in general, more limited participation by most students in this format – many do not speak up or turn on their cameras, which could speak to the disparate situations in which they find themselves learning from home. Because of this, I could not see the body language of the students. In one observed class, I was not able to “overhear” interactions during breakout room sessions because students were not all in a single space. However, these setbacks were minimal because of the study’s focus on the faculty participants rather than the students themselves.

A final issue with researching within the home institution is that of objectivity. Labaree argues that being an insider might simply make objectivity impossible: “The insider, already existing within the community, but re-entering the setting as an observer, possesses a

considerable amount of pre-constructed assumptions and knowledge about the community” (107). Creswell also notes that the researcher, as an insider, might be unable to clearly see “all dimensions of the experiences,” which could limit the development of themes when analyzing that dataset (139). This pitfall, however, is likely to strike any researcher, whether insider or outsider, when knowledge of the field of study is present. The other ways to mitigate this issue is through validating the data in a thoughtful way, which I will do later in this chapter when I address “validity” and “trustworthiness” and using “multiple perspectives that range over the entire spectrum of perspectives” (Creswell 122). I have attempted this very thing with the selection of the participants for my case study. By choosing a multiple case study with specific criteria, which I will lay out in “Data Collection Phase 2” below, I believe that my results attempt to substantially reduce issues of objectivity.

IRB Process

Because this research project took place at the institution where I am a full-time faculty member, I was required to receive IRB Exemption from both Old Dominion University (ODU), the institution where I study, and MACC, the institution under study. After obtaining IRB Exemption from ODU, I submitted my materials in the format required by MACC to complete the process. They wanted confirmation of my successful Exemption at ODU. Once I was granted IRB Exemption at MACC, my research began.

However, when the COVID-19 pandemic moved all learning to a virtual format in Spring 2020, I was asked to make modifications to my IRB package through ODU to reflect that data-gathering would be done virtually rather than in-person. This included the ability to observe recorded lectures and interview subjects over Zoom. When I attempted to make modifications to my IRB package at MACC, I was delayed considerably in obtaining information on requested

revisions due to the IRB administrator at MACC having recently retired. The interim administrator got in touch several months after my first contact attempt. This administrator requested that all students sign consent forms agreeing to be observed due to the change to Zoom observations, which could reveal the names of the students in the course. Because this was the middle of my data-gathering semester, the burden of this request was too great. The dean of my department intervened on my behalf and the requested revision to the IRB package was overturned. The dean made it clear to the interim administrator that I would not gather any personal information about the students. Likewise, because I am a faculty member at the college, she argued that I am already trusted with privileged student information, such as names, addresses, transcripts, and other personally sensitive data. I am expected and required to use that information in legally and morally appropriate ways as part of my job duties. Therefore, the small amount of privileged information during these observations, such as a student's name, would certainly be protected in ways equal to data collected during my ordinary job duties. Ultimately, MACC did not require a revision of the IRB package to continue my research.

Phases of Research Overview

This is a qualitative research study employing an emically-grounded approach that includes survey data and a case study approach to data collection, and uses the constant comparative method, often used in grounded theory, as well as Saldaña's coding methods for data analysis. An emic perspective is one that attempts to understand the lived experiences and perspectives of "how things work" by the participant, rather than through pre-established lenses or ideas. It requires research that values and prioritizes "open-ended" questions and attempts to establish how beliefs inform practice. It is a perception from which ideas of shared values and knowledge can be better understood (Fetterman 249-250). Both of my methods – survey and

case study data – build upon this open-ended perspective. In asking questions such as “what is good writing?”, my survey participants shared their perceptions without preestablished categories. This initial data then informed the direction of the case studies through the creation of interview questions to draw out further understanding of these “good” concepts and which, in turn, shaped the analysis of both the observations and the teaching and learning artifacts. Below, I articulate each phase of my data collection.

Data Collection Phase 1: Survey

This study’s data collection began with a qualitative survey of ENG and ESL faculty in the Spring 2020 semester. This survey attempted to gain an understanding of the values of good writing that the faculty in these departments hold. While survey data is traditionally thought of as a form of quantitative data, as Jansen points out, qualitative survey data can offer a unique perspective beyond the traditional counting of frequencies that a quantitative, often multiple-choice survey would provide. Jansen argues:

The qualitative type of survey does not aim at establishing frequencies, means or other parameters but at determining the *diversity* of some topic of interest within a given population. This type of survey does not count the number of people with the same characteristic (value of variable) but it establishes the meaningful variation (relevant dimensions and values) within that population.

The variations that Jansen describes as a central affordance of a qualitative survey were particularly meaningful in answering the questions that this project set out to answer. For example, as Arlene Fink points out, open-ended questions “allow for unanticipated answers” which help to “describe the world as [the participant sees] it rather than as the questioner does” (17), which works well for my emically-focused project. Therefore, I wrote my survey questions

with a mind towards allowing participants to provide longform answers with their own language so I could use In-vivo coding (Saldaña 74). The broad set of questions I developed (which can be found in Appendix A) were applicable to any instructor in ENG or ESL and were written with a mind towards minimizing a “multiple choice” restriction of ideas while gaining an abundance of authentic terminology (Braun et al. 251).

To begin this study, I attended an ENG faculty meeting where I spoke with attending faculty about my project, the data I was seeking to collect, and noted that any willing faculty could complete the survey anonymously. Anyone who was interested in or open to the idea of participating beyond the scope of the survey could include their name on the survey. Those who included their names would be considered, based on the answers they provided on the survey, for the larger case study. In addition to speaking with ENG faculty, I sent a write-up of my project and request to the associate dean of the ESL department who read the information to faculty and similarly asked them to help me complete this research. I could not attend this meeting as it ran concurrently with the ENG meeting. Faculty were further enticed into helping complete the survey with the opportunity to win one of four \$10 Starbucks gift cards.

While I hoped for as many “named” surveys as possible, so I could draw from that data for my larger case study, I wanted to keep the opportunity for anonymity in this survey because I suspected some faculty would feel more comfortable expressing their ideas and feelings if they did not feel judged or “watched” (Braun et al. 252). I ultimately received eight anonymous responses, about 25 percent of the total.

In the survey, I posed questions about the faculty’s background such as their education, years teaching, courses taught, and perceptions of pedagogical strengths. Additional questions were related to three broad categories: What do you define as “good writing,” and how do you

prioritize and practice these qualities in your classroom? And, if you work with MLWs, what are the strengths and weaknesses that these students have in your classroom, generally? The final set of questions attempted to better understand how faculty perceived the relationship between ESL and ENG and if they felt there was any need to strengthen such a bond. These questions aimed to gather enough data to answer each of the research questions I posed.

Because of the open-ended nature of these questions, I knew the survey would be time-intensive for faculty. However, one affordance of online survey collection is the ability of the participants to complete the survey over the course of several weeks, rather than in one sitting (Braun and Clarke). Therefore, faculty had the time to be thoughtful rather than having to rush through, providing limited or incomplete answers. Though I am not certain which instructors made use of this affordance, nearly all surveys were completed with responses to each question.

I made several calls for survey responses in Spring 2020, and data trickled in over the course of several months. By May 2020, when I closed the survey, I had 25 responses from ENG faculty members and 9 responses from ESL faculty, from a mix of full- and part-time employees. This represents a response rate of about 40% for ENG faculty and about 25% for ESL, making this data illustrative rather than generalizable. During the early part of summer 2020, I started to analyze the data using In-vivo coding. I wanted to capture a true sense of the ideas and values of the faculty members in their own words without any presumption as to the themes that might emerge (Glaser and Strauss 33-34). This itself presented some interesting challenges. As Braun et al. point out, one unique aspect of qualitative survey data is that “participants have more control over the research process.” If they want to “answer back” to the researcher in ways that are less useful, that is their prerogative (253). I found that in some cases during In-vivo coding, this was indeed an issue. For example, one respondent answered “They think I am too hard on

them” when posed a question about the strengths and weaknesses of their student writers. Such responses are difficult to analyze qualitatively. However, nearly all respondents were thoughtful and addressed the questions fully.

After doing this initial coding, as I will describe further under “Data Analysis,” I came up with initial “concepts” of interest to investigate further, and at that point, I moved onto the next phase of data collection. I later collected survey responses from two of the case study participants who had not filled out the survey initially; however, these results were not used as part of the initial In-vivo codes. This survey data was used to help develop questions that were posed during the case study interviews, such as interrogating further about the participants’ educational backgrounds and teaching philosophies. These interviews will be described in detail later in this chapter.

Data Collection Phase 2: Selection and Recruitment of Participants

The second research method used in this project is a case study approach. A case study is “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context” (Yin 13). This often includes the use of an individual (or several individuals) to represent a group as a whole; research questions that are answered within “the natural context,” such as studying the teacher within the natural workplace; and a wide variety of types of data gathered which brings rich context to the study (Hancock and Algozzine 15-16). A case study approach was the “best plan” for answering the research questions I set out to investigate (Merriam 41). I believe that questions about the disciplinary division of labor are worth studying, and through my chosen cases, something important can be learned (Ary et al. 454). The insights taken from my participants can help to advance the knowledge of our field and, if/when transferrable (as

discussed later under “trustworthiness”), can help to improve teacher or department practice (Merriam 41).

All case studies are bounded – “fixed in time and place” with “identifiable confines” (Birnbaum et al. 192). This case study involves the use of a “multiple bounded system,” or multiple cases, as well as a “single program study,” (Creswell 73) in which three individuals were selected for their work within the same division (though separate departments) at MACC. The decision to choose multiple cases for study was a deliberate design choice, intended to understand hypothetically contrasting results (i.e.: the disciplinary division of labor) “but for predictable reasons” (Yin 47). Three cases do not lead to strongly generalizable results, which Creswell notes is “a term that holds little meaning for most qualitative researchers” (76); however, choosing “representative cases” is one way in which a qualitative study can attempt to seek generalizability (74), as can attempting to identify trends between the chosen cases (Yin 60-62), as I have done here. However, only replication of this study at other institutions or in different contexts can indicate true generalizability.

I began selection and recruitment of participants for the case study portion of my research in January 2021. Multiple cases, as defined above, were necessary to this study for several reasons. The first was that examining an institutional divide between ESL and ENG was going to naturally require a minimum of two participants – one from each department; in ENG this meant someone who taught ENG 111; in ESL this meant someone who taught ESL 51. I also decided to add a third case study, examining an instructor who works in both ENG (teaching ENG 111) and ESL (teaching ESL 51), which I refer to as a “bridge” case, though the term “bridge” reflects their professional position at MACC rather than scholarly experience. Using a form of purposeful sampling (Birnbaum et al. 193-94; Creswell 125-29), I hoped to select “individuals

and sites for study because they can purposefully inform an understanding of the research problem and central phenomenon in the study” (Creswell 125). More specifically, this was a form of criterion sampling (127) in which each case met specific criterion for selection – that being the ESL/ENG /bridge criterion. That criterion was chosen to help me answer the central research questions posed in this dissertation – to reach a more informed understanding if, at MACC, there are important differences between the values held by ESL and ENG faculty members, and how those resonate in the teaching practices of our faculty.

My initial intention was to use the survey data to determine which faculty were available, willing, and a good fit for the criterion I had selected. However, this effort did not go as smoothly as I had anticipated. While I still used criterion sampling, I did have to go beyond the scope of survey responses for two of the three cases. I had a choice of two full-time ENG faculty who had provided their names and taught only college composition courses, and I ended up choosing a faculty member, Megan, who expressed that she had years of experience working with MLWs in the classroom, but without a linguistics background through her education, which was in teaching English writing and literature. Regarding the other two cases, I did approach someone who completed the survey and who taught both ESL and ENG courses, but she declined to participate. I had many wonderful survey choices for ESL instructors, but none of them were teaching ESL 51, the course I hoped to study, during the term I intended to collect case study data.

As a result of this initial setback, I reached out to the associate deans in both ENG and ESL for advice on good selections. It quickly became apparent that there was one excellent additional choice for the bridge faculty: Lee. He was someone who worked extensively in both departments and taught the requisite classes. He is dual-credentialed in these departments with

MA-linguistics and MFA-creative writing degrees. The ESL selection was based on one of two faculty members teaching ESL 51 in Spring 2021. This selection, Shu, ended up being an excellent fit because she had many years in the ESL field beyond her experience working at MACC. Both choices were approached, and both agreed to participate.

ENG Selection – Megan

Megan came to MACC after years of teaching in secondary education. She has a bachelor's degree in English, teaching in middle and high schools for seven years before beginning a master's degree in the Teaching of Writing and Literature. After time off to have a family, Megan found that her teaching certificate had lapsed, so she started working at MACC, where she was an adjunct for six years. The year she participated in this case study, she was in her second year of full-time employment at MACC. Megan does not teach literature at MACC despite her educational background, but teaches ENG 111 and 112, which she enjoys because of the variety of material and assignments she has the freedom to change each semester. She noted that while her pedagogical training in her bachelor's and master's programs were helpful and enjoyable, she found her experience in the classroom, through "trial and error" was where she had learned the most about how to help her students become better writers. She also articulated a teaching philosophy that encompassed transferability of her course and the desire to teach students that writing is a skill they will use for the rest of their lives. She also aimed to be approachable and welcoming in the classroom, making students feel comfortable in their abilities to tackle the subject. She uses copious models, templates, and examples to help students feel the work of ENG 111 is manageable and that they can succeed.

ESL Selection – Shu

Shu has been teaching for over forty years. Her bachelor's degree is in English, and she taught high school English and social studies for three years before moving to China, where she began teaching English as a foreign language. After doing so for two years, she went on to study Chinese at a university for two years before returning to the U.S. to begin work on a master's degree. After receiving a master's degree in linguistics, during which time she was also teaching ESL at the local public schools, she returned to China for two more years to teach. She then returned to the US to begin work on a PhD. After some indecision about which program of study to enter, she decided that linguistics was the best fit. She balanced PhD coursework while also teaching for the local public schools, sometimes full-time and sometimes part-time over the course of seven or eight years. Once she earned her PhD, she wanted to stay in the local area where she had been living for many years, but no linguistics positions were available at the area universities. MACC's ESL department was hiring, and she knew that she enjoyed working with adult international students, so she thought it would be a good fit. Because she is forever a student at heart, Shu is now taking classes towards a master's degree in English, hoping to dual credential at MACC so she can also teach ENG courses. Though she did not go into detail on how these courses have influenced her ESL instruction practices, she did mention assigning world literature that she read in her own coursework to see how her students would react. Shu prides herself on building friendships and long-lasting relationships with students. She calls her teaching style "eclectic," putting her finger on the pulse of each class to see if they prefer lecture or cooperative learning, tailoring the class to their needs. She said that after 40 years in the classroom, she's less focused on theory and more on identifying what each student needs, teaching them as individuals and moving them towards successful writing.

Bridge Selection – Lee

Lee's educational background started with an undergraduate degree in theatre. This involved a lot of script analysis and was very literary in nature. His master's degree was in linguistics with a certificate in teaching English as a second language. He spent some years teaching ESL at a private language institute and working as an adjunct at MACC and another area university. Shortly after beginning a PhD in linguistics, he dropped the program because it was not a good fit, and he instead returned to an MFA program to study his "other love," creative writing. When he was hired full time at MACC, he taught ESL courses in a variety of formats, including hybrid and online courses. He transitioned into teaching in the ENG department after getting the opportunity to teach a hybrid ENG 111-ENF 3 course, and because he was dual-credentialed, he moved into teaching additional ENG writing and creative writing courses. As of Fall 2021, he is in a full-time position in the ENG department, moving away from ESL courses for the first time due to declining enrollments and greater competition for courses among ESL instructors. Because of his extensive experience in both departments, teaching a variety of courses, I refer to him as a "bridge" instructor, though this term is entirely my own and is intended to reflect his experience as an instructor in these two departments rather than connote scholarly training within the fields of ESL writing and first-year composition. Lee's teaching philosophy involves mentoring and mentor texts; for example, he will write a paper live in front of a class so they can see how he moves through the process. He values making his course materials multimodal so students can see and experience things outside of a text. He also sees grammar instruction as an important part of his job – "wed[ding] grammar instruction with whatever content we're trying to achieve." He sees the differences in grammar in a narrative

versus a comparative essay and works with students to find the grammar that suits the work they are doing for a particular assignment.

Data Collection Phase 3: Interviews, Observations, and Learning Artifacts

The primary affordance of the case study approach is the flexibility it offers to gather many different types of data. For example, Yin points out that it is common to collect not only interviews, but also observations, artifacts, and documents (85-86). Therefore, case studies both offer and encourage the opportunity to gather and examine many useful pieces of data emically. Likewise, case studies allow data to be continually gathered, moving in and out of the research site (Stake 53), affording opportunities to add to the data set whenever necessary, such as when new categories emerge, or the researcher is seeking to reach saturation (Glaser and Strauss 61). I gathered many forms of data from my three case study participants. This included audio recordings of interviews with each of the participants, as well as video recordings with transcripts for class observations, artifacts such as textbooks, class handouts, essay models, readings, and assignment sheets, links to videos and websites. I also kept an extensive field note journal for memoing during each stage of the data collection.

Interviews

For each of my case study subjects, I conducted two formal interviews of about 70-90 minutes. My questions were focused, “following a certain set of questions derived from the case study protocol” (Yin 90), but I was open to allowing the interview to go in an unexpected direction and probed further into areas that seemed to be of interest to each individual participant (Hatch 94). The first of the two interviews with each participant was a more general interview, aiming to get at questions about the education, work history, and general philosophy of the participant that identified how they positioned themselves in their field and as a teacher. The

questions for each participant were almost identical, with minor changes as the interview was conducted. The basic set of questions asked to each participant can be found in Appendix B.

The second interview was much more focused on the content of the class observations I had conducted. I wanted to understand the choices each instructor made regarding assignments, handouts and materials, textbook readings, and outcomes and goals for the class and sequence of the work as it was positioned during the semester. I wrote a basic set of questions I planned to ask each participant, but post-observation I would immediately write the additional questions relevant to that class meeting. Therefore, each of the second interviews was unique. I have included the basic questions asked to each participant in Appendix C, though questions did vary as part of the open-ended nature of these conversations.

Hatch argues that interviewees should avoid being repetitive in their questions (103). While I never repeated any questions, either during the same interview or between interviews, I did attempt to ask all the questions I had planned, even if I felt that they had answered one of the questions in a previous response. This was to see if the participant answered in a predictable way or if they added additional information for study. For example, when I asked Megan about her teaching philosophy, she articulated a desire to help students feel they can tackle any challenge in her classroom, citing her frequent use of models and templates. Later, I asked about her pedagogical strategies in the classroom, waiting to see if she would repeat and describe more about her use of models and templates. When she did reiterate this strategy, it helped to reinforce emerging patterns along with additional valuable context and information.

One of the hidden issues with interviews can be, as Creswell describes it, issues of “power and resistance” during the interview, with the interviewer having “hidden agendas” and the interviewee lacking full consent or forthrightness (140). As addressed earlier, I selected these

participants with a mind to mitigate these power dynamics. Due to the collegial relationship I had with these faculty members, these interviews were often more like friendly conversations than formal interviews. This conversational tone led to occasional unplanned questions that provided additional insight into the interests and experiences of the participant and added useful data.

With written consent, I recorded each interview on the application Otter.ai, which also transcribed the interviews automatically. Due to occasional lag or sound-quality issues, I did edit these transcripts when transcription mistakes occurred.

Observations

As mentioned previously, for Megan and Lee, I was able to select the classes I wanted to view through Canvas, MACCs Learning Management System. Shu selected the classes she would record, as recording classes was not part of her usual teaching repertoire over Zoom. Because Lee and Shu's classes met for about 150 minutes each, I watched recordings of two classes for those participants. Because Megan had "normal" length classes – about 75 minutes, I watched a total of four classes so I could observe a similar amount of material.

Because the class materials for the day's lecture were on Canvas, I was able to view the materials the students were using during class both before and as I viewed the recording. I could prepare for the class as the students would and come into the lecture with some idea of the content of the class meeting, which helped to focus my field notes and memos. As I took notes during observations, I had in mind "sensitizing concepts," which J. Amos Hatch refers to as the "important frames of reference within disciplines and paradigms ... that can be used to focus observation" (81). Even with the ability to rewind and view a transcript of the class, taking notes on each moment is neither possible nor useful. Because of the constant comparative method of data analysis that I used for this project, I had already created several core concepts during the

survey collection phase. Therefore, during observations, I attempted to understand how their classes aligned with these established concepts. However, Hatch also mentions that the most important part of taking observation notes is “[f]iguring out what matters to participants and paying attention to expressions of what matters (82). Therefore, I also attempted to discern and record what was important to each faculty member beyond the scope of the established concepts.

Artifacts

Artifacts were an important part of the data for this study (Yin 96). Because I could not observe every class meeting that each teacher conducted, collecting materials from their classes was central to better understanding the values of each case study participant. It was particularly useful to see how these materials aligned with their statements during class observations and interviews. The materials included handouts, links to websites and videos, assignment sheets, textbook readings, short stories and readings, models, templates, and practice activities. These were assigned to the class as either homework or class work. Because of the crucial use of Canvas during the semester due to online learning, I was able to download and save all posted class materials by interacting with the instructor’s Canvas page at least once a week, searching for new materials and documenting written instructions. Artifacts were most useful in tandem with course observations and interviews because I could see how the materials were being used in context and how the participant framed those materials as part of the larger course structure.

Field notes

Due to the electronic nature of my interactions with my participants – the Zoom recorded lectures and the Otter.ai recorded interviews, I was able to take my time with my case materials, rather than frantically writing while in the field. I was able to record the actual words of the participants (Hatch 83), which was very useful for In-vivo coding This allowed me to take two

sets of notes in parallel – the first set was my research journal/memos – the thoughts I had during the observations and interviews while those were taking place. These contained my questions, ideas, confusions, experiences, and anything I thought was relevant (Hatch 87). I often color-coded these when I had reason to believe I had particularly interesting or pertinent questions that I needed to return to, either through the literature or in interviews and observations. These entries were always dated so I could recall when insights and daily events occurred.

The second set of field notes were directly relevant to my data analysis, as outlined below. These raw field notes (Hatch 82) were where I kept and started coding each interaction with my case study participants. These raw notes involved highlighting and sorting the initial codes, using the constant comparative method to organize and solidify my core categories. It was through a combination of raw field notes and my research journal that I created the final concepts for this project, bringing the total number of concepts up to eight.

Data Analysis

My dataset was analyzed using Glaser and Strauss' constant comparative method, as well as Saldaña's coding methods for qualitative researchers. For the first round of coding, I used both initial coding, in which I noted "possible or developing category[ies]" emerging from the data (Saldaña 81) and In-vivo coding as I drew directly from the participant's language choices (74) as I searched for categories. Coding "is the pivotal link between collecting data and developing an emergent theory to explain these data" (Charmaz 45-46), and using these two coding methods, I began to organize data inductively, without thought to preexisting codes or the ideas might emerge (Creswell 153). After the survey data was analyzed during this initial round of coding, I had several categories that appeared to be emerging.

I continued to gather data, such as interviews, observations, and artifacts, and I used the constant comparative method to incorporate that new data into the existing set of initial categories that were emerging (Glaser and Strauss 108-110). Constant comparison is when data is both coded and analyzed simultaneously, allowing the researcher to refine concepts and eventually develop a theory (Taylor et al. 156). During this phase of my initial coding round, I continued to find reinforcement for my initial categories and noted several additional categories that were emerging. I memoed about these emerging categories as I saw them becoming more relevant as data collection continued.

I also included a second stage of coding, focused coding, in which I looked through the data to see which codes were the most frequent and significant (Saldaña 155). These frequent and significant codes ended up fitting well with the categories that I had observed developing during these two stages of coding. There were eight categories that ultimately moved towards saturation and were worth retaining. Saturation, an important part of the constant comparative method, is reached when “no additional data are being found whereby the sociologist can develop properties of the category” (Glaser and Strauss 61). While I was able to reach saturation on these eight categories, I also refined the data during this second round of coding by throwing out items that did not fit my categories well enough, and, in one case, entirely throwing out a category that did not reach saturation. As Glaser and Strauss note, the constant comparative method does not require “consideration of *all* available data” (104). Therefore, during this round, I threw out some of the data that felt weak or tenuous for a particular category and did not fit well anywhere else but was not saturated enough to deserve its own individual category. An example of this process of moving from In-vivo codes to categories is in Table 3.

Table 3*Example of Select Codes*

Interview Data	In-Vivo/Initial Code	Focused Code	Final Category
“[There are] many possible verbs you can use. You just have to use the right form of the verb...”	“have to use the right form”	Form correctness	Accuracy/Correctness
“...we're just really focused on trying to help them, you know, assess, ‘What are my individual grammar challenges? How do I eliminate those from my writing?’”	“eliminate” “grammar challenges”	Grammatical correctness	
“And then I will follow up with suggestions like, ‘you need to be proofreading more...’ [and I suggest peer review] ‘because you might not find all the errors.’”	“Proofreading” for “errors”	Error elimination	

In addition to these methods, I also attempted a word cloud analysis of the most prevalent one hundred words spoken by each of the three participants during the interviews. However, this ultimately did not provide meaningful insight into the data due to the decontextualized nature of these words, showing the importance of the In-vivo coding, which examines language within the context of the conversation. The three word clouds have been included in Appendix D, E, and F. Two prominent words stand out in particular: “know” and “think.” “Think” represented participants talking about their values and practices, while “know” appeared to be a common verbal filler in the form of “you know.”

From here forward, I will refer to these eight categories as “concepts.” These concepts articulate what the ENG and ESL instructors value as qualities of good writing and begin to help me answer my research questions. Below, in Table 4, I will name each concept and give one example from the data of language that articulates the meaningfulness of that concept as a form of good writing. I will explore these concepts in greater detail in subsequent chapters. However, I am not able to cover and compare each of these eight concepts in depth due to the intensive nature of such an endeavor¹⁰. As Stake points out, it is “important to spend the best analytic time on the best data. Full coverage is impossible, equal attention to all data is not a civil right” (84-85). Therefore, as part of answering the research questions at the heart of this dissertation, in the three chapters that follow, I will focus only on the concepts that my data analysis showed to be the most important values of good writing to each discipline within the context of investigating a disciplinary division of labor.

¹⁰ The concepts Vocabulary and Logical/Critical Thinking reached saturation. However, because of insignificant disciplinary differences, these concepts will not be discussed in chapters 3-5.

Table 4*Final Categories (“Concepts”)*

Concept	Explanation¹¹	Example from Data
Accuracy/ Correctness	While this concept can and does mean a form of grammatical or usage accuracy, it also means the ability to follow directions, to fix errors, and to follow models and templates to create writing that is done the “right” way.	The job of an ESL teacher is helping a student “recognize [their] major challenges so [they] can correct the errors made.”
Clarity	This concept can overlap with Accuracy/Correctness. To some instructors it represents an ability to write clear and accurate sentences or comprehensibly organized paragraphs (able to be understood by an audience) while to others it has a rhetorical meaning, such as the ability to bring vividness to a piece of writing.	“[Student writers] have to have a concept of clarity, unity, coherence, development. ... [I]f students can achieve a degree of confidence in their writing and their ability to express or communicate their ideas clearly, it really ... positions them well to succeed in more academic courses.”
Organization	This concept is directly relevant to the ability of a writer to create a logical path for the reader to follow through a piece of writing. This can mean the use of a five-paragraph essay style for organization of a piece of writing but can also mean the use of a topic sentence/evidence/commentary paragraph model.	“I do spend a lot of time talking not only about, like, just organizing a paper, but organizing a paragraph, like, paragraph structure, and... some of them haven't given that any thought. They just stopped paragraphs when they think they're long.”

¹¹ All provided explanations here reflect the evaluation of the data rather than my personal definitions of these concepts.

Table 4 Continued

Concept	Explanation	Example from Data
Evidence Use	This concept incorporates the use of outside evidence, including source and citation practices, but it also considers an expanded definition of what constitutes forms of evidence or “development.”	“So, ... if you're going to start making those kinds of big statements, you're going to have to support it with something. If you say that online learning is more effective than in-person learning - based on what, okay?”
Logical/ Critical Thinking	This concept includes the ability to think critically about a particular source, such as responding to ideas with ideas and recognizing and avoiding logical fallacies within one’s writing.	“[Writing] the comparison/contrast [essay], you know ... it's something that we do every day, you know, we're constantly comparing things. And it is a ... life skill to be able to compare it and reach a conclusion.”
Audience/ Purpose	More broadly, this concept means “the writing situation,” though audience and purpose considerations were the most expressed. This concept primarily addresses the academy and instructor as an audience and the purpose of writing as transferrable skills.	“...another plus to adding detail to your story is that you're looking for ways that you can allow your reader to become a part of what you want them to see - what you want them to learn about. So, the more detail you can provide, the better it is for us as readers...”
Vocabulary	This concept represents the ability of students to use vocabulary that is both idiomatic and understandable to the reader. It can also mean the ability to transfer thoughts into English using the “right” words or to use “academic” vocabulary that will be respected by the academy as audience.	“[Student writers must learn] how to present their ideas in a way with vocabulary that actually communicates what they're thinking.”

Table 4 Continued

Concept	Explanation	Example from Data
Originality/ Self-Expression	This concept means bringing individuality and “voice” into a piece of writing. This can contribute rhetorically to audience and purpose considerations or be ideological in nature but can also add simply to the “development” of a piece of writing.	“...we should encourage students, when relevant, to share their own experiences ... For your audience, it's just more interesting. The students, when they're sharing in groups, are more interested, they're like, ‘Wow, that really happened to you?’ and then suddenly they're interested in the rest of the research.”

Although Tables 3 and 4 may make it appear that I organized each piece of data neatly within a single concept, this is inaccurately simplistic. Many pieces of data – from a sentence to a single word – fit within multiple categories. The example in Table 4 for originality/self-expression would overlap with audience/purpose. I also had an earlier 9th concept, Process Writing, that was both saturated and relevant. However, because of its centrality as a *way* of writing rather than a specific value, particularly within writing studies, this concept has become diffused throughout these concepts rather than being examined discretely. Rather than being a defect of this process, it is through this messiness and complexity that I came to understand my data, my concepts, and which were most important in informing what “good writing” looks like to each department and the effect on the disciplinary division of labor. Further detail on these overlaps will be central to my discussions in chapters 3-5.

Validity

To establish validity in this study, I engaged in triangulation (Creswell 208; Denzin 297; Yin 97-99), in which I selected unique cases to study, therefore looking “across cases” (Birnbaum et al. 193), as well as collecting data from “multiple and different sources ... to provide corroborating evidence” (Creswell 208). Yin argues that triangulation of data contributes to a “convincing and accurate” study and offers greater reliability (98-100). The data in this study included interviews, observations, and a wide variety of artifacts including textbooks, online course materials, and handouts. I also took copious memos after each participant interaction and during the data analysis phase, allowing for greater transparency and accuracy as I sought to reach saturation during the final stage of coding. An additional part of my analysis was, of course, the use of the constant comparative method, which allowed me to move in and out of the research site, adding additional data to triangulate and validate (or invalidate) my initial observations (Stake 53). Searching for such consistency (or finding inconsistencies) offers “deeper insight” into the phenomena being studied, strengthening credibility (Patton 248). Thus, each additional piece of data strengthened my interpretation of the overall concepts that were emerging.

In addition to validity, I worked toward rigor. It is becoming more common to focus on inter-rater or inter-coder reliability in quantitative studies as a verification of rigor. However, such practice has specious efficacy in qualitative research. As Janice Morse argues:

Maintaining a simplified coding schedule for the purposes of defining categories for an inter-rater reliability check will maintain the coding scheme at a superficial level. It will simplify the research to such an extent that all of the richness attained from insight will be lost. Ironically, it forcibly removes each piece of data from the context in which each

coding decisions should be made. The study will become respectively reliable with an inter-rater reliability score, but this will be achieved at the cost of losing all the richness and creativity inherent in analysis, ultimately producing a superficial product. (446)

Essentially, a practice of inter-rater reliability forces a new coder, without the same knowledge of the data, to code in a similar way. This expectation leads to a dearth of meaningful results in a qualitative study.

In an effort to avoid an outcome where the interpretive agency in analyzing my data rested on a second coder, I focused on several other and equally valid forms of rigor, including an “active personal engagement with the data” during the coding process, as well as providing thick descriptions (see “trustworthiness” below), noting examples of raw data and my interpretations, triangulation and reaching data saturation (O’Connor and Joffe 4), while practicing the reflexivity inherent in the reporting of this dissertation, allowing the reader to co-evaluate the rigor of this work.

Trustworthiness

It is important to acknowledge that with most case study approaches, results must be seen as “a slice of life” rather than definitively as a “whole” (Merriam 42). However, I have attempted to establish trustworthiness in my results by providing thick descriptions of the participants of the case study as I describe the relevant concepts that were developed during data collection. Through my descriptions in the chapters that follow, I attempt to describe not only the concepts that emerged from the data, but also why they are meaningful within the context of the research site (Geertz 6-7). The chapters that follow were written with the reader in mind – so the descriptions of the observations, interactions, and the emerging ideas resonate with the reader and allows for thick meaning (Ponterotto 543). If thick descriptions are done well, the reader can

determine transferability of the concepts based on characteristics of the participants as described (Creswell 209). Therefore, the thick descriptions that follow in the next several chapters attempt to provide transparent and meaningful insights.

Conclusion

The methodology described in this chapter has led to the collection of data which, through analysis, has led to some interesting insights that will become the focus of the next three chapters. Going forward, I will first articulate the concepts that are most important to those trained and teaching in ESL, focusing on the survey data and my case study work with Shu. I will then articulate the concepts that are the most important to those trained and teaching in ENG, focusing on the survey data and my case study work with Megan. Finally, I will look at Lee as my “bridge” case and examine which concepts most frequently inform his practice and what someone at the intersection of these two fields can tell us about whether a disciplinary division still exists. Throughout these chapters I will weave in my literature review as I attempt to analyze and contextualize the results of this study. Finally, I consider whether such differences matter and in what ways we could better build bridges between our departments to best support our student writers.

CHAPTER III

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE VALUES – “BUT YOU KNOW, TO BE REALLY HONEST, THE NITTY GRITTY FOR ESL IS IN THE GRAMMAR.”

In chapters 3-5, I present findings from my interrogation into the values of good writing with Shu, the ESL instructor; Megan, the ENG instructor; and Lee, my “bridge” case, respectively. I specifically seek to answer my first and second research questions, organizing my initial findings based on concepts that emerged from these interviews and the survey results. These research questions ask, “What do the instructors who teach ESL and those who teach composition value, respectively, when teaching writing?” and “Why do the instructors in each department, as representatives of their field, value what they value?” In other words, with these two questions I am trying to learn “What is the interplay of theory and practice here?”

In this chapter, I will address ESL values. As I noted in chapter 2, there is a messiness that blurs the boundaries of each concept that I present; however, these overlaps and connections will be central to examining how the ESL faculty articulate and understand the principles of good writing and, therefore, the disciplinary division of labor.

As I examine each concept, I will also weave in literature to help explain why these concepts might present as acutely important to each individual discipline. This, too, is invariably messy. While some of the literature in this chapter comes from journals such as *TESOL Journal*, which primarily addresses practitioners who teach ESL courses, there is other scholarship specifically addressing L2 writing such as the *Journal of Second Language Writing*. As Silva and Leki argue, L2 writing is “at the crossroads” of writing studies and applied linguistics scholarship (1), so scholarship drawn from this set of experts is likely to cross disciplinary lines by its very nature, drawing from both applied linguistics and writing studies theories. This also

means that scholars who focus on applied linguistics (which aligns more with Shu’s own educational background) may have perspectives quite different from L2 writing scholars. I have attempted to understand and articulate a broad view of scholarship to better understand the work these instructors are doing, but this undertaking is complex.

To provide an example of how this messiness is inherent to a discussion of ESL/L2 writing¹² instruction, when looking at a piece published in *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, a solidly “ESL” journal, written by applied linguist Andrew Schenck, which I reference later in this chapter, his own citations include cross-disciplinary work from *The Modern Language Journal* and the *Journal of Second Language Writing*. Another name in this chapter, Christine Tardy, also demonstrates this boundary: she has published in *TESOL Quarterly*, *Journal of Second Language Writing* (previously serving as an editor for this journal), and *College Composition and Communication*. She teaches undergraduate ENG courses but also works with M.A. and PhD scholars training to teach TESOL. She, therefore, speaks to a wide variety of scholars across multiple fields. Because ESL/L2 writing has become both cross-disciplinary *and* distinct over the last several decades, literature from a diverse array of publications cannot be ignored if a representative picture of ESL/L2 writing is to be given.

Like Tardy, Matsuda would likely consider himself someone who is at the intersection of several fields – he publishes in TESOL-specific, L2, and writing studies journals. However, he himself has said it best: “...since what we refer to as the ‘field of second language writing’ is not

¹² “ESL writing,” as Matsuda used in his 1999 piece, represents writing instruction based upon a primarily linguistics/TESOL-focused background. The term L2 writing is more interdisciplinary, drawing from applied linguistics and composition studies (Silva and Leki 5), and therefore is not as reflective of the educational backgrounds of Shu and her colleagues in this ESL department. However, because both ESL writing and L2 writing are frequently used by scholars across these fields and I draw from the literature of both, I will refer to these fields as ESL/L2 writing.

a physical reality but a set of socially shared (and negotiated) assumptions about a constellation of intellectual activities, any characterization of its status and development inevitably constitutes participation in the discursive construction of the field” (“Process and Post-Process” 75). The boundary between applied linguistics and writing studies is inherently artificial, and those who think and write about ESL/L2 writing become integral to the ESL/L2 writing conversation, even if they are not trained solely in the narrow field of applied linguistics. My literature reflects that messiness.

With that said, I have tried to use scholarship, as much as possible, that reflects the perspectives of those educated and/or active in a linguistics/applied linguistics/TESOL discipline, even if those writers are writing to a diverse audience. Or, as it may also be, being read by diverse audiences. When cross-disciplinary writers show up here, such as Tardy or Matsuda, I have attempted to use work that would address an audience, who, like Shu and her colleagues, would be teaching adult MLW students to write. Therefore, the literature I have used in this chapter attempts to contextualize where the field of ESL/L2 writing is right now and how my surveyed faculty members and Shu fit with the current practices of ESL/L2 writing, not simply “ESL instruction” (reading, writing, listening, speaking) as a whole. With that said, I will also attempt to make apparent how Shu views her own connection to ESL/L2 writing and applied linguistics scholarship and how this interacts with her values and practices.

Overview of Values

Before I begin an in-depth examination of ESL values, including relevant collected data, I will provide a brief snapshot of the major values that appear relevant and then dive into these in greater depth in this chapter.

Shu and her ESL colleagues place a strong value on academically based approaches to writing instruction, with a focus on English for Academic Purposes (EAP). EAP places the focus of ESL writing courses on a more scientific footing (Santos 11), with the expectation that students will learn structured forms that can seamlessly be transferred to other academic coursework (Silva and Leki 6). While these perceptions will be interrogated in this chapter, they can be seen in the practices that Shu and her colleagues express excitement about through their teaching and in their responses to my questions.

One of the major values that these instructors hold is for sentence-level writing instruction. Many instructors present the concepts of clarity and accuracy/correctness as two of their primary values. These values are present through grammar correction activities that occur during class time, and a focus on sentence-level edits when revising written work, placing significant emphasis on corrections rather than overall revisions and considering a work globally. How and why this value appears to be of primary importance in this department will be discussed later in this chapter, though it is worth noting here that a primary pedagogical focus on language instruction is common in the field of ESL/L2 writing (Larsen-Freeman 263-64) with accuracy being considered by some scholars to be “essential” in ESL writing (Schenck 167).

Additionally, faculty appear to value prescriptive forms of organization. Shu and other faculty mention that students quickly understand the assigned organizational styles, such as compare/contrast or cause/effect essays. As described by faculty, these prescriptive forms help to take the cognitive load off this stage of the writing process, therefore prioritizing linguistic concerns, with a faculty perception that students will not receive additional grammar instruction outside of the ESL class. Additionally, these organizational styles are often viewed positively because they are seen as highly transferrable (Atkinson and Ramanathan 560). Therefore,

classroom activities, such as fitting evidence to the organizational style, takes strong precedence over organization based on content.

Source use is seen as unimportant in the ESL writing class. There is a longstanding perception and backlash, as discussed later in this chapter, to the idea that MLWs tend to plagiarize more than native English-speaking writers (Grabe and Zhang; Merkel; Pecorari; Yoshimura). Shu believes that a student tendency towards plagiarism when using sources is an important reason to save such instruction for college composition rather than the ESL writing class. Therefore, students are discouraged from using outside sources in her class. Evidence is based on life experience and knowledge, which Shu believes has the positive benefit of students sharing cultural experiences, one of her personal values for ESL writing instruction. Although many ESL/L2 writing scholars advocate on behalf of source use instruction in the ESL writing class (Grabe and Zhang; Liu et al.; Pecorari and Pteric), as discussed later in this chapter, a lack of source use instruction is common in practice (Lee "A Comparison" 373-74).

Finally, although genre instruction is quite common in ESL/L2 writing scholarship (Costino and Hyon; Hyland "Genre Pedagogy"; Kessler), Shu and her colleagues approach the values of audience and purpose with a focus on students transferring academic writing skills to an audience of future instructors rather than presenting a rhetorically flexible approach based on the writing situation. This can be seen through Shu's minor emphasis on aspects of writing process such as peer revision/peer review which would present students as writers, and her greater emphasis on the instructor as the reader who corrects sentence-level errors. Therefore, ESL instructors primarily see the purpose of writing instruction as the transfer of linguistically acceptable writing across the college.

This brief portrait depicts the major values that will be discussed in depth in the remainder of this chapter. I attempt to contextualize these practices and beliefs within the field of ESL/L2 writing through relevant scholarship, as addressed at the start of this chapter.

Value: Accuracy/Correctness

Grammar Usage and Error Correction

Grammar usage and error correction is the most frequently cited value of good writing among the surveyed ESL instructors. These instructors mentioned the need for students to have “accuracy,” “correct grammar,” “attention to grammar corrections,” and an ability to “self-edit grammar, spelling, and vocabulary errors.” This appears to be a value perceived not only as important for ESL courses but for college composition as well: numerous surveyed ESL faculty noted that while most MLWs go on to do quite well in composition coursework, they still “struggle to use good grammar”

Along with these survey respondents, Shu articulated the importance of grammatical accuracy and “fixing” errors to create a submittable piece of writing. While she acknowledges that other parts of writing are important, such as helping students develop ideas with support and teaching organization, she states that:

...really, so much of my time is eaten up with grammar. I mean, again, we're just really focused on trying to help them, you know, assess, ‘[W]hat are my individual grammar challenges? How do I eliminate those from my writing? Why is it ... important?’ If they can assess, ‘[O]kay, I have a problem with subject/verb agreement; why is this important? And then, how do I eliminate this from my writing?’

Here, the words “challenges,” “eliminate,” and “problem” are prominent. Shu’s unstated idea is that standard academic English (SAE) is vital to a student becoming a better writer and that MLWs struggle and must make efforts to correct these mistakes so they can write in SAE.

Shu also articulates the belief in explicit grammar instruction, which she views as central to improving the overall quality of student writing:

...by working on subject/verb agreement, and ... parallelism, which, you know, they [understand] ... I tried to really challenge them to, you know, compare their native language to English, because this is a ... foundational point in improving your writing. I mean, you can't really improve your writing, if you don't actually understand the differing syntactical structures, or semantic uses of language, from your native language to English, because there are some tremendous differences....

Here, Shu is nodding to the grammar-translation method of language teaching, though perhaps in a modified form. Grammar-translation is a method in which “[g]rammar is taught deductively ... by presentation and study of grammar rules” to “enable comparisons to be made between the foreign language and the student’s native language” (Richards and Rogers 7). This theory posits that understanding the rules will ideally lead to improvement in the writing as a whole.

Grammatical accuracy and fixing one’s errors were recognized extensively in both Shu’s teaching practice and learning materials, such as her assigned practice activities and textbook reading. During one class observation, Shu began with a discussion on the types of feedback that students should expect to receive on a draft returned that day. The context of this discussion was primarily on the “types of mistakes” the students had made and the symbols on the essay that would represent that error. Later in the lesson, a demonstration on verb tense shifts discussed that a “repair” of the issue was making sure all verbs were in either past or present tense.

A student's ability to "fix" their writing is a value not just expressed by individual teachers but appears to be a value of the whole department. In a set of instructions for an ESL teaching demonstration from 2012, given to prospective full time faculty members, the instructors are told that "errors in writing can interfere with successful communication," and they are asked to help an imagined student writer "recognize his major challenges so he can correct the errors made."

Why error-free writing is so central in MACC's ESL department appears twofold. The first is the perception that once students leave the shelter of ESL coursework, the instruction they receive will no longer focus on grammar in other coursework, and ESL coursework is their last chance to make sure their writing is as error-free as it can be. Shu notes, "I've heard different [ENG faculty] say, they don't want grammar, and they don't work on that, they don't have time to focus on that in English [composition]. And so, I'm operating with that understanding or that assumption." The idea that grammar instruction starts and ends in college ESL is certainly a representation of the disciplinary division in action – it demonstrates that ESL and ENG faculty find a particular valued task as the purview of only one of these two departments.

The second reason for desiring error-free writing relates directly to the first – the unstated notion that the academy as an audience¹³ should not tolerate writing that lacks accuracy because it impedes the students' success with any college writing-related task at the college. Shu articulates this when she states:

...to be really honest, the nitty gritty for ESL is in the grammar, you know, so I just spend, I feel like it's an inordinate amount [of time], but it's what they need, you know.

¹³ Because of the messiness of these concepts, such overlaps will be common. The "academy as audience" will be addressed further under the value Audience/Purpose.

Here's what I've determined: if students can achieve a degree of confidence in their writing, in their ability to express or communicate their ideas clearly, it really does them a world of good and it really positions them to succeed in more academic courses.

Here, the idea of accurate grammar as fundamental for success in academic coursework is made clear. Shu notes that MLW students are “linguistically developmental” and, therefore, without meeting benchmarks for written fluency, they may not be successful in college coursework. This perspective views accuracy and correctness as a duty – if students leave an ESL program without the skills to succeed in college coursework, that student has been failed.

The need for grammatical accuracy as a tenet of good writing is one that has a long tradition within ESL theory and pedagogy. When the field was first developing, the Grammar Translation Method and the Audiolingual Method were the first practices to predominate. Both methods had strong grammatical focuses and “overemphasized grammatical accuracy at the expense of natural communication,” gaining an understanding of grammatical rules but lacking the ability to either speak or write in the language effectively (Schenck 166). These methods fell out of favor in the 1970s and 1980s when the Natural Approach and Communicative Language Teaching (communicative competence) became more recognized. These methods downplayed the teaching of grammar structures in the classroom, focusing on oral language. Stephen Krashen was a major influence within these movements, and his work argued that learning about grammar would not make students orally communicative and that learning and practicing rules had little value in the classroom (Larsen-Freeman 264). Krashen believed that “grammar should be limited to those situations in which learners could monitor ... their output” such as “prepared speeches and written compositions” (Lichtman and VanPatten 284). However, writing was also seen as the purview of only more advanced MLW students.

Because Shu has been teaching for over forty years, it is likely that she was educated around the time that these language teaching theories were most popular. In fact, during our interactions together, she mentions “communicative competence” several times. This may be something that has stuck with her from her educational background. However, because the theories popularized during these decades focused more on oral proficiency rather than writing, it is possible that these have had marginal influence on her own writing instruction practices. In fact, the emphasis that she places on grammar instruction would suggest this is the case.

In emphasizing grammatical accuracy as a necessary value of good writing, Shu is keeping in line with the field - in general, ESL writing courses take a traditional approach to grammar instruction. Larsen-Freeman notes that grammar instruction “remains traditional for the most part, with grammar teaching centered on accuracy of form and rule learning, and with mechanical exercises seen as the way to bring about the learning of grammar” (263), with drills and pattern practice still commonly used in the classroom (265). In the “Ethical Treatment of EAL¹⁴ Writers” Christine M. Tardy and Erin Whittig argue that ESL “courses should not be grammar and vocabulary courses” and that a “focus only on privileged forms” of language “does a disservice to students” (924-25). Despite this growing mindset among many scholars, “most educators persist in seeing grammar as a set of rules that govern accurate form in language, most often at the sentence level” (Larsen-Freeman 272), viewing instruction with a mind towards written accuracy as “essential” (Schenck 167) to MLWs. This perception of grammar as a form of accurate and good writing at the sentence level is clearly seen at MACC.

¹⁴ EAL stands for “English as an Additional Language,” which Tardy and Whittig use to “encompass a broader population of students who write in English as a second or additional language,” (921) rejecting the more traditional use of “ESL” writer.

The need for grammatically accurate writing also connects to instructor perceptions of transferability. As Silva and Leki note, an EAP-centered course focuses on student writers as “interested for the most part in learning how to meet the standards for academic success set by members of the academic discourse community” (6). MACC’s ESL department views grammar instruction through this lens. By viewing grammar as a method in which students will gain success across the college, ideological perspectives of grammar, such as those laid out by Tardy and Whittig, appear to be rejected.

The literature shows that grammatical accuracy and correctness are important concepts in ESL/L2 writing scholarship. The desire for grammatical accuracy, as well as the perception that SAE is important throughout a student’s education, all lead to the continued focus on this concept as an important quality of good writing. MACC ESL faculty view language as fixable and grammar as a skill that can improve academic performance. Additionally, the perception by Shu and her colleagues that fixing language issues before students leave ESL coursework is *their* responsibility demonstrates a disciplinary division of labor. Chapters 4 and 5 will further clarify this division, though a focus on accurate/correct language does become muddled by the participants described in these upcoming chapters.

Value: Clarity

Clear Writing as Correct, Simple Sentences

The value of clarity significantly overlaps with accuracy/correctness. One surveyed faculty member directly connects clarity to linguistic features, stating that ENG colleagues “want ESL faculty to focus on language the most ... So, I am trying to focus on language – clarity and accuracy – the most.” Likewise, Shu describes student writing that is not accurate – such as the use of sentence fragments, lack of mechanical punctuation, and subject-verb disagreement as

“confusing.” The word “confusing” functions to show that ESL instructors find inaccurate writing unclear, and therefore, connections between language, clarity, and accuracy demonstrate the value these instructors place on writing at the word and sentence level.

Shu also squarely places the concept of clarity as a sentence-level concern when she draws a distinction between the work of an ESL and a composition instructor as related to clarity. She argues that “if [ESL] can get the sentence level, you know, grammar and clarity that we need, ... they’ll be ready; they’ll have all the parts and pieces that they can then put together [when they take composition].” Here, the disciplinary division separates grammar usage (accuracy/correctness) and clarity with “everything else” which is then put into place in composition. In this view, it is not that a student is moving to advance writing skills from one class to the next, but instead each course simply is adding new discrete skills.

The need to fix writing to improve clarity is seen through Shu’s classroom activities and readings focused on simplifying confusing writing. Instructor-provided online activities, for example, describe how a verb tense shift “causes confusion” and a Tense Consistency Exercise asks students to “correct the inconsistency.” Likewise, an essay guideline provided by Shu lists one of the “standards for effective writing” as “clear, error-free sentences.” This again shows how clarity directly and importantly connects to sentence-level accuracy/correctness.

Clarity is a slippery concept when attempting to define it. The term is used frequently by both ESL and composition instructors, though often with different approaches to facilitating clarity. According to Joseph M. Moxley, an English professor with a writing studies background, clarity can have both a global and a local context. Global concerns of clarity include considering the rhetorical situation and applying an organizational pattern that can be comprehended logically. It also means “maintaining a focus” on the purpose and/or thesis. At the local level,

clarity is more of a sentence or paragraph concern, such as the use of active voice, or the correct use of diction, grammar, mechanics, and punctuation, with “breakdowns in these conventions ... likely to lead to murky writing.” In ESL/L2 writing scholarship, clarity is not *fundamentally* tied with accuracy and correctness, nor at the local level. Some scholars have referred to clarity concerns as more about the “effective use of language” rather than grammar and “forms of the language” (Sopher 20) or view it as a concern for “original ideas” rather than accuracy (Fregeau).

Though these competing definitions for clarity exist, the overall focus of clarity instruction in ESL/L2 writing scholarship relates specifically to sentence-level, local concerns – more specifically, accurate and correct sentences. Lynn Goldstein’s look at the literature on responding to ESL writers found that “only 15 published studies ... look specifically at teacher written feedback on content and rhetoric” and that such response to ESL writers on rhetoric and content is “a fairly new area of inquiry that has not received much attention” (76). Although Goldstein’s scholarship was published in 2001, in the past 20 years, the literature of ESL/L2 writing still focuses almost entirely on clarity at the sentence level – specifically “written corrective feedback,” which is “any written comment ... geared toward improving linguistic accuracy” (Kurzer 5).

While there have been decades of debate over the value of written corrective feedback in ESL/L2 writing (Ferris “The Case”; Janopolous; Truscott), some studies have linked corrective feedback to “good” writing, by defining good writing as clear and correct at the sentence level (Li and Vuono 102). For example, a 2019 study specifically defines issues of clarity in MLW writing as sentence-level concerns, including “difficulty in the usage of articles” and “errors [of] mechanics” such as “punctuation and capitalization,” (Goundar and Bogitini 176). Another 2015

study tying clarity to sentence-level accuracy argues that teaching MLW students “where adverbs traditionally fall within a sentence” can “add clarity” to a piece of writing (122). These studies connect the concept of clarity to sentence-level concerns and view good writing as both clear and accurate. This mirrors the values expressed by ESL writing instructors at MACC, who appear to separate linguistic concerns (their job) from content (composition’s job). This, again, reiterates a disciplinary division that exists between these two fields, which will be addressed further in chapters 4 and 5.

Writing as Clear to the Audience

Although there will be a more significant discussion on audience forthcoming, it is directly relevant here because both clear and accurate/correct writing must be fixed and simplified for one important reason: audience comprehension. In this case, Shu positions herself as the audience that must be able to understand the clear, accurate writing that the student produces. During a class discussion on the use of “person” within a piece of writing, Shu notes that a common mistake is in switching between “they” and “you” within a single sentence, noting, “[t]hat was the most common or reoccurring error of person that I found in your essays this time, and so be really careful as you're writing your essays.” By noting that she, the teacher, found the error, she positions herself as the reader, and that error-free writing is the most comprehensible. However, Shu does acknowledge that comprehensibility of a composition is not solely related to a lack of errors. During a course observation, she told students that “even though you have some types of mistakes, those types of mistakes that you've made generally do not interfere with my ability to understand ... what you've written.” The connection between language that one can understand and clarity is evident – if the teacher as reader can understand the work, it is clear. This idea was reflected by at least one survey taker as well, who noted that

they valued “accuracy—at least to the extent that it doesn’t affect clarity.” Though they do not reference “audience” here, they position themselves as a universal audience capable of evaluating *whether* errors within the work make it clear or not. This universal audience may also represent future instructors or employers, therefore assigning clarity a gatekeeper function.

The teacher as audience is a consistent theme in ESL scholarship. While the literature occasionally mentions a “reader” or “audience,” in general, the teacher is the reader who gives feedback to help students develop sentence-level clarity. For example, the idea of corrective feedback (Ekstein and Ferris; Ferris “The Case”; Kurzer; Lyster) itself places the burden of editing sentence-level concerns on the teacher. Likewise, the perception of the ESL teacher as the last gatekeeper before students enter the academy is pervasive. Vann et al. point out that while “ESL writing instructors face the chronic dilemma of deciding how much to emphasize structural and mechanical correctness in relation to instruction in other areas such as content and organization” (427), it is faculty across the college who are often “shocked” by “sentence-level ... local errors...” of MLWs (429), with faculty in physical science, mathematics, and engineering being the most bothered by local errors and those in “social sciences, education, and humanities” being the least bothered (434, 437). Though the level of concern differs, such faculty distress connects to the idea expressed by MACC faculty that the instructor must work on issues of sentence-level clarity first, because unclear writing later in the academic career of MLW students will be too bothersome to the reader.

Much like the values seen for accuracy/correctness, this view of clarity – as a sentence-level concern that affects participation and success in the academy – again shows that MACC faculty prefer a perceived transferrable curriculum through their focus on surface features such as “grammar, functions, or discourse structures” (Hyland “General” 19), which are common foci

in academic writing courses. Additionally, there are both interesting disconnects and overlaps for the concept of clarity as a surface feature concern by composition instructors, and this will be addressed in chapters 4 and 5.

Value: Organization

Organized Writing as a Five-Paragraph Mode

The organization of a composition is one of the most emphasized aspects of ESL writing by MACC faculty. Students in ESL courses learn how to write essays based on various standard rhetorical modes, such as compare/contrast, cause/effect, and argument essays. Rhetorical modes have been used as an entry into genre studies in ESL/L2 writing (Johns “The Future” 58) and are part of the history of contrastive rhetoric (discussed in depth later in this section) within the field.

The textbook used in the ESL 51 course, *Great Writing 5*, does present the term “rhetorical modes” to students, but it does not specifically define rhetoric or genre here, referring to these modes as a “kind of essay” (5). While these descriptions of writing will also be directly relevant when discussing the concept audience/purpose, it is also relevant to organization, as both the textbook and the ESL instructors present each mode as having a specific structure and organization. The word “structure” is particularly important. The emphasis is not on students figuring out how to organize or arrange their ideas, but instead students structure their essay based on the component parts considered necessary for each paragraph, as presented in the textbook. For example, in textbook chapter 4 on cause/effect essays, the organization of the essay is presented this way:

Introduction – Paragraph 1 – Hook, connecting information, thesis.

Body Paragraphs – Paragraphs 2-4 – Cause 1, 2, and 3, with examples

Conclusion – Paragraph 5 – Restated thesis, suggestions, opinion, prediction

As noted above, the structure is fairly inflexible. The organization of each individual rhetorical mode within the course is presented as a five-paragraph essay style. Though the mode for each essay is different, the model of the introduction with a thesis, three body paragraphs, and a conclusion is prominent. The *Great Writing* textbook notes that essays with this structure are considered “well-written,” (4) suggesting that this is an important value of good writing.

One survey respondent noted that students “get the essay structure pretty quickly,” with the five-paragraph writing style serving to scaffold from one essay to the next. While discussing the organization of a reaction essay, Shu said: “these ... parts [are] not too different than any of the other types of essays that we’ve had.” Shu’s response shows how students are meant to quickly catch onto the essay style and make only slight changes as they progress through the course, mastering the organizational patterns that the course values.

An important aspect of organization is connected to thesis writing. Several of the surveyed teachers mentioned valuing a strong focus on thesis writing, arguing that without a strong and solid thesis statement, a particular piece of writing cannot be properly *developed* (a term that will be significant when discussing the concept evidence use). As Shu notes:

“We focused ... on [the thesis statement] so much because I tell them, this is the heart ... of your essay. If your thesis sentence is not well-developed, if it’s not accurately stated and clearly emphasized, then you just fall part. And if you have grammar mistakes in your thesis, since they repeat throughout the entire essay, they’ll impact the flow of the entire essay. ... [W]e’ve worked on, you know, restating your thesis sentence for the conclusion...”

This shows that organization of an essay is a key value of good writing, but it also indicates that sentence-level concerns are equally important during pre-writing and outlining.

Likewise, the structure of the thesis statement is an important aspect of five-paragraph organization in ESL 51. The course values the use of a “three points ... thesis sentence” in which the writer makes an assertion, followed by the three points that will be used in the body “in the same order” as listed in the thesis. The thesis is then restated in the conclusion. As the teachers of this course note, the five-paragraph structure is one that students understand quickly, with a structure that scaffolds simply from one essay to the next without students having to make large or conceptual shifts in thinking about organization. This too signals the emphasis on sentence-level writing practices rather than large, overall structural decisions.

This focus on sentence-level practices taking precedence over broad organizational practices can be seen in ESL/L2 writing scholarship. Polio argues that sentence-level concerns are what an ESL course *should* focus on, noting that it is possible “the pendulum has swung too far in the other direction,” with too much emphasis now given to the organization and support of an essay rather than a focus on accuracy, which can take students years to improve (1-2). However, most scholars argue that sentence-level accuracy will not be usurped in ESL courses. Lee notes that most ESL writing textbooks focus mostly on sentence-level grammar, overlooking broader concerns, such as coherence (“Teaching” 136). Similarly, Plakans and Gebril point out that the ESL field is dominated by studies on “linguistic features, such as grammar or lexical sophistication” but they have observed that few studies had been done “on the organization features of L2 writing” so “‘best measures’ have not been established in this area” (100).

The lack of such “best measures” has left organization as relegated to a lesser status in ESL scholarship. Most of the literature on organization is based on reactions to Kaplan’s 1966 article “Cultural Thought Pattern in Intercultural Communication,” the basis of contrastive rhetoric, which argues that there are fundamental differences between the way certain

languages/cultures organize their writing, which reflect the logic a writer in that culture is expected to employ to arrive directly or indirectly at an argument, such as Asian writers preferring indirect organization (17). Matsuda notes that traditional contrastive rhetoric scholars believe that such mismatches can cause significant confusion because of the reader's expectation of a traditional English academic organizational structure and the writer's context with the "discourse community in his or her native country" ("Contrastive" 50). Therefore, contrastive rhetoricians believe that students should be taught highly prescriptive pattern approaches to paragraph writing so they can understand how academic writing is organized in English (Kaplan "Contrastive" 15).

There has been significant pushback to the premise of contrastive rhetoric, with numerous scholars arguing that there may be a variety of other social or educational factors that have a much greater influence on a composition's organization and one study finding that "Chinese college students, like their American counterparts, generally prefer directness" (Yang and Cahill 123). Other scholars acknowledge cultural differences in writing but use genre as an entry into better understanding contrastive rhetoric. Genre instruction pushes prescriptive organization to the margins by instructing students on the ways in which a writer and reader's background shape the organization of a text with a focus on these backgrounds as flexible (Connor 506; Matsuda "Contrastive" 53, 56).

Despite this pushback to traditional conceptions of contrastive rhetoric organization, the organizational pattern that seems most prominent in the instruction of MLW students follows a fairly structured approach: a five-paragraph essay with a thesis, topic sentences, transitions, and a summative conclusion (Eckstein et al. "Reading" 13; Lee "A Comparison" 372). While one study of ESL instructors found that many felt the five-paragraph style had "drawbacks," which

included a “fill-in-the-slot pattern” that can be “boring and awful to read” (Atkinson and Ramanathan 556) these surveyed instructors also acknowledged its value, believing it would be valuable across the disciplines to know a basic style of academic writing that could serve as an “extremely serviceable template” (557, 561). The common perspective that five-paragraph and modes essays are serviceable and highly transferrable views these essays as academic genres that students will be able to appropriate (or approximate) in a variety of situations.

While the argument that all instructors will have the same “academic norms and practices” is considered questionable because it fails to “acknowledge cultural difference” (Pennycook 265) between instructors and disciplines, the view of five-paragraph writing as a basic, transferrable ideal of Western academic writing appears to be the prominent perspective of MACC ESL instructors, with the ESL 51 course focusing on organizational patterns that they may be expected to perform in other classes. As will be made clear in the next several chapters, this model represents a significant disciplinary division between ESL and composition.

Evidence and Development Follow Organization

While a robust examination of the value evidence use will be examined later in this chapter, it is relevant here in thinking about the order in which various aspects of writing are completed in the ESL 51 course. Shu and the *Great Writing* textbook lay out a process of writing in which the organization of the essay comes before the development (i.e., the addition of examples or evidence). Each chapter on a particular writing mode in the *Great Writing* book sets up the writing process in this way:

What is a _____ essay? (cause/effect; reaction; comparison; etc.)

Organization of a _____ essay.

Supporting details/brainstorming for a _____ essay.

The sections of the textbook that talk about organization each present the unique style and the content that should be contained in each body paragraph. This shows that the course places value on organizing the essay ahead of developing the ideas that will make up most of the content in the body paragraphs. This is a common approach in ESL genre instruction, with a focus on the importance of understanding the text structure before students are expected to use that genre (Costino and Hyon 34). The writing process phase of invention, common in composition classrooms because of its loose connection to Greek rhetoric, entailing prewriting techniques that help writers develop their own ideas before they consider aspects such as organization (Clark “Invention” 52), does not have a strong emphasis in the ESL course. This value can be seen during one course observation in Shu’s course. There, the students read an article on Rosa Parks and learned about the term civil disobedience. One group of students was tasked to write an outline of a reaction essay to the article on Parks. They wrote a thesis that was reflective of an opinion. To paraphrase: “civil disobedience is a good way to create change.” The topic sentences written by the group were, to paraphrase, “Rosa Parks did _____. She also did _____.” The organization of this in-class activity fits the style proposed in the textbook, but the development of the ideas proposed does not reflect independent thought, as does the thesis. While Shu confirmed to me during an interview that this would not be an acceptable approach for the final reaction essay, this activity itself places more emphasis on the value of organizing the ideas over the ideas themselves.

A final aspect of the five-paragraph organizational style is the amount of content that is valued for each proposed idea in the essay body. Shu tells her students to “[m]ake certain each ... [paragraph is] getting equal space.” This, again, places emphasis more on the

organization of the essay – making sure it is lucid and easy to follow – rather than allowing the content itself to dictate the organization.

The literature on how MLWs move through the writing process seems to, in some ways, contradict the process presented in MACC’s ESL 51. For example, Racelis and Matsuda describe the writing process as “developing, organizing, and expressing ideas” (386). Raimes describes the process this way: “generating, organizing, and revising ideas” (“What” 250). Eckstein et al. describe how “students must ... collect, synthesize, and order research information” (“Multi-Draft” 168). All three of these articles describe a process in which invention is the first stage of the writing process, taking place before organization. Ruth Spack pushes back strongly against considering sentence-level concerns during the initial writing phase, arguing that concerns for “surface error” at early stages slow down writers and lead to breakdowns in the writing process (656). She specifically argues that “organization and correctness” must be prioritized only after “ideas [come] to life” (662). The way that the ESL 51 course is structured, with little time for invention, at least until after the structure is solidified, shows marked contradictions to the scholarship here.

However, when considering this writing process within the “processing writing model” proposed by Bereiter and Scardamalia, the ESL 51 approach makes a lot of sense. Under this model, “immature, inexperienced, or unskilled writers” compose by “using topic and genre identifiers as cues to search for appropriate content and discourse knowledge in their memory and retrieving this relevant information for generating text.” In this process they “simply tell what they know about the topic or task when composing texts” (Dujsik 16). In other words, after the writer has been introduced to the topic or genre, they simply search their memory for content that might support the topic, and then they write. By considering this to be a developmental stage

for MLWs, bypassing a significant focus on invention and moving immediately to organization may make sense. However, when returning to scholarship specific to ESL/L2 writing, the process that the *Great Writing* book outlines does not fit neatly.

Organized Writing as Accurate/Correct

The organizational patterns prescribed by the textbook and within the ESL 51 course are reinforced by a series of models and templates. This is a theme that will appear in the next several chapters and demonstrates one way in which these fields align in practice. In the ESL 51 class there are sample essays and outlines for the various assigned modes, a sample outline for a “common five-paragraph essay” meant to serve as a template for any type of writing, and an activity asking students to organize a series of sentences by putting them in the correct order to fill in a partially completed outline. Additionally, for each essay students are asked to write five-sentence outlines with a thesis, three supporting topic sentences, and a restatement of the thesis. These are reviewed for acceptability as connected to the writing mode. At each stage, students are given significant revision on the errors that impede the readability of their writing and are given up to three drafts to fix their errors. The final exam in the course also reflects accuracy/correctness-based organizational concerns. Students are given several hours to complete an essay exam in which structures such as a thesis, topic sentences, and support must be included. The timed final exam is graded on a pass/fail basis, based on their proficiencies with language and these structures.

These types of models, templates, and activities place the value of organization onto doing work correctly, which is common in product-based writing instruction, which focuses on writing that conforms to “a preestablished model” (Shannon 3). While a product method of writing has been supplemented in ESL writing by both process and/or genre approaches (as

discussed in chapter 1), some studies have shown that teaching product writing is still common and/or valued among ESL instructors (Horowitz; Santos 1; Vorobel and Vásquez 324-25). One reason that some teachers continue to support a product approach is the need to teach a formulaic model of writing to facilitate student success on timed exams, which continue to be a consistent form of student assessment (Bhowmik et al. 2; Horowitz 142; Lee “The Process” 365). Such product writing may therefore be emphasized in the ESL 51 class in part to the timed final exam that is graded on a pass/fail basis—as mentioned above—before students move onto ENG 111.

Shu’s use of modeling is also accuracy/correctness focused. Modeling can be the basis for flexibly organized texts. For example, probably the most utilized form of genre teaching in ESL/L2 writing, Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), focuses on organization as variable based on context, with text structure being flexible as the needs of the audience are considered (Hyland “Genre-Based” 23; Johns “The Future” 59). However, in many cases, models are taught in “simplistic and reductive ways” (Racelis and Matsuda 388), in which models become “rigid formats” (Johns “The Future” 62). These rigid modes are often seen by instructors as effective for teaching students to write across the disciplines (Atkinson and Ramanathan 557, 560). This can be seen with Shu’s use of a “common five-paragraph essay” model, which suggest that any type of writing activity can be translated across disciplines with the use of the basic format presented in class, without considerations of audience or purpose.

Additionally, a focus on more rigid organizational patterns is often the result of a greater pedagogical emphasis on language correctness rather than global organizational concerns (Polio 2; Zamel “Responding” 84). This again may be reflective of the ESL 51 class emphasizing sentence-level language practices over a more rhetorically flexible genre-based organization that has already been discussed at length. Looking ahead to chapters 4 and 5, there are indeed

interesting disciplinary divisions for the concept of “organization,” specifically related to genre considerations, but an emphasis on specific writing forms will present some overlap.

Values: Evidence Use and Originality/Self-Expression

For the ESL 51 course I examined, it makes sense to combine evidence use and originality/self-expression because of the types of evidence that students are tasked to use within their writing, as described below.

Evidence Use that Avoids Source Use

In Shu’s ESL 51 course, students skip over chapter 3, “Using Original Sources,” in the *Great Writing* textbook and they do not complete the final essay in that book – the research essay. Although the course content summary lists “document[ing] sources,” as a course objective, ESL faculty say that avoiding source use is by design – MLWs are, Shu says, “working on the nitty gritty of grammar primarily ... composition [courses are], okay, now, let me bring in some [outside] literature.” Because she values sentence-level writing accuracy in the ESL classroom, the value of using outside sources is the purview of college composition, showing a clear disciplinary division of labor. Shu says that the work on grammar that ESL 51 emphasizes does not leave enough time for learning how to handle outside sources, mentioning:

...research papers can take me weeks. I'm going to have to have them develop a bibliography, and then I'm going to have to have them, you know, come up with a thesis ... so for me, this is going to take a long time. And I don't think we have, in a 15-week course, where really, so much of the focus is on the grammar and the structure and the mechanics, I don't think I have time to do that.

In addition to seeing outside source use as a task more appropriate to a different writing course, Shu expresses concerns over her students’ lack of understanding of appropriate outside

source use, noting “the more that we assign them to go out and do research, the more of a problem we can encounter with plagiarism.” Therefore, she says, “I try to discourage them from using sources...”

Shu’s concerns about plagiarism and the difficulties MLW students may have using outside sources are common in ESL writing. There is a perception that students educated in other writing cultures may not have the same knowledge as American students about source use, with Merkel noting that “ESL students ... do not likely arrive at the table with the culturally conditioned knowledge afforded to native English speakers who have spent their entire lives as members of the U.S. academic system” (11). This perceived discrepancy has been backed up by scholars who cite studies that have shown “students from China, Japan, and South Korea did not practice citation and quotation skills in their own countries” (Grabe and Zhang 14), and that in some cultures, “memorization and copying are legitimate learning strategies” (Yoshimura 2).

There has been pushback to arguments about cultural differences, with Pecorari noting that “Western students also plagiarize, for a range of complex and interrelated reasons” and that because even those in different professions or academic fields differ in what constitutes appropriate source use, ESL/L2 writing should probably dismiss cultural reasons for plagiarism (96). Much current scholarship frames this debate as a developmental one, with students attempting to meet teacher expectations when they use sources (Keck; Pecorari; Pecorari and Petric), with significant improvements in source use noted after several years of study (Yoshimura 14).

While Shu has not expressed any sentiment about the cultural aspects of plagiarism, it may be that because she believes she does not have adequate time to work on source integration in the time allotted during a normal semester, she understands that students cannot be expected to

use sources properly without a strong level of teacher engagement. Tomas and Shapiro note that this can be a common concern – faculty know that teaching source use can be very-time intensive, and many believe they do not have the time to incorporate source use practices. However, they believe that such an endeavor is worthwhile due to the need to use sources throughout a student’s academic career (1109-1110).

Although a few scholars note that language concerns should take precedent in ESL classes (Polio; Qu), the need to teach source use tends to be the more common view in the current literature on ESL/L2 writing over the past several decades. Grabe and Zhang point out that because source use is often difficult for MLWs, it must be emphasized, noting that source integration “requires a great deal of practice” (10), and that it is necessary to “devote more time to teaching students to quote, summarize, and paraphrase information,” (16). Liu et al. similarly note that because international students face a “steep learning curve” in acquiring U.S. academic discourse, “instructors should ensure sufficient practice on source use” (50). In some cases, it is *because of* the accusations of plagiarism that students must begin to learn source use as soon as possible (Pecorari and Petric 289). However, there may be a conflict between theory and practice, with multiple studies showing that students are not always being given ample opportunities to work with sources, with a greater emphasis being put on personal experiences or prior knowledge (Lee “A Comparison” 367; Leki and Carson). More on approaches to source use in ESL writing classes will be addressed in chapter 5.

This scholarship shows that from a theoretical standpoint, source use is considered necessary for ESL writing, but it is less clear what the practice looks like at most colleges. Therefore, whether Shu and her colleagues are in the norm for evidence use is unclear. It appears that Shu and her colleagues are using the disciplinary division – the idea that composition

instructors are responsible for source use and they are not – as a way to avoid the time-consuming process of introducing source use, citation, and plagiarism issues. In other words, the lack of emphasis on source use might be portrayed as beneficial to students by giving them more time to work on linguistic endeavors, but it may further benefit faculty who do not have to engage in the difficult practice of source use instruction. This is a strong disciplinary division from the values expressed by composition instructors, as will be addressed in chapters 4 and 5.

Evidence Use as a Chance to be Culturally Expressive

Because ESL 51 MLW students are discouraged from using outside sources and do not learn about citation practices, it is important to examine what values the instructors have for evidence use. The terms that the *Great Writing* book uses to describe what would be contained within a body paragraph are “supporting ideas” or “supporting details.” Both surveyed faculty and Shu commonly use words such as “support,” “examples,” “content,” and “development.” All these words are broad in the interpretation of what the writer might include to fill out the body paragraphs. Though outside sources are not used, Shu does express value in students learning about supporting ideas, mentioning that one “area of need” beyond sentence-level concerns is developing/supporting ideas. She mentions how some students struggle to take their “topic sentences into a more coherent thought.”

While body paragraphs do not contain outside source use to support the thesis, they do contain self-expression. Shu refers to this type of essay development as having “an idea,” and she works with her students to develop ideas, including using their opinion or experiences, as a source to support their thesis. She tells her students during one class in which they are discussing the reaction essay to use the body paragraphs to explain “what you think” and “explain why you think what you think.”

Both Shu and the surveyed faculty mention how MLWs show particular strength in having and expressing interesting and unique ideas. She mentions that students “never have ... a shortage of ideas” and that “they have great ideas.” One surveyed faculty member mentioned that students have important “stories to tell.” Students in these classes are likely to have cultural and linguistic experiences that provide unique and meaningful perspectives in the classroom (Canagarajah “ESL” 30) that students can share with each other. For example, in one classroom activity, Shu had students work in small groups to compare marriage ceremony traditions in their home country to the traditions of students from other countries. Such activities provide students a chance to learn from each other, and, because source use is not taught, students in these classes learn to strengthen and value their experiences and prior knowledge.

As previously mentioned, having students use their own unique experiences or knowledge of various subjects is quite common in the ESL classroom (Lee “A Comparison” 367; Leki and Carson 42). Over the last several decades, there has been a strong movement in ESL/L2 writing to value the voice of MLWs, which would align well with the concept of originality/self-expression. Just as the discipline of writing studies went through the social turn, there have been aspects of a similar social turn in TESOL scholarship since the 1980s (Raimes “Tradition”) with a greater focus on issues of student ideology and power. With this social turn, valuing student experiences and voices has become prominent though divided in ESL/L2 writing. Stewart notes that some scholars reject “the importance of voice instruction as compared to other elements of writing, such as content, organization, and grammar in L2 contexts” (271). Opponents are against the valuing of voice over ideas (Stapleton), particularly for MLWs whom these scholars view as thrust into mainstream English classes when they might still benefit from ESL coursework (Helms-Park and Stapleton 249). However, the social turn has certainly increased

this value's acceptance. Stewart argues that focusing on life stories in writing makes students more engaged and motivated to improve their writing (273). Matsuda cited a study by Yeh who found that there was a "positive correlation between voice and content development" (qtd. in "Identity" 153), showing that allowing students to self-express can indeed lead to stronger writing. From a social justice perspective, Fernsten noted that due to the uneven distribution of power between the language the student and the teacher use, ESL learners need to be taught that they can "contest the voices of authority" and advises instructors to move beyond learning only academic discourse (51), which values student English.

While many ESL/L2 scholars have taken on these social aspects of writing, the concerns of MACC's ESL department appear to be a bit more pragmatic. While instructors do appear to value students sharing cultural experiences, something that is easily encouraged in large-multicultural classrooms, the focus on student voice appears to be more closely connected to a desire to downplay outside source use, instead helping students with sentence-level grammar and organizational concerns, which are seen by faculty as transferrable. Therefore, cultural or self-expression becomes more about reifying academic writing rather than a way to investigate linguistic power. The parallels and disconnects for self-expression between composition and these ESL instructors are complex and interesting and will be discussed in chapters 4 and 5.

Value: Audience/Purpose

Purpose as Academic and Career Success

Purpose and audience are often part of academic conversations on genre. Genre studies consider the role of social actions on a particular discourse community, such as helping students understand an audience and purpose for writing, which determine what is appropriate discourse in both style and form given the needs of the reader (Costino and Hyon 29). Shu and her

colleagues make clear the purpose of writing in the ESL 51 course, but it does not relate to genre studies or present rhetorical choices. Instead, the purpose of writing in these classes is to learn how to produce writing that will facilitate academic and career success. As Shu mentions “most students are not intrinsically motivated to improve their writing,” and they think “[i]f I actually can’t write ... the way that these teachers want to see me write ... what does it really matter?” because actually, to them, it really doesn’t matter” unless “it impacts their employment. It matters if it stops them in the process of getting a degree or achieving their academic goals.” Therefore, the purpose of writing improvement in the ESL class is to ensure that students can write in a way that facilitates greater success in the academic and work world. Writing education thus becomes more transactional than learning how to communicate effectively through this modality.

This perception of student writing is commonly associated with teaching prescriptive forms of writing. Such prescriptive instruction emphasizes writing as no more than students learning basic patterns of writing and fitting words into a “preexisting form with provided or self-generated content” has been common in ESL/L2 writing since at least the 1960s (Silva 13-14). Robert Kaplan’s identification of contrastive rhetoric was specifically influential on this type of writing as a pedagogical practice, arguing that cultural differences in paragraph organization meant that instructors should “begin the study of paragraphs by simply copying models or by manipulating carefully controlled models” so they can learn how “syntactic patterns” work in English (“Contrastive” 15). Though such formulaic models have generally been “frowned upon” in ESL/L2 writing for decades (Matsuda “Contrastive” 51), prescriptive mode writing is still common in ESL classes (Lee “A Comparison” 362) and textbooks, including *Great Writing*, promote such structures as valuable in academic writing (Schneer 622).

Therefore, Shu’s goal of having students better understand a specific form of writing – academic writing – using the patterns in the *Great Writing* textbook, makes a lot of sense.

Purpose as “Having Fun”

Directly connected to the idea of academic and career success, Shu attempts to make writing fun to develop the motivation that students will need to improve their writing, noting:

...I think anything I can do to encourage them to enjoy writing, or to see the benefit or value of writing is very helpful. Even if it’s not [a student learning outcome] – it’s not something we say, okay, we want these students to learn to appreciate writing or understand how powerful it is, or enjoy it, you know, on a personal level. We don’t have those as goals or objectives, but I think that they should be, because if students enjoy writing, it’s a whole new world.

Shu values the essay modes that she teaches in the class to facilitate fun, and to “get [students] interested in writing and find things that they like to write to try to motivate them.” These two purposes – having fun and later success are importantly connected because one serves the other – if students have fun, they will care about their writing improvement. If they improve, they will have greater career and academic success.

The idea of students having fun with writing is directly connected to the type of self-connected writing that Shu asks students to perform. As previously discussed, students do not use source-responsible prose in their essays but base their work on personal thoughts and experiences. As Bilton and Sivasubramaniam argue, when students consider classroom writing a place “for thinking and discovering” (303), there is a strong correlation with the development of a “love of writing” (316). The types of cultural and experiential exchanges the students have in

Shu's class, such as discussing marriage practices in their home country and debating the pros and cons of tattoos, as students did during one class meeting, likely support this development.

The purpose of helping students to develop a love of writing is to transfer their writing skills to academic and career success. This is certainly reflected in the course content summary for ESL 51, which says that the general course purpose is to "prepare advanced ESL students for college-level writing." This goal fits clearly with the EAP movement, which places the focus of writing courses on the ability to transfer academic writing skills and provide students with "immediate, concrete needs" (James 197) that will help them to write in academically acceptable ways across the disciplines (Atkinson and Ramanathan; Leki and Carson).

Some scholars see an academically focused approach to writing as critical to student success. Such courses can help students learn not only writing skills, but also study skills such as note taking, and acclimates students to the academic culture (Bhowmik and Kim 499). Stoller mentions that when students are preparing to "transition into mainstream courses, an emphasis on the skills required of students in regular classes is critical" (10), and such a viewpoint rests on two perspectives: first, that writing well is simply understanding basic writing skills and that such "general principles of writing" can exist (a highly contested perspective) (Johns "Written" 76); and second, that these discrete skills are highly transferrable across many writing contexts (also highly contested) (Johns "The Future" 61; Tardy and Jwa 63-64). While some scholars point out that tasks learned in an ESL course, such as summarizing, will clearly be used for "other purposes and tasks," (Vorobel and Kim 347), there are arguments that much of what takes place in the ESL class may not transfer well. For example, several scholars point out that basic prompts or tasks, such as compare/contrast essays or other tasks that do not require

understanding of genre knowledge are inauthentic and unlikely to transfer (Johns “The Future”; Myskow and Gordon 283).

While genre scholarship is seen as an entry point into transferability (DePalma and Ringer 141-143), Johns points out that such an approach has “had limited success” in part because those who teach the course may “find text-based (‘rhetorical mode’) curricula more accessible; and, of course, the difficulties posed by the abstract nature of any genre awareness curriculum” (“The Future” 64). This, again, may be the true reflection of what is being observed in MACC’s ESL 51 course – the time constraints and the pragmatic emphasis on friendliness and transferability of modes essays, particularly when the focus is most strongly placed on language, may make the most pedagogical sense to these instructors.

Audience as Conceptual

Previously examined when discussing accuracy/correctness is the idea of the instructor/academy as the audience – that with clear and accurate writing, a student sets oneself up for success in remaining college coursework. Additionally, because the purpose of writing is to improve comprehension for future job success, an employer could also be viewed as a secondary audience. Overall, the concept of audience remains an abstract or conceptual idea that is not presented as a rhetorical choice to the students in the ESL class.

In the course outcomes for ESL 51, the only idea that might connect to audience needs is “[s]tudents will be able to produce ... essays using idiomatic English.” The idea of using idiomatic English suggests a reader who can easily comprehend the text that they are reading. Likewise, the *Great Writing* textbook mentions “the reader” in a very abstract way, or, often, not at all. In the chapter on cause-effect essays, a section on supporting detail selection describes the process this way: “After selecting a topic, you should determine whether to focus more on the

causes of the issue or its effects. This process will also help you to select and develop supporting details to strengthen the argument, which is an important step in constructing a solid essay.”

Here, the focus is on what the writer is doing, while the reader is only implied.

Shu presents the idea of the reader in a similar way, presenting herself or an abstract “other” as the reader, stating:

[Students] tend to just run streams of words ... together without any kind of mechanical punctuation, which sounds like a minor thing. But [you get] like five lines of text with no punctuation, and the ideas are bleeding into each other, and it’s very confusing. And so, I know if it’s confusing for me, it’s going to be confusing for other readers.

During a class discussion on verb tenses, she also says to the students that “[s]imply choosing the wrong verb tense ... is the number one mistake that leads to the reader having a question in their mind about what you actually are intending to say.” In the case of both statements, the audience is the instructor and the academy at large, tightly connecting their need for clarity in writing.

The only example of a focus on an audience that might be someone other than the instructor is through “peer editing.” After turning in an initial essay outline for feedback, students draft the essay, receiving feedback on unity, support, coherence, sentence skills, readability, content, and grammar revisions from Shu. Then, students provide peer editing on a revised draft. Students are asked to provide feedback on content, such as whether the topic sentence connects to the thesis statement and what the reader likes best about the essay. After receiving peer feedback, students turn in a second/final draft where they receive additional instructor feedback and occasionally write a third draft based “just on grammar.” Therefore, the instructor intervenes a minimum of three times on a piece of writing while students receive one

opportunity to act as an outside audience, again placing outsized emphasis on the instructor-as-audience.

As previously mentioned, audience and purpose are part of learning about genre. Genre is not an unusual concept in ESL/L2 writing scholarship. In fact, Kessler notes that genre has been prominent in the field for over forty years and states that “nowhere has the concept been more influential than in the domain of L2 writing” (5). Costino and Hyon call genre a “useful L1-L2 rallying concept” because of the extensive use of the term in both disciplines (25). Despite its prominence in both writing studies and ESL/L2 writing scholarship, genre has made less impact in practice, with many instructors falling back on rhetorical mode curricula, which is often viewed as “more accessible” and less “abstract in nature” than genre instruction (Johns “The Future” 64). This is reflected in MACC survey data, with no mentions of the word “genre” by any ESL faculty regarding their values and practices.

One result of limited genre instruction is that the instructor as audience, an inauthentic, or implied audience is extremely prevalent in ESL writing courses (Fregeau; Lee “A Comparison” 367; Leki and Carson 54; Schneer 624). This appears common beyond ESL writing courses; a study by Melzer determined that 66 percent of assignments from across the curriculum had a teacher as audience (W257). Even when the audience is unstated, students “know” that the instructor is the intended audience and often write based on the perception of pleasing that audience (Fregeau). The idea of pleasing the audience is particularly important when placed in the context of the ideological nature of genre. As Ken Hyland argues:

Genre instruction ... stresses that genres are specific to particular cultures, reminding us that our students may not share this knowledge with us and urging us to go beyond syntactic structures, vocabulary, and composing to incorporate into our teaching the ways

language is used in specific contexts. It assists students to exploit the expressive potential of society's discourse structures instead of merely being manipulated by them ("Genre Pedagogy" 150).

In other words, genre instruction for audience is important for students to understand the social forces that reify cultural power structures. When the teacher is the audience for a particular piece of writing, a particular form of power is reified. In the ESL 51 class, the instructor remains the primary influence upon student texts, with a minimum of three interactions with each essay. Therefore, because the instructor as audience places the value of "good writing" on improved SWE and deductive organization, this reinforces the strength of the academic focus of these courses. Additionally, the ways in which instructor-as-audience represents a disciplinary overlap rather than a division will be further discussed in chapters 4 and 5.

ESL Practice and the Interplay of Theory

After examining each of the concepts that express MACC's ESL writing values, a focus on academic writing for transfer across the college appears to be central. These values help to show which are the most influential concepts to the department as a whole:

- **Accuracy/Correctness:** This is the most significant priority for MACC ESL faculty. Faculty view this concept with the viewpoint that grammar is a skill – one that can be fixed. Likewise, grammar improvement is seen as a path to academic success.
- **Clarity:** For this concept, faculty view sentence-level concerns as the greatest priority, with the academy asserted as the audience – students need to write clearly because this is their professor's expectation. Such a perspective connects to pedagogical approaches that focus on writing with a "functional efficiency" at the sentence level.

- **Organization:** The focus on academic genres, specifically modes essays and product modeling as a path towards correct, highly transferrable writing is a significant priority for this department. The emphasis on easy-to-understand organizational patterns helps these forms take a back seat to language instruction.
- **Evidence Use and Originality/Self-Expression:** Source use is discouraged due to concerns with plagiarism and the course focus on language concerns. The lack of instruction in outside source use appears to be pragmatic for teachers, who avoid the time-consuming practice. The use of self-expression provides “development” to paragraphs without taking away from the focus on sentence-level concerns.
- **Audience/Purpose:** The goal of transferrable, general academic writing skills is a strong value, with a focus less on power structures and genre flexibility and more on the values of the academy, demonstrated by the teacher as audience.

Ultimately, Shu and the department give a strong focus to concerns such as sentence-level accuracy and correctness for grammar, clarity, and organization. Less emphasis is placed on rhetorical concerns such as a broader understanding of genre and use of outside evidence. This may be contextualized by examining the educational backgrounds of MACC’s ESL instructors, with all coming from either a linguistics background (either M.A. or PhD) or from an ESL/TESOL background. Shu clarified that linguistics programs are often split into many branches, but that most of the linguists in the ESL department have a background in applied linguistics. Applied linguistics was originally intended as a scientific view of language instruction (Canagerajah “TESOL” 12) and was focused on “words, their meanings, and grammar” (Eckstein et al. “Assessment” 2). This “formalist” orientation (Leki 100) views

writing as a skill and values deductively organized essays (Eckstein et al. “Assessment” 3). These values and approaches are seen clearly in the major concerns of these ESL instructors.

Additionally, ESL writing has often “remained aloof from ideology” because of the perspective of applied linguistics as scientific and pragmatic (Santos 8). While the field has certainly made room for ideological perspectives for ESL writing instruction (Benesch; Leki 101; Pennycook), the pragmatic viewpoint remains more dominant (Costino and Hyon 26). In the observed ESL 51 class, students do share in ideologically focused cultural exchanges, such as discussing marriage practices of their home countries; however, these discussions are set up within specific “academic” limits related to organization, evidence, and revision, again suggesting that good writing is viewed through a highly structured academically focused lens, which fits quite clearly with the educational backgrounds of these instructors.

Though I have attempted to identify some of the ways that these values reflect (or do not reflect) a disciplinary division, these (dis)connections will be made clearer in the upcoming chapters as I begin to weave in the values of my ENG and “bridge” case to develop a fuller picture of what the disciplinary division looks like at MACC today.

CHAPTER IV

ENG VALUES – “I FOCUS A LOT ON THE PROCESS SO THAT, YOU KNOW, THEY RECOGNIZE THAT [WRITING] IS A WORK IN PROGRESS.”

After addressing ESL instructor’s values in chapter 3, this chapter will address ENG values, specifically related to teaching writing (ENG 111 – College Composition 1). Again, the messiness that blurs the boundaries of each concept that I present is central to examining the way the ENG faculty articulate the principles of good writing. Likewise, a discussion of the disciplinary division – both its presence and absence – will start to come into greater focus in this chapter because more concrete comparisons to ESL values can be made.

Like chapter 3, as I examine each concept, I will weave in literature to help explain why these concepts present as important to ENG faculty. Like chapter 3, the literature will present some messiness. While I have chosen scholarly journals in respective disciplines that target and are frequently read by writing studies scholars, it is impossible (and illogical) to separate MLWs from the classrooms of these teachers – in the U.S., over 10 percent of all students enrolled in K-12 public schools were considered “ELL” in 2018 (“English Language”). In addition to the approximately one million international students hosted at U.S. colleges and universities (“Enrollment”), many of these young MLWs will pursue higher education. As a result, a journal targeting composition instructors will contain experts and scholars that write about MLWs and considers their needs in the classroom, though, as Matsuda points out, these students do often get ignored based on the myth that L1 writers continue to be the norm (“The Myth” 637-38).

While such complexities make this a challenging undertaking, I have attempted to look at the field of writing studies as a whole – the trends that have shaped current best practices – and have attempted to contextualize my data within that work, examining how Megan, my ENG case

study participant, and the surveyed faculty members fit within those practices, with the assumption that they have some number of MLWs in their classrooms.

Overview of Values

Like chapter 3, I will present a brief snapshot of the major values that appear relevant before examining the evidence for each value in greater depth in this chapter.

Much like ESL colleagues, the ENG department's composition instructors focus on academic writing with a mind towards transferability to other academic coursework. This can be seen through an emphasis on the process movement, which focuses on specific skills for research and organization that are deemed useful across the college. Likewise, process approaches affect the amount of focus placed on linguistic concerns, as seen through the learning activities indicated and the responses to my questions.

Unlike the ESL department, ENG instructors generally deemphasize sentence-level writing instruction. For example, because Megan views sentence-level pedagogies, such as grammar and punctuation instruction, as part of revision, which often comes last in a process approach, such elements are deemphasized in her classroom. This deemphasis is quite common in composition scholarship and instruction (Devitt "Welcoming" 9-10; Ferris et al. "Self-Directed" 418) and represents a significant disciplinary division between these fields.

Composition faculty appear to value instruction for clarity but fail to define or specify how clarity is taught. However, it does appear that clarity is mostly a sentence-level concern for these instructors, which is similar to how it was viewed in early composition instruction (Nelson). These perceptions of clarity are critiqued by scholars concerned with genre and social aspects of writing (Butler "Style" 70-72; De Vries 12; Johnson; Nelson), and Megan appears to view clarity with this wider lens, tying it to audience need and interest.

Although composition instructors appear to critique five paragraph writing, other forms of prescriptive writing pervade, showing some disciplinary overlap between these departments. Megan values a paragraph approach that uses a topic sentence/evidence/commentary approach and views this organizational style as highly transferrable to other courses. While this organizational pattern is commonly taught (Duncan 471), many scholars view it negatively (Brannon et al.; Duncan 471; Lynch) and suggest that such prescribed genres may lack transferability (Beaufort 206-07; Downs and Wardle; Wardle “Mutt”). However, incorporating genre instruction does appear relevant to Megan’s organization instruction, with students focusing on rhetorical flexibility.

Source use is central to the composition class and is highly valued by these instructors. The field of writing studies has long viewed source use instruction as a central goal (Maid and D’Angelo; Scheidt et al.; Wardle “Mutt”) and MACC instructors appear to take this task seriously. Additionally, most of these instructors appear to see personal experience incorporation as a strength of student writing but do not view it as a value; instead, they focus on outside source use. Megan, however, presents a strong pedagogical focus on teaching students to value and incorporate their voice. The valuing of voice is quite divided in writing studies, as it was in ESL scholarship, with some scholars arguing for strong personal engagement in writing (Elbow *Writing*; Goldblatt; Newkirk “Selfhood”; Tobin) and others preferring a focus on “academic” genres (Bartholomae “Writing”; Hashimoto; Rose “Remedial”).

Finally, Megan values teaching genres with an eye towards transferrable academic writing skills, though this transferability is called into question by many scholars (Adler-Kassner et al. “Assembling”; Carillo; Downs and Wardle; Wardle “Mutt Genres”). This department also focuses on the instructor as audience, common in first-year writing (Clark “Audience”; Ede and

Lunsford; Melzer), though by using writing process approaches such as peer review, students also become an authentic audience for their classmates, a perspective that is viewed as crucial when producing self-expressive audience-connected writing (Hairston; Nash; Thomas).

This brief portrait depicts some of the major values that will be discussed in depth in the remainder of this chapter. As in chapter 3, I will attempt to contextualize these practices and beliefs within the field of writings studies through relevant scholarship, further developing and interrogating places where the disciplinary division appears both prominent and absent.

Value: Accuracy/Correctness

Grammatical Accuracy as a Minimal Concern

This concept represents the largest disciplinary division from ESL values. While there are forms of accuracy/correctness present in composition, sentence-level accuracy is deemphasized within the discipline. For example, out of the 25 survey responses received from ENG faculty, a total of four faculty responded in any way about grammatically based writing concerns, and only one responded that “mastery of the English language/knowledge of grammar” was a value of good student writing. One additional faculty member noted that one weakness of our student writers was that their “[g]rammar was low,” though they did not note “good grammar” as a teaching value. The two other faculty who mentioned this concern were directly related to what the teacher should do, rather than what the students should produce, with one mentioning that teachers should “give [students] professional writing training,” mentioning grammar as one aspect. Another mentions that students “can be taught grammar” which suggests that perhaps this instructor values grammar instruction. However, this instructor also fails to mention grammar as a value of good writing. Finally, one instructor mentions that “language” is a value of good

writing, but they define this as “tone, style, choice,” which does not always denote grammatical/sentence-level concerns.

Megan, too, does not focus on grammar in her classroom, and directly addresses that grammatical accuracy is not a value of her teaching practice. She mentions that she does not find sentence-level concerns to be frequently present or challenging in her classroom, noting, “...if you break down the [writing] process, I don’t have to go down to words and sentences typically. So, we’ll start, usually, at the paragraph level, so that’s good...” She does not assign students to read any textbook sections on mechanics or sentence-level concerns. Likewise, because she does not value grammatical accuracy, she discourages her students from focusing on it, noting that during peer review she tells her students “...please don’t focus on grammar. Chances are you don’t know where the commas go either, so let’s not try.” She instead suggests students focus on the higher-order concerns that make up most of her essay rubric, and points out that mechanical aspects, such as “punctuation, capitalization, usage, grammar, or spelling” make up a small portion of the overall essay grade.

Much of what is seen in this data is representative of the way that grammar is perceived and taught in the composition classroom, which is probably very little or not at all. The original purpose of writing instruction was to remove traces of error and fix bad writing through instruction in grammar, mechanics, and usage (Rose “The Language” 354, 343). Martha Kolln notes that there was strong pedagogical interest in such language and linguistics pursuits in the field into the 1960s, with at least fifty papers addressing “language” topics at NCTE in 1963 (27). However, as the process approach became ascendant, studying the language outside the context of the writing products students were producing for class fell completely out of fashion (Devitt “Welcoming” 10; Rule 21). Instead, revision for grammar became just one part – often

the least important part – of the writing process: revision (Devitt “Welcoming” 9). This focus on process can be seen when Megan tells students not to correct each other’s writing, and her call to focus on language revisions at the end of the writing process or not at all.

Additionally, as the field of writing studies “hard[ened] into disciplinary form,” sentence-level concerns were diminished (Connors “The Erasure” 121). The 1985 publication of Patrick Hartwell’s “Grammar, Grammars, and the Teaching of Grammar” is often seen as the definitive end to the focus on grammar and accuracy instruction within writing studies (Caouette; Matsuda “Let’s Face” 149). In Hartwell’s piece, he argues that most students already understand grammar inherently, though they don’t know how to talk about the rules, so grammar is unimportant to teach (119). He says that he himself “dismiss[ses] the teaching of formal grammar” (108) and suggests that teachers move on to something “more interesting” (127). The publication of this piece appeared to create a paradigm shift away from language interests in the field. Caouette argues that the continued publication of the piece “effectively ends debate ... on grammar instruction for those new to the field ... and it allows those within the field to avoid or outright dismiss the topic altogether” (61).

In addition to disinterest in grammar instruction in the field, Megan makes a strong distinction between what *she* does – teach composition – with what an *ESL instructor* would do, stating:

...I have a friend who asked if I would teach English to a non-native speaker, and I’m like, ‘that’s not what I do. I teach English, yes, but I can’t do that. I wish I could help you and I would [but] she doesn’t speak English. She doesn’t know how to write, and I can’t help with that. I don’t know what that’s like.’ So ... obviously it’s two very different things.

While both Megan and an ESL instructor teach writing, Megan suggests that the needs of the students are different and the skill to address these needs are different as well, suggesting a clear disciplinary division of labor.

Megan also notes that MLWs often want more grammar feedback than she is willing to provide, saying “I don’t go through their drafts and correct every error. And [MLWs] want me to go through [their paper] and they’ll happily fix them all, but I ... can’t do that for your whole paper.” Going back, again, to the idea that this is not her job and that she simply “can’t” teach English to MLWs, Megan suggests students visit the tutoring center to “submit their work as many places as they can get feedback.” She also suggests that students who need sentence-level help try the software Grammarly. In this sense, the lack of concern for grammatical accuracy may be twofold – first, it is not a value or priority, but second, Megan lacks the confidence in her ability to instruct students on language use.

Addressing MLWs in this way is common in first-year composition because “many teachers are unwilling to give up valuable class time for grammar or vocabulary instruction” (Ferris et al. “Self-Directed” 418), with only twelve percent of faculty in one survey indicating that they address grammar in writing classes (Matsuda “Let’s Face” 146), and many teachers seeing this as an “us vs. them” issue, believing they are compositionists, not linguists (147). Likewise, Ferris et al. point out that “composition instructors may not have the technical knowledge to effectively teach language points” (“Self-Directed” 418) because of their lack of education in applied linguistics. Both issues are made clear in the data from MACC. As Megan argues about her own pedagogy, she doesn’t feel capable of teaching language, only writing, noting “that’s not what I do.” She positions herself as a writing instructor who focus on process,

not a linguist, and as a result, she positions the work she does far apart from the type of language instruction that values accuracy/correctness.

Despite the push to move away from grammar instruction, there are still a few scholars or contexts in which it has been considered important within the composition classroom. For example, Blaauw-Hara believes that we should teach standard English to help students “succeed in their other classes and to get jobs at the end of their schooling” (“Why” 166). Daniel Cole states that grammar should be “in [students’] box of rhetorical and analytical tools, enabling them to both understand and be understood” and he dismisses ideological language issues, arguing that “grammar is not inevitably a means of oppression; it is, on the contrary a useful public trust that facilitates a free exchange of ideas and expression. Why should students be denied the use of this resource?” (28).

Over the last several decades, and more acutely in the last several years, there has been strong resistance to the claim that teaching grammar with a focus on SWE is necessary and non-ideological. The movement for antiracist writing assessment has demanded an end to white language supremacy which can harm non-white students (Inoue “How”). The Conference on College Composition and Communication published “This Ain’t Another Statement! This is a DEMAND for Black Linguistic Justice!” in July 2020. The authors of this statement demand that we stop teaching students SWE with the justification “that’s just the way it is in the real world” and that SWE should no longer be the “accepted communicative norm, which reflect White Mainstream English.” After Asao Inoue’s 2021 boycott of the Council of Writing Program Administrators (CWPA) due to the council’s resistance to implement the antiracist outcomes for first-year writing proposed by the council’s assigned task force (“Why”), a group of scholars including Inoue published “Toward Antiracist First-Year Composition Goals” as a counter to the

WPA outcomes statement. This statement asks instructors to teach conventions as “historical and political in nature” and interrogate how “particularly historical groups” create and reify these structures (Beavers et al.). These statements are deeply important for the future of composition, though because they are so recent, it is not yet clear what impact they will have on language instruction practices.

When returning to MACC, it does not appear that a focus on school or workplace-based grammar or antiracist considerations have made a significant impact on this value. Instead, the course outcomes for ENG 111 continue to reflect the values of the original WPA statement, and the lack of interest in sentence-level accuracy instruction appears more closely connected to the disciplinary division, such as pedagogical training and focus on process approaches, rather than an interest in incorporating a social justice mission connected to instruction in SWE. Examining how Lee fits into the debate over SWE’s importance will be addressed in chapter 5.

Value: Clarity

Clarity as Ambiguous

Returning to the definition of clarity provided by Moxley in chapter 3, clarity can contain both global and local writing concerns. Local concerns were more present in ESL instruction. However, when looking at the survey data, whether global or local concerns for clarity are dominant in ENG is difficult to determine. Clarity was one of the most common values repeated by faculty responding to the survey, with at least seven ENG faculty noting clarity as a value. However, devoid of definition, it is hard to analyze the way that composition instructors are interpreting clarity. By using context clues, I could determine that some faculty are likely talking about local concerns. For example, one faculty noted that they value “[c]larity – I emphasize proofreading...” Another mentions a value of “[c]larity, simplicity, brevity.” A third notes that

students are often weak in “grammar and clarity.” It could be assumed that these instructors refer to sentence-level clarity concerns. One faculty, on the other hand, mentions that “process work and collaborative work in peer review ... helps with clarity.” This could suggest the global concern. Some are simply vague: “Clarity, organization, using evidence,” and: “Clarity. I need to be able to understand the ideas on the page.”

Likewise, the course outcomes summary for ENG 111 does discuss clarity, but also suggests ways that clarity could be global or local, noting: “[Students] will be able to organize and explain ideas with clarity, vividness, effectiveness, and grammatical and mechanical correctness in expository essays.” There are connections here to both organization (global) and explanation (perhaps more local). Because of a lack of clear definition, how faculty are approaching clarity is guesswork.

This falls in line with much of the recent literature on the concept of clarity and the difficulty of pinning down a useful definition. Many scholars have critiqued the lack of a mutually agreed-upon definition of clarity and the confusion this causes students who are graded on this ubiquitous but ill-defined term. There does seem to be some general agreement that the term clarity is most often used under the umbrella of “style.” By examining the seminal style text, *The Elements of Style* by Strunk and White, style is nearly always a sentence-level or word-level concern. As Catherine Prendergast points out, those who are “Strunk and Whitian *shibboleths*” (emphasis hers), “clarity, brevity, and correctness have defined the conventional wisdom of what counts as good style for the last fifty years” (15). Likewise, Katherine Nelson notes that clarity is almost always a concern for “the language itself ... through diction and style.” Therefore, by most definitions, clarity is a sentence-level concern.

However, beyond this general agreement, the term gets much more complex. Nate Kreuter points out that writing studies, despite the ubiquity of the term, “has no single working definition of clarity, but instead many competing definitions.” Ian Barnard argues that when clarity is “invoked ... it is always spoken as if its meaning were obvious” and that there is a sense that there is no need to explain clarity, because we are all in agreement (22). Katherine Nelson notes how damaging this can be for first-year composition students because when teachers are “lax about unpacking how ‘clarity’ is defined” they are also unclear about the “ideological implications of our own assessment criteria and the hegemonies we potentially reinforce.” Barnard goes as far as to dismiss the concept, noting that we simply cannot define what is clear and what is not, arguing “‘clarity’ always stands for something else” (30).

While the scholarship demonstrates that there is a great deal of dissent over the definition of this term, it appears that MACCs ENG department falls into this unclear clarity trap. Because the instructors fail to define clarity, as does the course outcomes statement, how clarity is being applied at MACC is vague and possibly unproductive.

Clarity as Primarily Rhetorical

When looking at Megan’s use of clarity in ENG 111, a stronger picture of clarity’s definition emerges, though I cannot assume that her practice is instructive of the department. Megan views clarity as a sentence-level concern. This is made apparent when she states that students generally “don’t have any problem with clarity. Like, their ideas and sentences are typically” clear and “I don’t have to go down to words and sentences” when teaching.

While she uses a sentence-level definition of clarity, unlike ESL, which focuses on clarity as a form of accuracy/correctness, in Megan’s 111 course, the concern for sentence-level matters is much more rhetorical – it is about engaging the reader (which will be discussed further as part

of audience/purpose) with the use of narrative tools such as figurative language and imagery, strong and active verbs, and purposeful decisions about sentence variety. In one example she describes how the use of rhetorical devices can bring greater meaning and understanding to a reader and could be imitated by student writers as they craft a scholarly personal narrative essay:

In many publications that we read, people rely on imagery, figurative language, setting, you know, to show us how people are impacted by world events. ... [T]his is a tool that writers use all the time, and so I pull these pieces [of writing] out ... and then [students are] just looking for ... imagery, look for strong, active verbs, those kinds of things ... you [could] try in your own writing, and then try to connect it to your plan for the narrative part of the research paper.

While students are not required to use all of these techniques, Megan states that they should use this type of rhetoric within their scholarly personal narratives to make sure the story “come[s] to life.” She stresses the need for students to write in ways that are “specific and descriptive.”

Because early scholars often considered clear writing synonymous with good grammar (Butler “Revisiting” 320) and a “rejection of rhetoric, which was always associated with obfuscation and deception” (Barnard 23), Megan’s emphasis on imagery, active verbs, and figurative language is quite different. However, there are ways in which Megan’s usage of these terms represents a modern interpretation of clarity within writing studies. As writing studies developed into its own discipline, genre scholarship has had a significant influence on the concept. As a result, clarity is now often seen in the field as dependent on audience expectations which means that clarity will differ depending on the needs of the audience (Butler “Revisiting” 319; De Vries 12; Johnson; Nelson). Here, Megan’s own practice comes into view. Her approach

to sentence-level writing relates to audience engagement by offering students opportunities to engage in decision-making about the types of images and language to use in their writing.

Another way that Megan's clarity practice aligns with genre scholarship is through her instruction in syntax, such as sentence combining and mixing sentence types within a piece of writing. Here, Megan addresses sentence variety as a rhetorical choice meant to engage a reader. For example, she tells students in one class that she is going to "show you some examples of how you can start thinking about sentence structure as a deliberate choice and tool that you as a writer get to make," later giving an example of how a simple sentence can be a deliberate choice to "highlight a specific thing you want your reader to remember."

While sentence combining was traditionally seen as part of a formalist movement in writing, in which students were focused on sentence-level accuracy rather than using writing to encourage creativity and critical thinking (Connors "The Erasure" 110), Megan's emphasis on sentence-level writing "choice" draws from the anti-formalist focus on rhetorical grammar. Rhetorical grammar is about viewing grammar as a choice that a writer makes to effectively reach an audience (Kolln; Rule). It allows students to reject the oppressive nature of "school grammar" by experimenting with language for rhetorical effect (Micciche 717, 722). For example, a class might study the rhetoric of a politician to see the word choices the speaker makes to qualify their claims (Micciche 725) or imitate model texts to consider punctuation choices and their rhetorical effect (Devitt "Welcoming" 14). Considering choice and audience effect, as Megan does, fits neatly here. Lee, who also ties grammar to choice but in different ways from Megan will be discussed in chapter 5.

Much like her deemphasis of accuracy/correctness, Megan's articulation of "choices" here appears to present clarity not as a series of rules but as a much more complex process in

which students focus on the reader. This again represents a clear disciplinary division, with ESL placing clarity very closely with accuracy/correctness by focusing on sentence-level concerns for producing SWE. However, it is not clear if Megan is an outlier in this department or the norm. It appears that the composition department should do a better job of defining this characteristic and expectation for students, particularly given its ubiquitous use by faculty.

Value: Organization

Accurate/Correct Organization

Much like the ESL 51 course, organization is a very important element within the ENG 111 course. However, “good” organization appears have some differences between the two disciplines. While the ESL 51 course outcome specified “mode” essays, such as compare/contrast and cause/effect, in which an organization structure is highly specific, the ENG 111 course outcomes specify only that students “will be able to organize and explain ideas ... in expository essays,” noting that texts must demonstrate an “awareness of rhetorical elements such as purpose, audience, and organization.” This open-endedness is reflected in a 2014 MACC department survey (which was not part of the data collected for this study) which showed that faculty assign a variety of essay genres including (but not limited to) compare/contrast, description, literacy narrative, memoir, argument, rhetorical analysis, and exploratory writing.

This range of assignments may be reflected in the survey data, which, like clarity, was frequently cited, but not often defined, with many instructors simply listing “organization” as a value without commentary or definition. However, one value that the ENG instructors did appear to agree on was that a five-paragraph genre was something they had to train students to avoid. One instructor mentioned that students need to be taught organization, noting: “the curse of the five-paragraph essay,” and two instructors used the words “break free” when describing the need

to teach beyond the five-paragraph essay. A final noted that one of the greatest weaknesses of student writers was the inability to move away from the five-paragraph model. This departs significantly from the ESL writing course, where the five-paragraph model is standard.

Five-paragraph writing is not entirely eschewed in composition classes, in part because “formalistic” writing has been an easy way for departments to deploy to a large labor force of contingent faculty (Wardle “Intractable”). However, most ENG faculty agree that it should be avoided. In an analysis of the disciplinary conversation on five-paragraph essays, “about three to one [writers were] against the five-paragraph theme” (Tremmel 29). The primary arguments against five-paragraph writing in writing studies are that it lacks critical thinking to produce (Brannon et al. 18), it ignores audience and purpose (Tremmel 34), it is boring to produce and read (Lynch 289; White), and it is not a natural way to write (Vieregge 211). Much of this backlash is the result of the move away from current-traditional rhetoric towards process and genre approaches. Current-traditional writing focuses on form over content, downplaying discovery and development of ideas in favor of specific structural modes (Vieregge 210). Most scholars argue that approaches focused on problem solving and other tasks will serve students better in future writing tasks (Bernstein and Lowry 218; Tremmel 36). Therefore, although five paragraph writing is simple to implement, MACC’s composition instructors and the field reject this style.

Despite this rejection, there are certainly elements of prescribed organizational patterns present within Megan’s ENG 111 class through her use of templates and models. There were also survey-takers who mentioned focusing on “form” and the use of professional texts as models of good writing. Megan describes her emphasis on models and templates in the classroom, noting that the use of such models is an effort to help students feel less intimidated by

the writing process because often students are “scared of [writing], they never liked it, and they don’t feel like they’re good at it.” She develops model papers and draws from “good student samples” to help students “feel like they can approach [a writing] task.” Here, process is discussed in a way that values a specific organization for academic writing that is “good.”

In addition to templates and models, Megan emphasizes different components of academic writing that she believes will help her students transfer writing skills to their other classes. Some of the elements that she values and sees as transferrable are large, overall organizational matters, such as learning how to write a thesis statement and including topic sentences in each body paragraph. As she is working with her students in the classroom, they discuss the organization of their research narrative essay, a thesis-driven essay that asks students to incorporate both research and personal connections to their topic, written in a narrative style. Megan mentions that “your introduction paragraph ends with your thesis statement” and that “[b]ody paragraphs will always have topic sentences that give the focus for that paragraph, and that will always happen first.” Students should then go on to “group your ideas into chunks of information” which become part of each of the body paragraphs. Likewise, just as Shu suggested the amount of content that should shape each body paragraph, Megan also notes that “you want to plan for” approximately “two paragraphs per page.” If students do not have enough to meet the requirement of the paragraph, she recommends going out to find more research to expand the paragraph.

Megan also emphasizes rules about paragraph structure, particularly for a research-based essay, noting that she spends “a lot of time talking about ... organizing a paragraph.” Megan teaches her students a “claim/evidence/commentary” model of writing a paragraph, not only discussing it in class, but emphasizing it with homework assignments and in-class activities to

practice this model. She calls this model a “typical pattern for any body paragraph in any paper you write,” again suggesting that the model is highly transferrable. While the five-paragraph model might show a disciplinary division, the idea of basic, transferrable writing skills using templates and models does show some overlap with what ESL writing values.

This highly formulaic pattern for paragraph modeling continues to be central within college composition pedagogy. Its use can be traced back to the mid-1800s with Alexander Bain’s 1866 text *English Composition and Rhetoric* which taught the “first position topic sentence” (Duncan 471) and valued paragraphs in which all ideas in the paragraph flowed logically from that topic sentence (D’Angelo 431-33). While this style has been critiqued because writing studies has become more concerned with “contextual, socioeconomic concerns” (Duncan 472) such as teaching students to write without strict stylistic conformity (Brannon et al. 19), the textbook market continues to focus heavily on the “prescriptive structural model” which is a “topic sentence with support” (Duncan 471, 490). This can clearly be seen in Megan’s valuing of this style for “any body paragraph.”

Modeling is also very popular among composition practitioners. One study of university composition instructors showed that 76 percent of faculty used modeling as part of their instruction (Stolarek 155). Modeling has been considered by some scholars to put student writers into a prescriptive box (Dean 30; Devitt “Welcoming” 14; Stolarek 154) and by others for ignoring the social context in which writing takes place (Pemberton 47). However, other scholars over the past several decades have demonstrated that when models are used as part of helping students to recognize and engage with genre, they can be very useful (Charney and Carlson 111-12; Dean 25). For example, Charles Bazerman argues that reading models can help students to

understand the “wider public, professional, and academic communities” they will encounter, rather than basing their work only on their own prior experiences (“A Relationship” 661).

The default purpose for such activities – modeling and teaching a “traditional” academic structure – has been the desire for transferability. Megan expresses her desire for these classroom practices to help her students transfer basic writing skills. However, as Downs and Wardle note, there is no indication that a “unified academic discourse” exists (552) and there are not yet any clear genres that are “universal in the academy” and therefore highly transferrable (557). Anne Beaufort notes that attempts to transfer basic writing skills from one course to another can even result in “negative” transfer – attempting to apply first-year composition writing skills inaccurately to other contexts (206-07). While many scholars recommend genre instruction to aid transfer of knowledge, such knowledge must be made explicit to students if transfer is to occur (Adler-Kassner et al. “The Value”; Nelms and Dively 229; Wells). Therefore, Megan’s goal of transferrable writing skills may rest upon how she uses and teaches models in her classroom. If they are used primarily to show students how to produce rigid academic structures with a focus on form, there is a distinct disciplinary overlap with MACC’s ESL department, which also had a strong focus on form. Such rigid structures will be a significant topic of discussion in chapter 5.

Rhetorically Flexible Organization

Despite some elements of prescriptive organizational patterns, Megan also emphasizes the need for rhetorical flexibility in the process of organizing an essay in which students must make decisions about what information should be contained in each body paragraph. She notes that in her song analysis essay she provides a list of questions that students can choose to make the focus of each body paragraph, but with the research narrative essay “everyone’s topic is so different that I don’t know that I could even come up with a list of questions ... so I just tried to

help them look at it through various examples,” noting that students might see sample essays or outside reading that could spark the student’s organizational creativity.

Such student-provided examples can help spark creativity but can also show students that they have choices to make as they write. When writing the research narrative, Megan notes that some students are comfortable sharing a lot about their connection to the topic, while others are more reserved. She notes that either choice is acceptable, saying:

I have some students who in the past have had minimal ... of their own self. Like, just a little bit in the intro, as their kind of engaging opening. ... And then I’ll show another example where ... this student ... tells a ... very detailed narrative. And then throughout her research she reflects on whether or not this research is true to her own experience or not. ... So, we just talked about how there are different ways [to write], and they have a lot of choices to make with their own work.

The reflection on students making their “own choices” regarding organization and content decisions reflects a rhetorical flexibility in the class and suggests that writing cannot be fit into a one-size-fits-all approach.

Because Megan reflects again on modeling by having students look at many examples to help them think about their organizational choices, she goes beyond prescriptive writing instruction. By considering the effects that a particular organizational choice will have on a piece of writing, Megan helps students to recognize that texts are created in different ways that will have different effects on their reader, an important aspect in understanding text genre (Beaufort 206-07; Devitt *Writing* 208; Dufour and Ahern-Dodson 124). However, because Megan does not discuss or teach genre flexibility explicitly, the effects of such models may be muted and ultimately used in prescriptive ways. This can be seen through Megan’s emphasis on certain

prescriptive elements, such as topic sentence position. Therefore, some elements of writing appear to be choices (how much personal writing to include and where) while others (topic sentence position) do not, limiting overall writing choices. Ultimately, Megan's genre-based organizational instruction does represent a disciplinary division from the ESL department, though prescriptive organizational patterns represent a disciplinary connection. This connection will be explored further in chapter 5.

Value: Evidence Use

Outside Sources as Forms of Evidence

Unlike the ESL course, there is a significant emphasis on source use practices in the composition class, which includes incorporating source evidence into writing, evaluating that evidence, and avoiding plagiarism. These values are reflected in the course outcomes summary, noting that students “will be able to use evidence in a thesis-driven essay” and “will be able to use and evaluate outside sources of information, incorporate and document source material and avoid plagiarism.” Many faculty reflected on this practice in the survey data. One instructor said that they value student writing that “understands how to use outside sources effectively and honestly,” and many noted that they teach students how to do library and academic research as a major course goal: “I dedicate up to two weeks to learning how to research” one instructor said. Another mentioned “[students] need help using sources credibly.” Many faculty stress that this is a value because, in part, it helps develop critical thinking skills. One faculty noted that a good writer “is able to *critically* evaluate outside sources” (emphasis mine), and another states that students must “practice ‘responding’” to outside sources with “their own insight/‘new’ idea.”

Megan also integrates a significant amount of practice with source use into her course. She notes that part of the writing process is the “process of collecting research.” Many of her

provided Canvas materials and readings from the class textbook, *In Conversation: A Writer's Guidebook* (Palmquist and Wallraff), connect to source use. This includes sections on how to quote, summarize, and paraphrase outside texts, how to complete keyword searches, identifying popular versus scholarly sources, and how to avoid plagiarism while using sources among other materials. She also supports this reading with significant work in class on this topic. Students learn about the definitions of quotation, paraphrase, and summary and practice writing these. She also discusses evaluation of source quality and points out things that are a “good sign that you’re looking at a credible source.” She teaches the importance of playing with keywords to discover strong research and she is realistic about the materials students are ready to handle, noting:

We talk a whole lot about types of sources and what kinds of things are great for academics ... and I only require them to use one scholarly source. ... And then we just ... spend a lot of time talking about why the scholarly sources are going to be much harder for them to read, to understand, and to use. And so, when you pick the one you want, you’re going to have to spend a lot of time with that. Maybe as much time as you spend with the other four.

While this quote represents an expectation for source use, Megan also acknowledges that using sources can be a struggle for students. This, too, is a theme that comes up frequently regarding source use. Though outside source use is a value, many surveyed instructors believe that students often have difficulty with source use. One noted that students “have trouble with research” including “documentation” and “grasping the idea of having a source for reasons other than the source’s agreement with the student’s thesis.” Another noted that integrating sources “in effective ways to help build arguments” is the task that needed the “most improvement.” A third states that “[u]sing evidence properly (introducing, analyzing, citing) is a consistent weakness.”

Finally, plagiarism comes up as a common weakness. Megan notes that she always starts “at zero” regarding source use, assuming students know nothing about citation or plagiarism. However, she still has students who plagiarize, though she recognizes it is generally “unintentional,” and she will “give the paper back and allow for a revision.” She hopes that they will learn through this experience to “cite their sources appropriately” and by allowing for revisions she doesn’t have to “give a zero.”

The responses regarding outside source use in the composition classroom represents a significant disciplinary division between ENG and ESL. In the ESL classroom, source use was actively discouraged despite the literature suggesting that it should be emphasized. In the English classroom, source use is both a scholarly and pedagogical value. The CWPA addresses source use in their outcomes statement for first-year composition. This outcome has become standard in the field (Maid and D’Angelo 44; Scheidt et al. 215; Wardle “Mutt” 772). Text-responsible writing, which is writing based upon the understanding and use of source texts (Leki and Carson 41), is almost always expected in first-year composition (Ford and Perry; Hood), with research assignments going back to at least the 1920s (Manning 73). Lunsford and Lunsford’s national study of first-year writing classes revealed that by the 2000s there was significant emphasis on argumentation and research papers being assigned (793). While some scholars believe there is too much emphasis on a single course teaching students to use sources (Jamieson 134), most scholars view source instruction positively, considering first-year composition a good course in which to introduce critical literacy and research practices (Brent; McClure and Clink 116). Like Megan, all teachers in modern composition practice are teaching source use within the digital landscape that students encounter each day.

One of the core concerns for teaching source use is helping students transfer research skills to other classes. Without genre instruction, most scholars consider transfer of these skills to be impossible (Blackwell-Starnes 141). For example, Downs and Wardle argue that the term “academic writing” is problematic because it can mean different things across various fields, so it cannot be used as an “umbrella term” that implies easy transferability (556). Maid and D’Angelo note that studying genre within the context of information literacy, including understanding “scholarship as conversation” as one of the many ways to facilitate writing transfer (42). In general, teaching students that sources should be understood and used as a form of academic conversation is seen as critical to source use instruction and to later transfer (Jamieson 133; Kantz 82; Witte 227). For example, John Bean suggests facilitating research instruction within disciplinary genres, which can “accelerate students understanding of a field” (192-93). Such understanding is crucial to transfer. Because much of the ENG faculty suggest that students responding to sources is a struggle, transfer of source use skills may need further consideration.

Additionally, Megan’s experience with the difficulties students have using sources has also been well articulated by the field of writing studies. Megan notes that students have trouble locating and selecting quality sources and she helps students learn strategies for finding research. These are common concerns. Many instructors have found that students struggle to find meaningful sources (Lockett 238) and integrate them in ways deemed academically acceptable, such as including source material without comment or interpretation (Kantz 79) instead just integrating random quotations or paraphrases at the sentence level (Jamieson 133). However, a great deal of instruction and scaffolding can help students begin to develop source use skills in first-year composition (Branson 21). While studies show these gains are incremental and often

slow (Jamieson 133; McClure and Clink 119-120), source integration is often recognized as part of a developmental stage (Howard 796). For example, a 2016 study showed that after being instructed in information literacy, including database searches, scholarly versus popular sources, and citation instruction, students made gains in finding quality sources, integrating, and organizing sources from the beginning to the end of the semester (Scheidt et al. 226). Therefore, Megan's approach to scaffolding these tasks appears to fit current best practices.

Much of the scholarship here fits neatly with Megan's experiences and insights. While she acknowledges that students struggle to use sources, she also recognizes that source use must be instructed. She also takes a relaxed attitude toward plagiarism, allowing students to treat source use as a developmental stage (Howard 802) rather than an indictment of their abilities as writers¹⁵. As previously made evident, this concept represents a significant division of labor between composition and ESL simply because ESL does not instruct in source use at all. The ways in which Lee strengthens this as a disciplinary division will be discussed in chapter 5.

Citation and Source Use as Accurate/Correct

While faculty recognize that research skills are a benefit to students, there is a perception that some parts of citation should be done *correctly*. While this has already been demonstrated for the types of sources used (assigning students to find one scholarly source and others that are from acceptable locations, for example), it is also demonstrated in other course requirements. The course outcomes for ENG 111 specify that students must produce at least 15 pages of writing over the course of the semester. Megan, too, focuses on specific expectations. For example, she emphasizes research requirements, noting, “[students] have to have a certain

¹⁵ While MACC has a student conduct and integrity policy for which plagiarism is considered a violation, anecdotally, most English faculty agree that disciplinary actions against plagiarism are at the discretion of the instructor and are often handled best as moments of learning.

number of sources” and should “be mindful of the content requirements.” Finally, students need to learn to use MLA, and both cite and format their papers correctly. Megan notes that students often think “‘I didn’t know I was even supposed to do it in a certain way.’ And so, we kind of focus on just ‘Yes, there will be a certain way and you need to figure out what the certain way is going to be, and here’s where to look.’” This places a value on conventions that make the citations and the paper correct and easier for the reader to evaluate.

The emphasis on conventions appears common. Head and Eisenberg note that of a sample of handouts with guidelines for written work, a majority “placed more attention on the mechanics of preparing a research assignment” rather than focusing on things such as “how to define and focus a research strategy” (2). Such an approach towards information literacy appears somewhat problematic. Students often assume that if they follow such guidelines and use the “right” number or type of source, they will be successful in their writing task; therefore, they prioritize their efforts towards meeting these requirements over other source use skills (Lockett 236-38). More discouragingly, one study showed that students will “comply” in finding a required number of sources, but that around 50 percent of those sources were cited only once, showing that students are fulfilling a checkbox rather than learning to understand and use sources appropriately (Jamieson 128). A similar study showed that “formal rules did not facilitate inquiry but served to enforce consistent standards of labor” for source use, leading students to choose easier topics that allow them to fulfill requirements rather than move them towards true inquiry (Detmering and Johnson 17-18).

A final concern with such conventions is that they can be problematic for issues of social justice. While some scholars argue that writers must learn about the conventions of the genres in which they write and the communities of practice in which these genres reside (Adler-Kassner et

al. “Assembling” 33), strict adherence to academic conventions can result in writing that is the only “socially accepted way of interacting with text as defined by the middle class” (Pattanayak 85). Such values are reproduced and persist in part because they are dictated primarily by professional organizations such as the Modern Language Association, which has more to do with disciplinary conventions for experts rather than students (Connors “The Rhetoric” 237). Therefore, when such conventions are strictly enforced in undergraduate courses, they can cause a reproduction of harmful values about who belongs in the academy. As discussed in chapter 1, this gatekeeping mechanism was one of the central missions of composition instruction from its inception, though much work has been done to dismantle this approach.

When looking at evidence use instruction in MACC’s composition program, students appear to be instructed in using sources in ways that the scholarship finds to be both effective and perfunctory. Because the ESL program does not teach source use, this presents a significant disciplinary division. Lee’s approach, however, represents a difference to his colleagues and this will be explored in chapter 5.

Value: Originality/Self-Expression

Originality/Self-Expression as a Strength, not a Value

Writing that is connected to developing voice and an ability to incorporate one’s own experiences and personality is positioned uniquely based upon the data. Only two ENG instructors noted this explicitly as a value, with one saying they valued “self-expression” and one stating that student writing “should include details that are unique to the writer’s perspective.” A third listed “[g]ood ideas,” differentiating it clearly from “support for ideas (including research),” so this instructor may also value originality/self-expression.

However, in the survey question asking faculty about what they see as the “greatest strengths” in MACC student writing, ten ENG faculty noted something directly connected to this concept. One instructor wrote “I think when they write about things inspired from life, they are very honest and thoughtful.” Another said “...they are very good at bringing their own experience into their writing.” A third noted “The breadth of experience among the students is a great strength. They have much to say, and many students are eager to explore subjects that address their curiosity and concern.” In general, the survey data demonstrated a feeling of a celebration of the diversity of student writers. However, these responses also show that while originality/self-expression might be a strength of student writing it is not necessarily a value.

This perception can further be seen in two ways. First, some faculty hedge their response about the strength of originality/self-expression by stating that this can also cause a weakness in other areas. For example, one faculty mentioned that “...student writing has a lot of personality and uniqueness to it that closely resembles the writer. However, this can sometimes lack attention to certain detail (grammar/source inclusion) in favor of getting their voice/ideas out.” Another stated that “[s]tudents are really good at talking about their own opinions, even if they have no evidence to back up said opinions.” Additionally, returning to the internal 2014 faculty survey, approximately 70 percent of ENG 111 teachers assigned some form of narrative writing to students, while only 14 percent of ENG 112 (College Composition II) faculty assigned narratives. Looking at these two surveys together shows that while originality/self-expression is a strength of student writing, other matters, such as text-based writing, is the value that students really *need* to develop as they move through first-year composition.

This survey data appears to show that while self-expression in writing is considered acceptable, it may not be the ideal or standard in this department. Such an attitude has a long

history within the field of writing studies. The emphasis on self-expression in writing studies, which is often referred to as “expressivism,” was part of a pushback during the 1960s and ‘70s to the current-traditional focus on grammar and mechanics (Bowden 286), with scholars such as Peter Elbow, Lad Tobin, and Eli Goldblatt arguing that rather than having students “replicate the stilted prose of status quo writing,” students should instead find relevance and connection to their writing, which would validate their own experiences (Bowden 289). Self-expression was seen by these scholars as an opportunity to share power through centering the student in their writing, rather than centering the instructor (Sumpter 346).

However, other scholars argued for a social-constructivist mindset in which the student was not the center of their writing, but rather had to learn to function within the “larger cultural context,” most likely, the academy (Sumpter 342). Mike Rose argues in 1983 that narrative assignments are unlikely to help students construct more academically challenging essays (“Remedial” 121-22) while Hashimoto’s 1987 article on voice argues that writing is an “intellectual endeavor,” and any push towards expressive writing is anti-intellectual by nature (77). In the 1995 debate between Peter Elbow and David Bartholomae, Bartholomae does not dismiss that students may feel “pleasure or power” by authoring themselves in their narratives, but he still believes the central goal of such writing courses is what he calls “critical” or “academic” writing” (“Writing,” 486, 488). This debate has persisted into the current century, with academic voice being more commonly taught (Baez and Carlo 122; Spigelman 63; Sumpter 347). While MACC has not taken a “side” in this academic debate, it would seem, based on the data showing that self-expression is a strength rather than a value of good writing, academic writing appears to be the focus, though this does not mean that faculty dismiss narrative writing. The value placed on academic writing will be further articulated in chapter 5.

Valuing Voice

While the surveyed ENG faculty appear to show limited interest in encouraging students to use self-expression, Megan values the use of individual student voice and ideas more strongly than what appears from surveyed faculty. However, Megan *also* does not list self-expression on the survey as a value for student writing. Therefore, it is not clear whether Megan represents an outlier or norm for her views and her teaching practice on the use of student voice.

The most significant way that Megan incorporates the use of originality/self-expression into her ENG 111 course is through her research narrative essay. As articulated in other sections of this chapter, this essay asks students to weave personal narratives, including personal experiences, into their research essay, making connections between the research and their lived experience. Megan was motivated to create this assignment after being inspired by the books *Liberating Scholarly Writing: The Power of the Personal Narrative*, by Robert Nash, and *Me-Search and Re-Search: A Guide for Writing Scholarly Personal Narrative Manuscripts* by Nash and DeMethra LaSha Bradley. Both books promote the idea of creating assignments that encourage students to have a personal connection to the topic, and Megan articulates the value she sees in “me-search,” stating:

I even did a little bit of background study about just using ... “me search” or “I research,” or just things that are close to you and how it can become ... more meaningful writing for students. And just this break away from what we traditionally accept in academia as academic work can also include, you know, your own personal experiences and observations and that we should encourage students when relevant to share their own experiences.

Megan finds that these papers are stronger than those she was receiving before the inclusion of the narrative aspect, noting that they are also “more engaging and interesting to read”¹⁶ and the students “feel proud and connected to the writing that they produce.” She connects this to the inclusion of the personal aspect, stating that the work becomes “more authentic” to the writer. She also notes that most of the students really enjoy this type of writing, and they are often happy with the outcome and “less fearful” about future writing tasks after completing this essay.

Incorporating self-expression in this assignment, in which Megan clearly wants students to know that “there is a place for you and your voice in ... academia,” aligns with goals that many voice-centered instructors view as crucial for obtaining a quality higher education. For example, Victor Villanueva attempts to contextualize the argument for expressive writing by drawing on Paulo Freire’s idea of “critical consciousness,” an understanding of the relationships “between the self and society” and the ways in which these relationships reify certain power structures. Freire sees personal writing as a way to better understand one’s position and “affect changes” for oneself (477). Elbow builds on Freire by framing personal expression as a chance for students to center themselves in their own writing rather than simply repeating what experts have said, which he believes is the goal of basic, academic writing (“Being” 497). Eli Goldblatt wants students to see narrative writing as a path away from giving the academy too much power, noting that narrative can prevent the writer from making the teacher the “arbiter” of their writing, and can give writing a purpose aside from “passing the next class or getting a job” (461-62).

The goals of centering the lived experiences and empowering the writer continue to be central to instructors who value personal writing. Robert Nash, the scholar that Megan uses,

¹⁶ Although Megan clearly addresses audience here, I will address this aspect of her response to narrative writing in the next section on Audience/Purpose.

argues that narrative writing results in “stunning self-insights” (4), and Maxine Hairston argues that because students become aware that their classmates have different lenses through which they view the world, personal writing results in “genuine multicultural growth” (627). Elizabeth Baez and Rosanne Carlo tie such writing to antiracist writing pedagogy, stating that “[a]ll writers of scholarly discourse have the right to use their languages and dialects ... and to speak from their past experiences,” advocating for the development of individual voice as a necessary companion to the academic voice instruction that is common in writing instruction (122-23).

While some of these scholars argue that personal writing can help students produce stronger academic writing *through* the incorporation of personal connections (Elbow “Personal” 16-17; Spigelman 77), the push for academic genres continues to be the predominant theory in writing studies scholarship (Goldblatt 445). Megan appears to value both academic and expressive writing. Because 70 percent of ENG 111 faculty assign some sort of narrative writing, it may be that self-expression is a significant factor in this department’s practice, though most faculty appear to deemphasize it in favor of academic writing. Megan therefore may or may not be an outlier. Lee’s articulation of the need for personal and academic approaches are quite different from Megan’s and will be explored in chapter 5.

What is clear, however, is the disciplinary division between this form of self-expression and the form represented in the ESL course, which appeared to be related to faculty concerns over the time needed to teach source use, rather than a perceived need to develop student voice. Incorporating personal experiences in ESL writing was, then, a stand-in for academic research and a way for students to complete the evidence portion of the paragraph rather than an opportunity for self-expression, as it can be seen in Megan’s ENG 111 course.

Value: Audience/Purpose

The course outcomes for ENG 111 make the value of audience/purpose a clear goal, noting that students should be able to produce “well-structured prose appropriate to a particular purpose and audience,” and they should be able to produce texts that “demonstrate a self-critical awareness of rhetorical elements such as purpose, audience, and organization.” However, this value comes up in a limited way in the survey data, with mixed perceptions on whether this is a value with which students struggle or succeed. One instructor noted that students “need help finding a purpose for their writing,” and another said, “they need a lot of help ... considering the differences between audiences.” However, someone else said that one of their “greatest strengths” is “creativity in addressing a variety of different audiences.” Other than these three comments, only two other faculty listed audience and purpose as a value. Therefore, while this concept is addressed by surveyed faculty, perhaps it is less emphasized *or* it is being subsumed into other categories, such as organization (for example, if the essay was arranged with a particular purpose in mind). As a result, the remainder of this section will focus on Megan’s attitudes and values regarding these concepts.

Purpose as Transfer

Much like the ESL value of transfer, Megan notes quite frequently that she hopes students will transfer knowledge from her class into other classes, with a focus on general writing skills. While Megan does note that “you can’t possibly present all [writing] situations” that would be transferrable, she does still articulate some writing-focused transfer goals, including the fact that students will “have to do writing ... they’re going to have to do research” as well as recognizing that other course writing assignments will ask them to:

write a thesis statement, ... write well-organized body paragraphs ... topic sentences and ... how to wrap up paragraphs and conclusions. ... And then also finding and citing sources appropriately, following MLA. And I try hard to stress to them that it doesn't matter that we're using MLA, that you might be asked to use APA. Then, this is just a skill of learning where to look.

As previously discussed, the idea of "basic writing concepts" as universal and highly transferrable is questionable (Adler-Kassner et al. "Assembling"; Carillo; Downs and Wardle; Wardle "Mutt Genres"). Beaufort notes that decades of research have proven that a "generic writing skills course" simply does not exist due to the genre and context constraints that affect expectations of "good writing" (206). It is likely that such transfer will happen only for "near transfer," when an assignment matches almost one-to-one in skills or tasks, so students can easily reproduce those past practices (Nelms and Dively 228).

There are important ways, however, to facilitate transfer. One way is by making such transferrable moments explicit to students through "contextual cues" (Nelms and Dively 229), and discussions on ways in which new assignments may match previous ones (Wardle "Mutt Genres" 770). Scholars recommend reflective assignments, which allow students to consider the past writing skill and how it could be used in new contexts (Adler-Kassner et al. "Assembling" 30; Blaauw-Hara "Transfer" 359-60; Carillo 26). These reflective assignments rest upon significant genre instruction in which students learn about the relationships between "contexts, purposes, audiences, genres, and conventions" (Adler-Kassner et al. "The Value") and consider how writing is always discipline-specific (Thonney 358).

Because Megan has attempted to make connections to future tasks and transfer skills explicit to her students, she has started to help students facilitate transfer. However, because the

amount of reflection she requires appears limited it may be that some academic writing skills end up being viewed by students as less transferrable. Additionally, the viewpoint of general writing skills as highly transferrable appears to be a solid disciplinary connection between the ESL and ENG courses. This perception of transferability of specific writing skills will be addressed further in chapter 5.

Audience as Teacher/Classmate

Much like the ESL 51 course, Megan's course values audience considerations, but many of those connections are made in an ambiguous way often failing to consider *who* the audience is and *what* they need to know. This ambiguous use of audience comes up during multiple course observations. For example, when Megan talks about the deliberate choices students might make about sentence construction, she mentions those choices can "highlight a specific thing you want your reader to remember," and later says about a particular sentence that students are co-writing during class "[y]ou want to consider your reader all the time. Does a reader want to navigate a sentence that long? Probably not." Later, when discussing rhetorical techniques, Megan asks "[w]hat kind of details can you use that would help someone understand what this moment means to you?" and describes the use of narrative writing to "help engage an audience." Finally, when discussing evidence integration, Megan mentions consideration of how the reader would react to the ethos of a particular well-respected research institution, mentioning "[t]hat shows a credible source people have heard of..."

There are additional examples, but they address the same type of recognition of a reader. In this way, Megan clearly asks the students to address the audience during multiple phases of the writing process (from research to writing to revision) but does not focus on a specific audience, much like the observed ESL course. In this case, students are likely to conjecture that

their classmates or the teacher are the reader and write accordingly. This is reflected when Megan describes the addition of details to the research narrative paper, where she mentions that “...the more details you can provide, the better it is for us as readers...” Here, the inclusion of “us” makes it clear who will be reading and responding to the work – most likely a set of peers during a peer review day, or ultimately the teacher/grader.

Considering the teacher or peers as readers is common in first-year writing, just as it was in the ESL course. While teaching students about audience has been an important concept in the field of writing studies since the 1970s, when writing studies began to focus less on correctness in writing and more on rhetoric, Irene L. Clark argues that “it has not had a significant impact in writing classes because students tend to think of ‘audience’ only in terms of the teacher who will grade their work” (“Audience” 120-21). As Lisa Ede and Andrea Lunsford argue, a successful student “has so effectively internalized [academic] conventions that she can subordinate a concern for her complex and multiple audiences to focus on ... the single audience, the teacher...” (163). However, it is not just the student who views the teacher as the audience – teachers also project themselves this way; in Dan Melzer’s study on writing across the curriculum, 66 percent of all assignments are written to the teacher, and 6 percent have an audience as peers (W257; W250). Both teachers and students, therefore, are projecting this transactional writing relationship.

While Wayne C. Booth argues that a teacher *can* be a true audience as long as written feedback “shows that some sort of dialogue is taking place” (142), the general consensus in writing studies scholarship is that students must be taught how to address a non-instructor reader. In one of the seminal pieces on the importance of audience instruction in writing studies, Walter Ong argues that a writer’s audience must be fictionalized. The writer will consider this fictional

audience and adapt their writing style based on the expected conventions of this audience (11-12). Clark builds upon Ong's argument, pointing out that if students automatically consider the teacher as audience they tend to omit "necessary explanations, definitions, or support..." which leads to weaker writing ("A Genre").

Based on Megan's practice, students fit quite neatly with most composition instruction in focusing their writing on a general academic audience, though she diverges from writing studies scholarship. Just like the "purpose" of writing was viewed as academic transfer for both MACC's ESL and ENG departments, viewing the audience as instructor is another significant disciplinary overlap. This overlap will be further reinforced in chapter 5.

Purpose as Audience Connection

While Megan frequently takes a teacher-centered approach to audience and considers transfer a primary purpose of writing instruction, there are also strong connections between how these concepts are used in her practice that suggest a more rhetorical approach. Although self-expression was previously discussed, it is relevant here for the ways that Megan uses self-expression instruction through narrative writing to engage the reader (audience) and help students to understand the writer's perspective, a strong aspect of rhetorical education. When describing the use of narrative writing in her pedagogical approach, she discusses persuading students to use narrative in their writing:

...just this break away from what we traditionally accepted in academia as academic work can also include, you know, your own personal experiences and observations and that we should encourage students, when relevant, to share their own experiences because ... for your audience its's just more interesting. The students, when they're sharing in groups are more interested. They're like 'Wow, that really happened to you?'

and then suddenly they're interested in the rest of the research. So that's why I do it. I like it [and] the students respond well to it.

Later, when describing the use of her own narrative writing model on hospice care, she describes how students can “use [their] own experiences to get people to think about topics in a relevant way” and that such writing makes “students feel proud and connected to the writing that they produce. They seem like they're writing something more authentic.” She reiterates this when she later mentions that she was “tired of reading these papers that [students] had no real passion for” when she assigned a paper without narrative writing requirements.

Here, there is a clear connection between audience and purpose as well as self-expression. The instructor-as-audience, the student-as-audience, and the author themselves all benefit from the incorporation of narrative writing through greater investment in the work and increased self-awareness. As the writer values their voice and their story, the purpose of writing becomes to transmit not only information but to engage a reader and make them care about what is being written. Though the audience is still other students and Megan herself, by asking students to consider what they are writing, why they are writing it, and how they can best make their classmates care, audience considerations are addressed through these assignments.

Although the use of personal writing has already been discussed at length, viewing it through an audience-based lens here is useful. There are two impacts that personal writing has on audience considerations. The first is on the writer and the second is on the reader. When the writer considers an authentic reader (even if it is their classmate), they make greater considerations for the purpose of the text as a way to make a connection to that reader. When a writer has a goal of sharing a story and connecting to others, they often open up and grow as a writer (Goldblatt; Newkirk “Selfhood”). When students tell others about their lives, ideally both

see life through a new “lens” and understand that people experience things in a diverse range of ways (Hairston 672-73), fostering critical cultural exchanges. Finally, drawing back to the rhetorical aspects of this form of writing, students must consider what they write for their audience – the information they can omit and include based on what they expect the reader to already know (Clark “Audience” 121), which helps them to develop an understanding of purpose and need.

The other co-author, the reader, becomes just as important with this type of writing, as they attempt to better understand the writer. Robert Nash argues that sharing stories may be a biological function to which we are “hard-wired” to respond (63). Patrick Thomas, in a Barthian way, argues that the audience is actually more important than the writer because a reader “weaves together an interpretation based on the reader’s own previous experience with those words, with similar genres or situations, or her own priorities for the text” (127), and that this is actually a worthy goal, because multiple interpretations of a text are what a writer actually desires – the ability to discuss “the knowledge they make” as they write (129). Such an audience-driven perspective on writing helps students to write something that is both individually meaningful and resonant to the other writers in their “writing community,” (Hairston 673), in this case, a classroom.

These scholarly ideas connect clearly with Megan’s goals for this assignment – to connect both the students and the audience (their classmates) to the work. As Hairston points out, a writing community is an ideal place in which to better understand audience needs. Because the writing classroom functions as a space in which student can share their work and engage their fellow students, the writing gains a natural audience of peers. This functions to help students gain a more authentic purpose for writing. Again, this is quite different from how purpose was

addressed in the ESL course where an explicit focus on career and college “readiness” skills, was the main focus. Lee’s approach with his ENG classes is very different from Megan’s, and this will be addressed in chapter 5.

ENG Practice and the Interplay of Theory

After examining each of the concepts that express MACC’s ENG writing values, a mix of rhetorical considerations and prescriptive approaches appear to be central. These values help to show which are the most influential concepts to the department as a whole:

- **Accuracy/Correctness:** This is a low priority for MACC ENG faculty. Megan’s focus on process puts “editing” as a last-phase concern, deemphasizing this concept. Grammar and sentence pedagogies have long been seen as the purview of ESL instructors and therefore are not often taught in composition. Both theories demonstrate why this priority may lack interest in the ENG department.
- **Clarity:** While this concept was tricky to examine due to faculty not defining the term, Megan’s practice of emphasizing audience expectations and engagement connects clearly with genre considerations. Her focus on rhetorical concerns clearly eschews prescriptive views of clarity, once dominant in the field.
- **Organization:** These instructors deny the five-paragraph model of writing, yet prescriptive practices appear through modeling and the deemed necessity of thesis statements and topic sentences. However, Megan espouses some amount of rhetorically flexible organization with considerations for audience.
- **Evidence Use:** Using sources is considered central in this department with a great deal of scaffolding and process for finding and deploying sources. Students gain some

understanding of how sources “work” in academic writing, crucial for transfer.

Prescriptive concerns dictate the use of MLA and other research conventions.

- **Originality/Self-Expression:** While most instructors in ENG view self-expression as a strength of student writers but not a value, Megan gives strong voice to personal writing. Students are taught to value their voices and recognize how writing impacts and is influenced by the writer’s lived experience. However, both academic and personal genres are valued by Megan and other instructors, with academic genres remaining prominent.
- **Audience/Purpose:** The purpose of writing is for transfer of academic writing skills. While the audience is often the instructor, peers provide a more authentic audience which helps students to gain a better understanding of writing beyond the scope of traditional academia.

Ultimately, Megan and the ENG department give a strong focus to concerns such as source use and transferability of academic writing genres, and they spend less time than the ESL instructors on language and sentence-level writing practices. While students make choices in their writing, the choices are set up within highly specific “academic” limits related to topic, organization, sources, and audience.

These concerns may be contextualized based on the course outcomes statement, which values the writing process, stating: “*Through the writing process*, students refine topics; develop and support ideas; investigate, evaluate, and incorporate appropriate resources; edit for effective style and usage; and determine appropriate approaches for a variety of contexts, audiences, and purposes” (emphasis mine). The process approach, which has been dominant in the field of writing studies for decades, emphasizes the teacher as a facilitator rather than a corrector (Berlin 16), which could account for the reduced emphasis on language concerns. Megan is a strong

proponent of process, mentioning process repeatedly and incorporating it into her practice. She frames process as a way to help students “have confidence” in their ability to “transfer the basic things that you need in any assignment.” Likewise, thirteen surveyed faculty mentioned process in some way, showing that the process movement may have made a strong impact on how this department approaches some of the most strongly-held interests expressed by ESL instructors.

However, concepts such as originality/self-expression and clarity were harder to analyze in part because it may be that Megan responds to these things in ways quite different from her colleagues. This could be contextualized by examining the educational backgrounds of MACC’s ENG instructors. Unlike ESL instructors who had a fairly uniform educational background, the surveyed ENG instructors have a wide variety of degrees. There are some faculty with MFAs, some with MAs or PhDs in English (few instructors clarified if their degree has a writing studies or literature focus), as well as degrees such as MA in Literacy Education, M.Ed. in Secondary Education, PhD in Community College Education, MA in Teaching of Writing and Literature, and several others. Among the instructors with these various degrees, there are some who bring different professional experiences to their teaching, including six teachers who have some form of middle/high school teaching experience, and five with editing/technical/professional writing credentials. Such diverse educations could result in significant differences in emphases from teacher to teacher. For example, Megan’s emphasis on self-expression may come directly from her training, where she learned “how to use your own personal writing to make yourself a better writing teacher...” Likewise, it is possible that teachers not trained in writing studies might base their course content on popular or available textbooks, common departmental practice, or the values of the subdisciplines that they are from, rather than current scholarship.

Finally, this chapter helped to demonstrate a clear disciplinary division of labor between ENG and ESL. There is a large gap between the two department's approach to accuracy/correctness and evidence use, though the departments overlap in many significant ways in their views of audience and purpose. Additionally, while prescriptive organization is clear in both departments, ESL appears to value a more word- or sentence-level approach to "good" writing, within ENG this appears more at the paragraph- or essay-level. As I move into my final case study in chapter 5, examining my "bridge" instructor, these disciplinary (dis)connections will be further strengthened.

CHAPTER V

BRIDGE VALUES – “A LOT OF THE UNDERGRADUATE WORK IS ... IMITATION.

A LOT OF LEARNING HOW TO TALK THE TALK OF THE ACADEMY.”

In this final data chapter, I will explore the values of Lee, an instructor who is credentialed in and has taught in both the ENG and ESL departments. Lee has an MA in linguistics and an MFA in creative writing and he was initially hired in the ESL department at MACC. However, because of his dual-credentialing, he can and does teach in both departments. Due to declining enrollments in ESL courses, Lee now teaches primarily in the ENG department. I examined one section of Lee's ENG 111 course because he was not teaching an ESL 51 course during the data collection phase. However, during interviews and through my observations, I attempted to gather data that presented a picture of his values for both ESL and composition writing. Additionally, as Lee himself said “a lot of students follow me. ...I've had entire ESL 51 and 52 classes literally migrate over to [ENG] 111...” Therefore, he may be teaching ENG 111 courses to primarily MLW students. This will allow for additional understanding of how he bridges his practices between ESL and college composition.

As I examine the concepts central to Lee's practice as a bridge instructor (a description that is not an official MACC title and does not connote specific scholarly training but is used to designate his status for the sake of this study as both an ESL and ENG instructor), I will briefly reflect on the relevant literature from both writing studies and ESL/L2 writing that were examined in previous chapters. Additionally, the presence and absence of the disciplinary division will be a point of primary discussion in this chapter as I compare Lee's practice to his two colleagues and to the literature of these fields. While the literature will draw on two fields

that have clear scholarly and theoretical distinctions, I will make efforts to address when literature cited is specific to a particular field.

Overview of Values

Because I have already presented the survey data in the previous chapter, this overview of values will represent a snapshot of what Lee, the bridge instructor, articulated. Then I will expand upon these values in greater depth.

Lee, much like Shu, places a great deal of value on grammar instruction and the production of SWE, including in the composition classroom. Sentence-level writing activities are a common pedagogical practice. While the goal of SWE production is an ongoing division in both fields (Horner et al.; Inoue “How”; Larsen-Freeman; Silva and Leki; Tardy and Whittig; Vickers and Ene), Lee argues that upholding language standards that students will encounter in the future is necessary. Similarly, Lee views clarity through the more traditional lens of sentence-level pedagogy in which writing is clear and highly transferrable to an academic audience of future instructors (Bartholomae “Inventing”; Bartholomae “Writing”).

Lee values prescriptive forms of organization. He assigns five-paragraph modes in ENG 111, and he presents a strong focus on students writing the “right” way by following rigid models that help students to produce writing that looks uniform. Like his colleagues, he views these writing styles as necessary for helping future professors understand student work as much as students understand what their professors want. He has students watch him write an essay in class and provides copious model input for students to understand his academic expectations. While rigid organization is not uncommon in either field (Costino and Hyon 26; D’Angelo; Duncan), whether such prescriptive genres transfer has been questioned (Adler-Kassner et al. “Assembling Knowledge”; Carillo; Downs and Wardle; Wardle “Mutt Genres”).

Lee articulates a strong pedagogical focus on teaching source use in both ESL 51 and ENG 111. He himself articulates the disciplinary division by noting that he is critical of his ESL colleagues for not teaching source use. Much like organization, Lee believes source use instruction can help students transfer academic writing skills to other courses. Like Megan, he sees the need to heavily scaffold this process (Scheidt et al.), which he acknowledges is quite difficult for most college writers (Howard). Lee works on source use skills in class to help students prepare for college research expectations.

Although Lee has an MFA in creative writing, he does not heavily emphasize personal writing. While he acknowledges the benefits of personal writing, his depiction and definition of student “invention” suggests a Bartholomaen focus on academic writing over personal writing (“Inventing”), which, as articulated previously, is more common in the practice of teaching college composition (Goldblatt 445).

Finally, much like both Shu and Megan, Lee hopes that the work in his course will transfer, focusing on a writing process as something that will transfer, which appears to have some evidence to support it (Yancy et al. 28), unlike considering genre transfer, which is more contested (Adler-Kassner et al. “Assembling Knowledge”; Carillo; Downs and Wardle; Racelis and Matsuda; Schner). Lee also focuses on the instructor as audience, again, quite common across the academy (Melzer); but because his approach strongly favors a perceived transferability of academic writing, he places more emphasis on the instructor as an evaluator and downplays student interaction.

This brief portrait depicts the major values that will be discussed in depth in this chapter. Throughout this chapter I will attempt to strengthen the disciplinary connections I have been articulating in the previous two chapters.

Value: Accuracy/Correctness

Grammar Usage and Error Correction

Students having accurate and correct writing, particularly regarding grammar usage, was the most frequently cited value by ESL writing instructors in the surveyed data, while for ENG faculty it was one of the least emphasized values. Faculty in both departments noted that MLWs present struggles with “good grammar” when they enter college composition; however, teaching at the word- or sentence-level was not a common practice among ENG instructors.

In looking at Lee’s practice, he articulates a strong commitment to grammar instruction and error correction, aligning himself closely with ESL values in this category. When discussing his education, he nods towards contrastive rhetoric, noting that he has learned about why students from particular cultures would be likely to make certain “mistakes,” noting that this knowledge background helped him “predict which students were going to have which errors.” This knowledge allows him to help students with their individual language challenges, which he sees as a pathway to better writing. For example, he cites a 1995 article by Jessica Williams in the *TESOL Journal* which is influential to his practice. He notes that Williams’ research shows that overt grammar instruction not only improved student grammar abilities but also the content of the work, stating “...basically, give people the mechanics, give people the language, and then their own thoughts can start to run free, and the content will kind of come with it.” Therefore, he ties grammar instruction to improvement in overall writing content.

This educational training is reflected in Lee’s classroom practice. He focuses on sentence structure, verb usage, and punctuation in ESL 51, noting that these students are “still needing work [in this area], but, you know, they’ve got a handle on [it]. He also believes that these lessons must continue in first-year composition, where students can “fine tune things.” Lee finds

that students “even in [ENG] 111, 112, and even in the 200 levels ... haven’t been exposed to some of the grammar that comes with, like, comparing things, like ‘twice as much as...’ They just haven’t had enough overt training in it,” noting that no matter the struggles he finds students having, he will “wed the grammar instruction with whatever content we’re trying to achieve.”

Lee certainly practices what he preaches. During both observed classes, Lee spent the first half of the class working on sentence-level activities, such as editing a paragraph and discussing parallel structure and punctuation use, using examples drawn from workbooks. He notes that he spends a lot of time at the beginning of the semester working on grammar, and:

...just getting everybody’s mechanics up, because I have found [if] you go too fast and you start making assumptions about writing ability and you start sublimating [grammar instruction], you get very, very stressed students during midterm and afterwards because they feel like they were left behind long ago.

Here, Lee ties the term “writing ability” directly with good grammar and mechanics, suggesting that the abilities of the writer are directly tied to their ability to use correct and accurate syntax. Therefore, in an effort to make sure students are not “left behind,” Lee paces his class based on students’ abilities to produce SWE. He reiterates this value when he connects such deficiencies in grammar and mechanics to an inability to be successful as a college writer, noting, “because [students] don’t have [grammar instruction] they end up being at a loss to achieve the standards that the textbooks and our own objectives are asking for. So, I ended up putting a lot of effort into grammar instruction.” Later, he strengthens this connection, noting that “even though [students] may have good ideas, you don’t really want the barrier of grammar to keep them from getting an A for their ideas.” In other words, Lee makes a strong pedagogical connection between accuracy instruction and ultimate college readiness and success.

A final way that a focus on accuracy and correctness influences Lee's teaching practice is through his focus on line edits for student feedback. Lee notes that other instructors give "limited error correction" to MLWs and these students are often unsure how to respond or improve.

However, Lee ties his "overt line-by-line edits" with improvement in student writing, saying:

I turn... the papers into lessons. So, you know, "[T]his is not a good sentence ... This is confusing, try this." Boom. So, in the comments, ... they not only see that it's wrong or awkward or whatever, but I've told them why and what I've replaced, what I've done, so that they can relate that back to the lesson. ... So, because I'm so overt in what I've done to [the essay], as far as correcting grammar and some content errors, it's sort of pointless for them to revise it and send it back to me, because I've already told them everything.

Unlike Megan, Lee does not believe in choice, which will be discussed further below. Instead, Lee appears to be presenting "grammar" and "content" as the two most important aspects of a written essay, with sentence-level matters taking precedence: because grammar errors can be tied back to previous lessons and reviewed, they can be fixed in the upcoming essay. However, because each essay's content and structure is different, without the chance to revise students appear to be expected to gain more from sentence revisions than content ones.

As I discussed in chapter 4, one of the major reasons for the lack of emphasis on grammar instruction in Megan's ENG 111 course was that she saw grammar as part of the last stage of the writing process – revision, a common perspective in writing studies (Devitt "Welcoming" 9). While there are ways that Lee focuses on process as part of his emphasis on grammar instruction, his approach is quite different from Megan's. Lee views process as a way to produce an accurate form. In returning to the 1995 Williams article that Lee cites as influential, she states that "explicit rules and feedback seem to be the most effective ... in

eliminating errored forms” (15). With his focus on line edits that students are expected to internalize and improve upon in the next essay, Lee signals that written content can be improved over the course of the semester through such form-focused feedback.

Clearer than the connection to process writing are the ways in which Lee’s focus on grammatical accuracy/correctness leads to prescriptive forms of writing. Lee does mention tying grammar to content, which would suggest a rhetorical grammar emphasis, focusing on the rhetorical effects of certain punctuation and grammatical choices (Micciche 725). However, rhetorical grammar is also meant to help writers reject oppressive forms of “school grammar” (Micciche 717). Lee focuses on rigid essay genres such as compare/contrast and ties grammar to content by helping students to produce these specific forms. Therefore, the grammar/content connection that Lee makes does not suggest rhetorical flexibility as much as an emphasis on correctly written versus incorrectly written sentences based on the assigned genre.

Additionally, Lee’s perception that students can only get an A in his class through the production of SWE fits with the product-based concerns of some scholars in both ESL/L2 and writing studies. There has been a growing movement in both fields the past decade to acknowledge that language difference can be seen as both a choice and a “resource for producing meaning” (Horner et al. 303), often referred to as translingual writing perspectives, and some ESL/L2 writing scholars view instruction in SWE as concerning due to the valuing of only privileged language varieties (Inoue “How”; Tardy and Whittig 925). However, the perspective also remains that MLWs and ESL teachers want grammar instruction with a focus on conventional, academic usage (Larsen-Freeman 265-66; Vickers and Ene 112). Likewise, writing studies scholars such as Blaauw-Hara argue that “our students *need* to be able to adhere to standard English to succeed in their other classes and to get jobs at the end of their schooling”

(“Why” 166), reflecting Lee’s perspective, particularly as an instructor who teaches sections heavily populated by MLWs. Therefore, Lee’s idea that students can get an A if they produce specific types of writing reinforces SWE as the most valuable tool a student can have in their writing toolbox. Because it is considered the most acceptable form of communication, it is, by nature, highly transferrable.

In general, this concept is one in which the disciplinary division appears quite stark. Megan’s approach to accuracy and correctness aligns with most scholarship in the field of writing studies – placing the emphasis on process, with accuracy as a low priority. Lee, however, aligns with the minority of these scholars who continue to emphasize SWE as a path to academic and career success. This approach aligns with Shu’s depiction of the need for grammar instruction in ESL writing. Lee’s approach results in a focus on form over content. Because Lee’s practice aligns more clearly with the theory of applied linguistics, the disciplinary division appears in action through the significant differences seen between Megan and Lee’s pedagogy.

Value: Clarity

Clear Writing as Correct, Simple Sentences

Like the ESL and composition courses taught by Shu and Megan, Lee views clarity as a sentence-level concern, and much like Shu, he presents clear writing as simple and easy to read, calling it “good.” For example, in one class, Lee is presenting a prepositional phrase patterns and parallel structure worksheet activity, both sentence-level concerns, and he says:

We can sometimes not ... be clear about what's in our own head. We can just, like, assume that people were going to understand it, [but if we] go back ... a day later, you can see that now ... I left something out. It's not going to be very clear to everybody, and ... one of the main reasons for doing this [activity] is clarity. ... Think about the

times you've read a novel or longer work. If the writing is really good ... you can kind of flow along. ... You don't have to read every single little line; you get it, you ... understand ... what they're saying, and you can skip on ahead. [With] bad writers it's like, 'what?'

Here, Lee ties good writing with clarity in which sentence-level structures and syntax are a major concern. Likewise, bad writing does not have the attention to sentence-level concerns that good writing does. Good writing, therefore, is not based on content but on surface features.

As referenced in chapters 3 and 4, clarity can mean larger, overall structural decisions (Melzer). However, all three of the case study participants tend to view clarity as a sentence-level concern, even when opportunities arise to present it as a larger organizational matter. For example, Lee talks to his students about cohesion, which can refer to the larger structural and organizational patterns in a text, but Lee uses it as an opportunity to talk about transitional words and phrases, mentioning:

You want to make sure that you are being cohesive. For instance ... let's say you're talking about ... Virginia Beach. Don't just quickly go to the restaurants [there]. It's like, 'okay, well how did we get to restaurants?' Make sure you have the transition words in there. Let's say you've talked about the beaches, your very last line might say 'besides the beach, there are many cool places to go out and eat in the wintertime.' Boom, done.

By focusing specifically on transitions, clarity for Lee manifests primarily at the sentence level. Lee also talks about using transitions words such as "in addition" or "furthermore" to make "writing much more understandable, a lot more professional." Here, the connection between "understandable" and "professional" writing is meaningful – writing that is clear has focused on surface features, and the result of careful attention to surface features is "professional" writing.

Much like Shu, Lee is concerned with clarity from a perspective that views SWE and sentence-level concerns as highly transferrable. Shu argued that if students could get “grammar and clarity” in ESL, they could be successful in college composition while Lee calls clear writing “professional.” This is a common perspective in many composition *and* EAP-style classes which focus on “functional efficiency” (Allison 314), downplaying ideological implications that affect how curriculum is produced and texts are written, what Sarah Benesch calls this the “myth of neutrality” (706). Some in the field of ESL/L2 writing defend functional efficiency on the grounds that it helps students produce writing that is considered socially acceptable (Allison 314), which, by nature, would be highly transferrable. By teaching sentence-based skills, such as transition words, that make writing more “understandable,” Lee focuses on meeting an academic or “professional” reader’s expectations for a particular essay.

Likewise, this sentence-level focus on clarity as producing “good” writing sounds much like the types of traditional style pedagogy that have long held sway in writing studies. For example, clarity has long been synonymous with good grammar (Butler “Revisiting” 320), and it is almost always tied to correctness and language concerns (Nelson; Prendergast 15). As demonstrated in chapter 4, there has been resistance to these perceptions of clarity (De Vries 6; Johnson; Nelson), with Nelson pointing out that many instructors of first-year composition are “lax about unpacking how ‘clarity’ is defined” and the “ideological implications that exist for such terms.” However, Barnard notes that many instructors continue to view writing “[e]fficiency and utility” as necessary because colleges are a training ground for the workforce (35). In other words, the desire for transferability of writing to a variety of academic and other contexts results in instruction focused on viewing style as good or bad, which can be seen in the way that Lee perceives his instruction in clarity.

When viewing these two fields and considering Lee's perspective on clarity, he reinforces that clarity is a sentence-level concern for both disciplines, providing a significant overlap between the two departments. Lee again aligns more with ESL perceptions of clarity by tying this term closely to grammar concerns. In ENG, however, the term was used too ambiguously to determine whether clarity is also being tied closely to grammatical correctness.

Clarity as Anti-Rhetorical

Lee also views clear writing as that which is acceptable to an academic audience he often refers to as "the academy," mentioning at least three times during our discussion that students can view college writing growth through "imitation" as they move towards independence, well after first-year composition is complete. For example, he states:

I just don't have students that are confused. Because, you know, I've mentored, I've taken them by the hand and just, 'try to imitate what I'm doing.' ... Imitation is that first step, right, you know, 'here's the information, imitate that. Try to copy what this person is doing. That person is sometimes me or the textbook, and then we'll get to invention. So now that you've had a chance to basically understand the situation, like an argument essay, let me show you how I would do it. Let me show you an example. Let me even show you the basic argument essay that I wrote, and then imitate that. And then boom, come up with your own argument [and] fill in the slots with your own information.¹⁷ So, it's just really trying to give students that constant mentorship along the way and so that they get to the point where they don't need you anymore.

¹⁷ There are overlaps to organization here. These overlaps, particularly related to modeling, will be further discussed in that section.

This mentorship should lead to a specific kind of writing – academic writing. Lee notes that writing instructors are teaching students to “manipulate [language] in a way that we’re prescribing – the academic language,” noting that such writing gets them “accustomed to talking that talk and walking that walk because of the ... advantages that they can have from that.”

While imitation and a focus on academic language can be traced as far back as ancient Greek writing instruction (Enos 33), it is also common in current-traditional writing instruction in which students imitate specific writers (Berlin 38) and avoid invention, which would entail choice in the matter of form and content (Gold and Hammond 275). This seems more reflective of what Lee is doing, downplaying invention in favor of prescriptive forms. Lee even takes imitation one step further, having students imitate his work as well as that of other writers.

Additionally, he connects “academic language” and students having “advantages” as a likely nod to SWE, an idea that style handbooks such as *The Elements of Style* argue should be the goal of any written product (Prendergast 13). While many scholars have pushed back against teaching SWE in writing courses due to the marginalization of non-standard speakers (Beavers et al.; Inoue “How”), as addressed in the previous section on accuracy/correctness, some scholars in both ESL/L2 writing and writing studies believe that SWE brings privilege to writers due to its acceptability in our society and the perceived “advantages” one will obtain from using it. For example, Jeff Zorn, in a direct response to the momentum of the linguistic justice and antiracist pedagogies movements, argues that because standard English “remains the academic norm,” not instructing on SWE is a disservice to students and further marginalizes them (152-53). This connects to Lee’s belief that academic achievement is gained through learning writing valued in the academy, a concern that mirrors Shu’s perspective.

The idea of using imitation to produce good academic writing is also directly related to an anti-rhetorical view of style. As Katherine Nelson points out (and critiques), clarity scholarship often emphasizes the “relationship between form and content: that the best presentation directly correlates to content, regardless of intent or genre.” Therefore, clear writing is viewed as inherently honest, rising above rhetoric. This is reflective of Lee’s use of “fill-in-the-slots” writing: efficient, good-quality academic writing is achieved through imitation rather than considering the rhetorical situation and provides inherent advantages from producing that privileged form. While this perspective has been critiqued on the grounds that writing cannot be audience- or purpose-neutral (Ryder), many instructors still view good style with Strunk and White in mind, with good writing aligning with set rules (Prendergast 15).

Finally, while Megan focuses on audience reaction and need and presents clarity as a series of choices the writer must make (Johnson; Nelson), Lee posits that first-year composition students are not ready to “invent,” drawing on Bartholomae who argues that students use “imitation or parody” rather than “invention or discovery” when they are first learning how academic writing works (“Inventing” 11). Bartholomae views academic genres of writing as more important than narrative/expressive ones, dismissing the latter as too humanistic (Bartholomae “Writing” 488), and while he does not dismiss writing creativity, he does argue that “some students will need to learn to crudely mimic the ‘distinctive register’ of academic discourse” as a path to academic success (“Inventing” 19-20). While Bartholomae may view such mimic as flexible approaches to modeling, Lee goes one step further by presenting an imitation/fill-in-the-slot model that presents clear academic writing as a work that has followed a set of prescribed rules presented by the instructor, therefore aligning more with current-traditional approaches to writing instruction.

Overall, while the use of clarity in college composition is difficult to assess due to faculty ambiguity, when comparing only the three case study participants, a moderate division appears. While Shu and Megan are quite far apart in their approaches to clarity, Lee takes an approach that is recognized by some scholars in both writing studies and applied linguistics, by viewing writing with a with a mindset towards imitation of a set form. However, because all three focus on sentence-level clarity concerns, this represents a much smaller disciplinary division than that recognized for accuracy/correctness.

Value: Organization

Organized Writing as a Five-Paragraph Mode

Other than a single five-to-six-page research essay written at the end of Lee's ENG 111 course, all essays are designated as a five-paragraph mode. While Lee specifies that each essay in the course may be more than five paragraphs, his expectation when students leave ENG 111 is that they can write a well-organized, thesis-driven paper involving research. Lee's students cover at least seven or eight modes, including narration, compare/contrast, example, cause/effect, argument, and research. Lee views the major difference between ENG 111 and ESL 51 as the requirement that ENG 111 students bring in research for all mode essays other than the narrative paper. In ESL 51, students have less research requirement (which will be discussed under evidence use) because the major goal of that course is grammar improvement and "how they can imitate the form of a research paper or an essay."

A similarity between Shu's ESL 51 course and Lee's ENG 111 course is the emphasis on organization over content. Students must first learn about the structure of the assigned mode before considering the purpose for writing the essay. As Lee describes it:

...[students] can go through the chapter and then do the little quizzes to make sure that they know ... the structure of things and what things are called ... point-by-point, block. And then once they know the structure, whether it's a narrative, or a cause/effect, comparison, whatever the rhetorical form is, once we've talked about that for a while and looked at some mentor texts, sometimes they're my own texts ... they start launching on their outline, and they come up with the topic. And so, what they do is they present to me an outline, and then I go over that outline. Tell them what they're missing. Have a look at the structure of it and what bulleted points need to be in various paragraph...

Here, Lee points to the importance of understanding the organizational style of the mode genre, including how to distill the work down to bullet points, instead of having students consider an audience or purpose, therefore bypassing the invention phase, including considerations of the types of research or evidence to bring into the work, again overlapping with the ESL 51 course.

Another indication of the importance of organization around the mode is that Lee does not have students write multiple drafts of any essay other than the research paper, but they may do unlimited revisions of essay outlines once they've understood the structure of the mode. As outlines are a tool designed to focus on organization over content, essay structure is thus emphasized. Lee's description of this process and his feedback is worth noting:

...since I don't do multiple drafts of papers, what I have them do is they ... have to come up with their thoughts. They can bounce those back off me if they're having trouble. And then they give me their outline. And I go over the whole outline form. There's a whole other class devoted to, I literally type an outline, I have other mentor texts I give them to show them how to do an outline, what I need it to look like. It's very formal. I want everybody's outline more or less to look the same. ... So that's what they present to me.

And I tag that with a combination of content notes, and even grammar notes if I see that they're already off with their tense or punctuation in their phrases and stuff. And then they go off, and within probably about four or five days or so ... they submit their paper, and that's it.

Lee does provide “content notes,” but these are alongside an outline that values an easy-to-read structure and is relatively identical from one student to the next, again valuing organization over content. Likewise, grammar concerns are placed with equal importance at this early stage.

The emphasis placed on outlining and grammar alongside content notes shows that, much like Shu’s ESL 51 course, content decisions are based upon their usefulness in fitting the organizational mode. The desire to place organizational and structural considerations before issues of content is a perspective that is quite common in ESL writing (Costino and Hyon 34; Johns “Genre Awareness” 243). Modes essays fit this perspective well – because every student essay looks “more or less ... the same,” good organization has been distilled down to a format. A rigid organizational approach is also not uncommon in college composition. While Megan did allow students some amount of rhetorical flexibility in their writing, like many in the field, both Megan and Lee hold prescriptive ideas about paragraph organization, including placement of the topic sentence and organization of body paragraphs (D’Angelo; Duncan). While some instructors view such forms as highly transferrable to other courses (Atkinson and Ramanathan 556-557), as addressed in chapter 4, this remains a contested position (Adler-Kassner et al. “Assembling Knowledge”; Carillo; Downs and Wardle; Wardle “Mutt Genres”). However, such perspectives continue to inform Lee’s pedagogical practices for organization.

The writing process has often been used to reject product-based forms of writing with a focus on developing organization based on the unique writing situation (Racelis and Matsuda

386). While Lee does consider using the writing process in his assignments through allowing students unlimited outline revisions, because students cannot revise drafts and must follow the assigned form, Lee's class remains more product based (Matsuda "Process" 70; Vieregge 209) than process centered.

Finally, although prescriptive paragraphing in first-year composition is common, Lee's focus on a five-paragraph form does appear distinct for ENG 111. Recalling the survey data from chapter 4, many faculty distained the five-paragraph model of writing, which is a common perspective of writing instructors (Tremmel 29). This type of writing is often used because it makes the job of the instructor easier (Lynch 288) because they do not have to work very hard to respond to such writing. If the student has written prescriptively, it is correct; if they have not, it is wrong. Therefore, such classes are teacher-centered, common in product-based classrooms (Rosati 12). Because product-focused writing has long been supplanted by the process approach (Matsuda "Process" 68), Lee appears to be a bit of an outlier for his choice to focus on mode and five-paragraph writing.

Accurate/Correct Organization

As was made clear in the previous section, teaching organization is a very important part of Lee's practice. While both Shu and Megan emphasize modeling, modeling in Lee's ENG 111 course is less about teaching genre flexibility and more about meeting the requirements of the prescribed mode. Lee strongly emphasizes "imitation," following a product-based form of that idea. For example, he describes how he initiates students into producing the work he expects:

I do a lot of mentoring. I believe in mentor texts, and I believe in not just throwing the [text]book at people and just throwing whatever you found online as an example. I literally will either do a live presentation or a recording of me writing a paper, for

instance. I will bring up [Microsoft] Word, I will show every single way to format that ...as far as ... doing all the MLA stuff... I will literally sit there and write part of a paper and so ... it takes the mystery away.

Lee later notes that students can use the essay that he wrote to “come up with your own argument [and] fill in the slots with your own information.” If students do not produce work that meets the organizational standards that he sets, he notes that he is able to bond with students and be friendly while also asking them “[h]ow come you can’t make [your paper] look like [mine]?”

This emphasis on correct writing is further elucidated by his focus on outlining rather than producing drafts, as he notes “[w]hat I’m trying to train the students to do is do things right, pretty much the first time you do it. Get your thoughts down, get it organized, write the paper, move on to the next one.” Such emphasis on a correct/accurate form of organization highlights a belief that writing is not rhetorically flexible, but it is instead simplistic and can be taught as a set of rules based on prescribed academic genre. Therefore, students internalize rules that they can take forward to better or correctly organize the next essay.

Here, Lee views organization as highly transferrable as he places himself as the audience for a piece of writing. While he is “train[ing] students to do” it “right,” he implies that good writing is about uniformity and doing what the teacher wants. This perspective provides students an ideal of Western academic writing (Pennycook 265) that they may have to perform in other classes. This viewpoint overlaps with product-based forms of writing. In such pedagogy, the person in charge – the teacher – has their “privileged status in society” reified (Berlin 37). Lee’s expectation that all texts will and should look the same reinforces the notion that good writing can and should be based upon his (and his understanding of future professors’) expectations.

In general, there is a moderate division between ESL and ENG in this category. While Lee has students create very rigid texts, he also appears to be out of the norm. Megan, who does have some product focus in her assignments also builds in genre and process elements that set her apart from Shu and Lee. Given the distain for five-paragraph writing in ENG 111, as well as the strong emphasis on process expressed by surveyed faculty, it is unlikely that Lee's case is representative of college composition. Megan may be closer to the norm at MACC and within the field, reinforcing this category as a moderate disciplinary division and Lee as a potential outlier.

Value: Evidence Use

Outside Sources as Forms of Evidence

So far, many of Lee's values and practices have aligned more closely with ESL writing values. When it comes to evidence use, however, Lee aligns with Megan and ENG values. Lee, like his ENG counterparts, places a strong emphasis on source use as a form of evidence and he takes the time to scaffold this process throughout the semester. For example, he assumes that students in ENG 111 do not know how to cite sources and he introduces citation practices around week three. Then he uses each essay "except for the narrative" as a chance to include "at least one source to back up something you've mentioned in your paper." Lee views incorporation of research as "going off and doing a journey" in which students can find sources, share those ideas with the reader, so the reader can "go out and do [their] own research," while the writer gains the ability to both "summarize and respond." He mentions that he wants "students to be able to leave [ENG] 111 and ... prepare to jump into a conversation that's going on and feel like they have something to share." These ideas show that Lee sees source use as more than just repeating the ideas of others but involves students entering an academic conversation.

Lee teaches students how to narrow searches “so they don’t end up with a billion hits when they’re doing searches.” He also teaches students to use Google Scholar and to better understand which types of “websites and articles are valid and ... peer reviewed.” However, his expectation for this process is tempered by an understanding of where ENG 111 students start this process, noting that he introduces academic journals and databases but “most aren’t quite ready for that.” He instead focuses on using the library website, reading abstracts, and citation skills. During one observation, Lee taught students to refine keyword searches in ProQuest.

Lee also views source use practices for ESL 51 very differently from Shu. He believes that students in ESL 51 should be learning source use before entering ENG 111. He notes:

Sometimes my arguments to my ESL colleagues about, ‘you really need to get your [ESL] 51 students adjusted to doing basic research.’ [They respond] ‘Well, I don’t have the time for that because we really need to be spending time with grammar.’ I go, ‘they’re not mutually exclusive, guys. ... You can only do so much grammar before your brain starts to melt. You have to have a context.’

Lee reinforces this position when he notes that he teaches ESL 51 and 52 as “English lite.”

Though he allows ESL students to write without sources for most of their essays because “you’re just looking at the grammar ... [and] the form of a research paper or an essay,” he has these students write one five-paragraph research essay. He notes that for students “it’s a big learning curve but ... extremely beneficial because now when those ESL 51 students get into [ENG] 111, ... they know what MLA means ... they know the basics ... of getting online, getting a couple of sources, ... somewhat accurately give credit to those sources, and then, you know, make a conclusion.” He separates this work from what he calls a “cold essay, where [students] say, ‘you know, most doctors think that COVID-19...’” Here Lee is differentiating between what

he does – introduce research – with what his colleagues and the final assessment in the ESL 51 course requires students to do – write with only sentence-level and organizational concerns in mind, allowing students to use vague, generalized statements as evidence.

While Shu saw source use instruction as too complex and time-consuming to teach, particularly due to issues with student plagiarism, she was outside the norm of ESL/L2 writing scholarship for this value (Grabe and Zhang; Liu 50; Pecorari and Petric). Lee, by rejecting the perspectives of his colleagues and voicing the discrepancy between ESL instructors and the perceived needs of his students, reinforces the strong disciplinary division for this category.

Much like Megan, Lee views source instruction with a mind towards transferrable skills. As Leki and Carson point out, students in ESL writing courses must be taught source use and engagement with source texts because of the work they will do across the college, noting “giving students direct acquaintance with text-responsible writing in writing classes transforms the class ... into one that becomes central to students’ academic and personal growth...” (63-64). This seems to align quite clearly with Lee’s perspective for starting to introduce source use in ESL 51. Because he recognizes that source use will be expected in ENG 111, by preparing students to use sources, he helps them to understand expectations for research, analysis, and citation that are present in most college writing classes (Lee “A Comparison” 373).

Lee, like Megan, focuses on scaffolding source use practices. Lee teaches students about keywords, discovering a variety of places to find sources, reading abstracts, and choosing quality sources. He also recognizes that source use develops over time, with students learning to use stronger sources as they move through their academic careers (Howard 796), placing reasonable expectations on developing writers. Viewing source use as a process that students move through in developmental steps is important to help students avoid frustration that can “actively work

against the learning process” (Detmering and Johnson 13-14). Likewise, both Lee and Megan help students enter “scholarship as conversation,” which facilitates writing transfer (Maid and D’Angelo 42). Teaching students “what ... sources do” in academic conversations is crucial for helping students be critical users of sources (Kantz 78-79), rather than simply parroting experts. By focusing on students joining academic conversations, Lee is facilitating this knowledge.

Of all the concepts articulated in this chapter, source use practice is the one upon which Megan and Lee most align and where Shu is a clear outlier. The fact that Lee articulates the difference between his practices and that of his colleagues in the ESL department reinforces this strong disciplinary division. ESL and college composition appear to view the goals of writing with evidence quite differently. For Shu it’s about developing language skills rather than using sources while Lee and Megan see evidence use as students gaining practice in inserting themselves into disciplinary conversations.

Citation and Source Use as Accurate/Correct

Similarly aligning with Megan and ENG values is the expectation that certain requirements, such as MLA citations, are done correctly. Lee introduces MLA format during the ENG 111 class and reinforces such conventions through textbook readings and videos. He notes that he assigns students to use this format and stresses to students that “it’s kind of robotic, and I tell them that, ‘guys, I want you guys to be nice little soldiers. So, when you go to any other class, you’re gonna have work that looks good. It’s not going to be all over the place.’” He also mentions that when students fail to use MLA format, it shows that they are “just not paying attention,” and that he allows for revision to make the paper look like the samples he provides. Here again, Lee reinforces that such skills reduce the cognitive load for him and other teachers at the college and that such values are part of being inducted into the “academy.” He appears to

believe that learning to perform such skills correctly will allow for greater access and approval in spaces where these skills are desired.

Lee also stresses that citations themselves are something to view as a rote skill. Like Megan, he does not connect citation to academic communities. Lee has his ESL 51 and ENG 111 students create EasyBib accounts, which helps these students to generate citations and create “a consistently good-looking work cited page.” While showing his students how to use EasyBib he tells them that if they use the tool to create a work’s cited page “then you never have to worry about it again. You just get that skill done, and you can move on and do the more fun things, like just doing your research...”

Here Lee emphasizes that certain parts of citation are simply to check a box without providing a clear understanding of the purpose of these conventions, why they exist, and how to contextualize them (Adler-Kassner et al. “Assembling” 33), again overlapping with the general view of citation seen in Megan’s composition class. Citation is often “taught as generic skills which can be transferred across contexts, but not all disciplines use and evaluate references in the same way” (Hyland “Genre-Based” 23). Therefore, while both Lee and Megan view such skills as transferrable, such transfer is not by any means certain. Therefore, both instructors view such conventions with a product-based mindset in which students learn more how to check the boxes rather than gaining a greater understanding for why they cite sources (Jamieson 133).

Additionally, Lee views MLA conventions as important for making each student’s work look “good,” ignoring the ideological implications and values that are reinforced with this ideal (Pattanayak 85). Because he centers the teacher as the judge of writing that is good by stressing the necessity of conventional uniformity, he is reducing the cognitive load on himself as the grader. However, this may be a risky strategy in part because conventions do not exist uniformly

across the academy (Thonney 357); therefore, the cognitive burden may be less on Lee, but future instructors may not benefit as much from the focus on uniformity as he perceives.

Just as the last section indicated, for evidence use, the connections between Lee and Megan are clear, as are the disconnects between these instructors and Shu. Because Shu sees outside evidence use as the purview of another department (ENG), this is a significant disciplinary division that appears to be uncommon when considering ESL/L2 scholarship but more common when considering actual ESL writing practices.

Value: Originality/Self-Expression

Valuing Academic Writing

While Megan's valuing of student voice was particularly strong, it can be seen in a weaker form in Lee's class. Because he almost always ties the goals of using original ideas or self-expression along with additional academic writing goals, he does not view this value through a strong expressivist mindset as Megan did.

One example of Lee's focus on academic rather than expressive goals is seen in his ENG 111 autobiographical narrative essay. This essay allows students to write about their lives and gives Lee a chance to get the class comfortable before they begin research-based writing. However, rather than discussing this essay as a cultural exchange or personal exploration, Lee articulates that one of the values he places on narrative writing in these early weeks is to work "on grammar quite a bit," because narrative essays move "back and forth through time a lot" and this gives the class a chance to put grammar instruction into context with the work of the class. Therefore, this goal is far more teacher centered (Sumpter 342-43) with a goal of accuracy and correctness rather than self-expression.

At several points, Lee articulates the value of student personal experience, but always tempers this by noting the types of outside research students should bring in, again valuing academic genres. For example, he says:

...every time you respond to a TV show you hate, or to two people's relationships you think [is] a mess, you're responding to a situation, and usually backing it up with your observations. But everything's coming back to the topic, you know? And what we do, of course, is we're trying to get [students] to the point where not only are they responding with, you know, internal feelings and thoughts, but also trying to ... bring in some outside data to support that.

Here, he argues that "internal feelings and thoughts" are important aspects of writing, but that the academic goals of "outside data" are equally important. In another conversation, he reiterates the connection between narrative writing and academic writing, stating:

...all research is a narrative. I feel that if you can give people some background, and then tell them where you're headed and guide them, that's a narrative. I don't care whether it's arguing about abortion or whether it's talking about Black Lives Matter or about whether we should have a capital punishment, you have to tell a story. And you're simply supporting that story with enough convincing evidence or shared experiences to bring your reader on board.

In both quotes, Lee articulates the value of student voice – that good writing is personal and infused with the writer, transcending the use of only outside evidence (Clark "Process" 14). Lee does not suggest that this writing must be personally revealing, as Elbow critiqued ("Personal" 23), but only that writing is inherently personal. However, Lee's approach is tempered by academic goals, in which independent critical thought is supported by research.

Therefore, while personal and voice-based writing does appear important to Lee, he also aligns more closely with social constructionists who view college writing as an opportunity to strengthen the understanding and use of academic genres. For example, Bartholomae argues that students become part of an academic community by “assembling and mimicking its language” (“Inventing” 4). Lee also values mimic, noting that students must imitate the writing instructor, receiving “that constant mentorship ... so that they get to the point where they don’t need you anymore.” Here, Lee may even go one step beyond social constructionists such as Bartholomae, who connect mimic to academic modeling. By asking students to imitate the instructor specifically, he is centering his own work as good writing. This is reinforced when Lee discusses invention. This term has roots in the Greek canon of rhetoric and often refers to “the search for the right line of argument to persuade a given audience in a contingent situation” (Gold and Hammond 275). Lee sees this as something only more advanced writers can do, noting “...once you’re out of ... [ENG] 111, the invention is something that matures with time. You know, you just invent more and more, [but] you still need guidance.” Therefore, to get to invention stages of writing, students first must pass through earlier stages that require rigid academic imitation during first-year composition.

Megan, too, focuses on both academic research and personal experience. Both instructors recognize the ways in which personal experience can help produce stronger essays, including those with academic research (Elbow “Personal” 16), and the ways in which personal experience itself can serve as strong evidence (Spigelman 83). However, while Megan acknowledges that personal experience can make writing more authentic and powerful (Goldblatt 461; Villanueva 477), Lee views narrative writing as a path towards grammar improvement, tempering the ideological implications of this type of instruction by maintaining the language is the power.

Finally, when considering the disciplinary division for this concept, the difference between Lee and Shu’s approach appears relevant. Shu views the purpose of self-expression as a form of evidence use so she does not have to instruct students on source use. Evidence becomes a generalization meant to develop a paragraph rather than investigate power or produce academic writing. Therefore, this value shows a strong disciplinary division. While Megan and Lee differ from each other on how to emphasize individuality and self-expression in writing, they both reflect the principles of writing studies scholarship that are pervasive in the culture of writing instructors. Although Lee also prioritizes sentence-level language practices while teaching narrative writing, because Lee articulates additional goals for self-expression, such as responding to ideas with ideas, Shu’s concern for only transferrable language skills demonstrates this divide.

Value: Audience/Purpose

Purpose as Academic and Career Success

As previously articulated, Lee sees a major goal of ENG 111 as getting students to “manipulate [language] in a way that we’re prescribing – the academic language,” which includes “talk[ing] back to the academy.” He believes that being able to appropriate academic discourse should bring with it academic success. Lee verbalizes this when he discusses that students should be able to transfer the skills he’s teaching into their other courses. Even if they do not necessarily care for the subject matter, they can find ways to be successful by meeting academic expectations. Lee states:

I think what I want my students to be good at is just being ... good students and being inquisitive. They may hate history, but no one cares. Can you be good at it? Can you be good at going into that topic, and ... making something interesting for yourself, and taking ownership of it, and doing the research properly, and writing a decent paper? You

may never go back to history again in your life, and a lot of the good education is about doing well at those things you ... aren't necessarily in love with, but still doing them well.

That's just good training for everything, for life.

He further articulates this purpose when he mentions that he is “preparing ... students to be able to go into any ... discipline” and do the research work he teaches in ENG 111, such as write a proposal, write a thesis, do library research, understand valid websites, and “prepare to jump into a conversation that’s going on, and feel like they have something to share.” In other words, much like Megan and Shu, Lee sees a set of discrete and highly transferrable academic skills that students can use and take to be successful in other coursework across the college.

He also has a secondary purpose which is closer to Shu’s – that of success beyond the academy. He sees skills such as writing reports, emails, and articles as important for all students to learn, noting that “everyone has the same stakes. Everyone has equal benefit” in learning to write. He argues that if students cannot internalize these writing skills, they are going to struggle to find success in the job market, noting:

And I [tell them], ‘a lot of employers, it's not unusual now to say, “must have strong oral and written communication skills.” And believe ... me, they will test you on it. I've been through it. It may not happen the day you come in for the first interview, but at some point, they will have you come in, they will sit you in a room, and they will give you something to write. And if you don't know how to do it, you're not going to get the job. And so, the oral [skills] they can usually tell by simply the interview. If ... they're serious about the written communication skills, they will test you on it.’ That gets everybody's attention.

Here, the types of academic research skills that Lee values he presents as highly transferrable into the work world. For students who may be MLWs, Lee's focus on grammatical accuracy and SWE would appear meaningful because learning to write in ways that are valued in the mainstream workplace are an opportunity for career success and "job prospects."

Lee clearly views the writing process as a transferrable set of skills. For example, when he discusses being able to develop a topic, take "ownership," and do research to write a paper, these are not specific elements of a written work, such as a topic sentence or type of essay such as compare/contrast. Instead, he's referring to a specific set of skills. This may be a meaningful approach. There are significant debates about the transferability of genres across writing tasks, as discussed previously, with the idea of academic genres seen as unlikely to transfer or even exist (Adler-Kassner et al. "Assembling Knowledge"; Carillo; Downs and Wardle; Racelis and Matsuda; Schneer). However, Yancey et al. note that students appear to transfer writing process (28). Likewise, van Blankenstein et al. find that when students work together, often an integral part of process, transfer of motivation can also be facilitated (221). Therefore, Lee's focus on the transferability of process could be useful for students.

Additionally, because the stated course content goal of both ENG 111 and ESL 51 is that writing skills will transfer to other academic coursework, even with different pedagogical approaches, all instructors should be instructing with this goal in mind. All three of the instructors studied, even with different approaches and mindsets, did indeed see transfer as a major purpose of their instruction. Therefore, there is very little disciplinary division for purpose. The ability to teach transferrable skills and concepts is seen as controversial in the field but uncontroversially when comparing the two departments examined here.

Audience as Academy

Lee appears to ignore classmates as an audience, which is visible through his lack of peer response and drafting. He does, like Megan and Shu, use a generic audience, making statements such as “[students] need to be ... educating the reader, not stating the obvious” and “...your readers have to be able to go back and see [where you got your source materials].” Here, he does not necessarily present audience as a genre consideration but as generic, a common theme among the three instructors.

However, Lee sees the primary audience for ENG 111 and ESL 51 skills as future professors. This is baked into his focus on accuracy/correctness – he hopes that when students enter another instructor’s class, they already understand some basic writing expectations and can duplicate those expectations so the new instructor values and respects the work that the student can produce. Lee mentions this when he discusses outlining, noting: “I want everybody’s outline more or less to look the same. So that when they get to other professors, [ENG] 112 to 200, whatever, they’re not creating a jumble of notes and stuff. ... It’s easy for the professor or anybody else to see what’s going on, see the organization of the thinking.” He reiterates this when he discusses enforcing MLA conventions, noting that if students use various font sizes and styles ““you’re going to drive your professors crazy.”” In a final example, he notes that he hopes students will leave his ENG 111 course “confident and not being a drain on themselves or the professor. That they go in, aware of things, aware of terminology, aware of structures...”

Each of these examples demonstrates that the values Lee instills in his students are meant to be transferrable in a highly specific way – to make their work easier on the intended audience – the professor. This can again be contextualized by considering that he himself is the only audience for his student’s work. Because Lee values academic writing and college success above

other writing considerations, centering the instructor as the gatekeeper makes a great deal of sense. This attitude may also connect to issues of labor at the community college. With most faculty teaching a 5/5 load each academic year, writing *efficiency* may make the most pedagogical sense to both the writing instructor and future instructors who act as the audience.

Unlike purpose, there is a slight disciplinary division for the concept of audience. While both Shu and Megan present themselves or future instructors as the reader in an abstract way, Lee makes the concern for himself and future instructors very explicit. His approach to transferability of writing skills ties directly to a product approach in which the classroom is teacher-centered and makes clear the power structures inherent in a classroom, with power flowing from teacher to student (Sumpter 342). The difference in Lee's approach, however, is that his articulation of audience begins and ends with himself and future professors. While Megan and Shu (to a lesser extent) focus on process, particularly related to peer review and viewing classmates as readers, Lee's focus fails to see the classroom as a space of shared power as most process-based classes function (Devitt "Welcoming" 10). Therefore, Shu and Megan bring in elements of process while Lee keeps his focus on more product-centered methods.

Megan fits most closely with the field of writing studies, which values process and classmates as a natural audience (Clark "Audience"; Hairston 672-73) while Lee fits with common practice, in which both students and teachers view the instructor as the audience for written work (Melzer). The result is that the three instructors have a fairly uniform view on the subject. The teacher is centered by all three, with a slight focus on classmates by Shu and slightly more by Megan. While the differences are not negligible, they are not very strong. The most noteworthy finding is, perhaps, Lee's lack of process, such as peer review, which is considered standard in the field of writing studies (Brammer and Rees 71). Because he is an outlier in

deemphasizing process pedagogy, he may be an outlier in this category. Therefore, the overlaps between Shu and Megan might better show the limited disciplinary differences in this category.

Bridge Practice and the Interplay of Theory

Lee's bridge case has served to reinforce some of the findings in chapter 3 and 4, and these findings will be re-articulated in chapter 6. Below, I've briefly summarized what Lee's case has demonstrated about the disciplinary division.

- **Accuracy/Correctness:** Lee values SWE as a transferrable and teacher/employer-sought skill. By focusing on sentence-level usage concerns, Lee also values product writing while deemphasizing process. Because his approach appears unusual in the field, he is likely an outlier, tending more towards a focus on applied linguistics, showing the stark division between MACC's ESL and ENG departments for this value.
- **Clarity:** While both disciplines view this as a sentence-level concern, ESL instructors (including Lee) view this with a focus on surface features that connote a product approach and an academic skills mindset, with a goal of reinforcing academic moves at the sentence level. Megan's emphasis on genre and audience stands out. Therefore, there is a much stronger division between Megan's and Lee's approaches, but because of the confusion over how this term is defined by ENG faculty, the overall division is unclear.
- **Organization:** Lee draws from his ESL writing background to value modes-based writing. He prefers genres viewed as academically valued – creating products that the teacher will understand and appreciate. Composition instructors typically reject five-paragraph writing, emphasizing an approach that considers content alongside form. Therefore, there is a medium disciplinary division here. Lee also appears to be an outlier by ignoring some genre elements that would require writerly flexibility.

- Evidence Use: Lee voices the disciplinary division here. Both Lee and Megan value source use and use scaffolded instruction, overlapping quite closely. However, Shu is a significant outlier in both her field and in practice. Lee rejects ignoring evidence use in ESL writing, showing a strong disciplinary division in this category.
- Originality/Self-Expression: Lee values originality and self-expression, as does Megan. However, Lee's focus is more on the role of imitation of academic forms with "invention" coming later. Megan takes a more process- and ideology-focused approach, with self-expression being a significant factor. Shu is the outlier here, again focusing on self-expression as evidence rather than ideology. Therefore, Lee's case again reiterates the strong disciplinary division for this category.
- Audience/Purpose: Lee and Megan align when considering purpose, emphasizing process as part of transferrable writing goals. Shu sees a desire to have students enjoy writing as the primary goal of transfer. All three take a transfer-centered approach, showing only a slight disciplinary division. Likewise, for audience, all three see the instructor as audience. Megan also focuses on peer readers while Lee places a very strong emphasis on the teacher as judge. This does show individual differences in approach, but both align with common practice within college composition. The disciplinary division does not remain strong given the focus by all three on teacher-as-reader.

Ultimately, there are interesting ways in which Lee's practice overlaps both with applied linguistics and with writing studies scholarship, though he does tend towards a product-centered teacher-centered form of writing that has often been rejected in writing studies over the past few decades. This could be contextualized in part through his pedagogical background. His MA in linguistics demonstrates that he is likely to have many connections with the scientifically focused

language teaching (Canagarajah “TESOL” 12), a concern for sentence-level practices and grammar (Eckstein et al. “Assessment” 2), and deductive essay structure (Atkinson and Ramanathan 555) that is common in ESL writing.

Lee also has a creative writing MFA. Most creative writing programs continue to use a workshop model (Donnelly 98), with Patrick Bizarro stating that creative writing programs have been taught the same way for over a hundred years (296). Workshops typically function as either a “course in craft” as students read work from professional writers in a particular genre and consider the author’s creative choices through examination of form or focus primarily on workshopping other student work (Donnelly 101) or entail a blend of these forms (LaFemina). Such workshops, Anna Leahy argues, have great value because students use “collective wisdom” to help others develop their work while the instructor focuses on students in highly individual ways because the course is small to allow time for much individual interaction (66). Strong instructors encourage individual experimentation and are open-minded to new styles and ideas and students are pushed to expand their repertoires as they learn from each other (LaFemina).

While such pedagogy is the basis for a strong workshop that produces MFAs, there have been strong critiques to the workshop model over the past several decades. Bizarro argues that workshops are based on “lore,” with a focus on historical practice rather than theory, employing an approach in which the instructor teaches students what they, the teacher, do, creating a master/apprentice relationship (297). This has been a concern because it causes students to generate pedagogical methods that are “acceptable and commonly emulated” (Ritter 284) which has been critiqued by many non-white and non-male students as a reinforcement of harmful ideals for how good writing should look (Fleisher 115). While some scholars have pushed back

on these critiques, suggesting that good workshops encourage experimentation rather than emulation (LaFemina), concern for such lore-based writing workshops continues (Sumpter 349).

There appears to be some connection to a lore-based model of instruction and Lee's teaching practice. Students do not do much work together in his class, with more of an emphasis on the teacher as an arbiter of "good" writing who creates models for students to emulate. The master/apprentice relationship, along with a focus on academic genres seen as highly transferrable is also present. It may be that his limited use of some of the common theories in writing studies, such as process and genre-flexible approaches may better align with a lore- or applied linguistics-based practice. This may further demonstrate the ways in which disparate educational background can affect pedagogical choices in the first-year composition classroom.

When viewing these three instructors as practitioners influenced by theory, departmental ethos, textbooks, institutional constraints, and other factors, it does appear that there remain significant disciplinary divisions that affect the practices of these departments and instructors. In my final chapter, I will reinforce these findings and discuss what they mean for these fields. I will also discuss implications and recommendations for both MACC and these two disciplines.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

In the previous three chapters, I presented findings from my three case studies and survey data, articulating the writing values these participants hold, comparing the cases to each other and contextualizing these values within the theory and practice of their respective disciplines. In this final chapter, I discuss these findings and address my third research question. I then discuss the implications of my findings for both ESL writing and college composition. Following each implication, I present recommendations for building bridges between these departments at both MACC and within the fields of ESL/L2 writing and writing studies. Finally, I suggest areas for future research that would be relevant to both fields. I conclude with a final thought about the importance of bridging a disciplinary divide.

Before I begin with the key findings, I return to Min's experiences from chapter 1. If Min were a student who had taken an ESL 51 course taught by Shu, Lee, or any of the surveyed instructors in the ESL department and then an ENG 111 class like Megan's or a class taught by one of the surveyed ENG faculty, Min may have difficulties in a few areas. First, Min may struggle with the expectations for "clarity" and "accuracy" that are present in the ENG 111 course rubrics but are not a significant part of the course instruction. While Min will have opportunities for revision, being sent to the Language Center may make Min feel like an academic outsider with a "problem" many other students do not have. When her ENG 111 instructor tells her that some of her sentences "just do not sound right," without further articulation, Min may be significantly frustrated that she cannot write "as well as" her native-speaking peers.

Additionally, while Min may have had a great deal of experience in discussing controversial topics in ESL 51, the expectation that she should support her ideas and cite them in ENG 111 is new. Instructors like Megan, who allow for quite a bit of personal experience to be incorporated, might smooth this transition. However, most instructors, who view self-expression as something to be tempered as students learn to work with academic sources, may instill in students like Min the impression that experts are used to “prove” points rather than in support of academic conversations that have specific, highly genre-dependent expectations. Therefore, Min may downplay personal connections or individual ideas about her topic, focusing more on finding “good” sources to use in her essay, in which “good” means stating her argument better than she can.

Finally, Min may be surprised that her 5-page expository essay, which her ENG 111 instructor has praised as having excellent topic sentence organization, should not be distilled down to three major ideas, which was the organizational style of her ESL 51 essays. Min certainly wants to understand what the teacher’s expectations are for organizing her information, but she may struggle to understand the conventions of the assigned essay genre and the many possibilities for organization. Her instructor provides models but may not want to force-feed Min a template for her essay, which could result in Min feeling confused about these new expectations.

This composite brings full circle the experience of a student like Min as she transitions between these classes, though native-speaking students will likely encounter some of the same questions and concerns over values as Min does as all students come to better understand college writing expectations. Therefore, after I present my findings below, my “implications and

recommendations” are directly relevant to the many students like Min who populate our ESL and ENG courses.

Key Findings

Q1: What Do the Instructors Who Teach ESL and Those Who Teach Composition Value, Respectively, When Teaching Writing?

Accuracy/Correctness

This value appeared to be the most important to ESL instructors. For these instructors, this was most often tied to grammatical accuracy, though connections to other concepts such as organization were also present. Faculty saw eliminating “individual grammar challenges” as an important goal for ESL 51, and “grammar corrections” as a main focus of ESL instruction. Therefore, sentence-level writing tasks appeared to take up the most time for Shu and her ESL colleagues. Although a few composition instructors noted that they instructed in grammar or articulated grammar as a pedagogical concern, for the most part, grammar was not a significant focus of course content in the ENG 111 course. Megan, for example, did not feel able to teach English language skills, noting that composition instruction and learning to write in English are “two very different things.” Lee, who focused on grammatical accuracy in his classes appeared to be an outlier, perhaps drawing from his applied linguistics educational background.

Clarity

Much like accuracy/correctness, clarity was a significant value for the ESL instructors. This term was bound tightly to grammar usage, with “grammar and clarity” again appearing to be central, focusing on sentence-level concerns in the ESL 51 class. Clear writing is considered “error-free.” This value was difficult to assess based on the data from composition instructors. Although many faculty said they valued clarity, they failed to define their use of the term.

Megan, however, uses the term with a greater focus on genre considerations, looking at audience need to consider what words would bring a story “to life.” Her focus here shows that composition instructors most likely consider clarity a sentence-level concern rather than a broader organizational one.

Organization

Correct organization was a value for both departments. ESL writing valued “modes.” Shu described how students appeared to quickly catch onto the chosen mode and write in specific, prescribed ways. However, the organizational pattern appeared to dictate content, showing a focus on form over content. This appeared to be due to the focus on sentence-level writing instruction. Because grammatical accuracy took precedence in the ESL course, the form became a means on which to practice sentence-level writing. ENG instructors also valued prescriptive organization without a “modes” approach. Megan valued organizational markers such as topic sentence and thesis placement, but she also focused on flexibility based on content, taking an approach that allowed, to some extent, content to drive form. Lee again appeared to be an outlier for ENG 111 instruction with a strong focus on mode and five-paragraph forms. Additionally, none of the instructors viewed genre in the way that most genre theorists see it – as a living form that can respond to specific situations and change to meet the needs of the writers as local situations change.

Evidence Use

The ESL instructors de-prioritize the use of sources as evidence, focusing on students using their own experiences to add “development” to their essays. Plagiarism and time constraints were cited as major concerns for teaching students text-responsible prose. Composition instructors, however, valued source use significantly. Instruction on finding and

using sources was one of the primary goals for these instructors, with most valuing source use over personal expression as a form of evidence. Lee made the distinction between ESL and composition clear for this value when he expressed to his ESL colleagues that grammar and basic research skills “are not mutually exclusive,” acting as an outlier in the ESL department.

Originality/Self-Expression

This value appeared to be the central way that students produced “development” in the ESL classroom. While there are potential ideological implications for the use of self-expression in writing, the ESL instructors appeared to be more focused on sentence-level grammar, with self-expression driving content simply for convenience and as a means of writing practice. In the composition class, most faculty saw self-expression as a strength of student writing but were more focused on teaching text-responsible writing. Megan and Lee, however, did value student experiences as a form of evidence, though Lee focused more on the use of such evidence for grammar instruction, while Megan saw the ideological potential of such work. Megan, therefore, may have a stronger focus on self-expression than most composition instructors.

Audience/Purpose

For Shu, the purpose of the writing class is to instill in students the need to value writing as a skill. If students can have fun and see the purpose in writing as academic and career advancement, they are positioned well. For composition instructors, the purpose of writing is success in the academy and a transfer of “basic” writing skills. In both departments, transfer is, therefore, a major value, reflected in the course content summaries. Certain practices are seen as highly teachable and transferrable.

Both ESL and composition instructors valued themselves and the academy as an audience. While all used references to “the reader,” based on the instructor’s role as responder

and the focus on transferrable writing skills, the instructor was positioned as the central audience. However, Shu and Megan did, to some extent, focus on other students as audience. Megan's composition class in particular considered peers as a natural audience to target.

Overall Answer to Research Question #1

There is a significant set of disciplinary divisions recognized by the values held by MACC ESL and ENG faculty. In fact, while Matsuda's original 1999 article primarily focused on the language instruction practices—ones that I found separated these instructors—there are many other values that also represent a division. The biggest divisions between these two departments appear to be on accuracy/correctness, evidence use, and originality/self-expression.

The significant focus that the ESL class puts on accuracy/correctness as a sentence-level grammatically based concern affects the rest of the course focus. Because the concern is on grammatical instruction, all other values are connected to improving that value. So, organization matters because it is a way to practice sentence-level concerns; self-expression matters because it allows students to spend more time on sentence-level writing.

In the composition class, faculty values surrounding source use, citation, and organizational decisions reduce the focus on sentence-level pedagogies such as accuracy/correctness and clarity. Due to concerns for transferrable skills, instructors focus a great deal on the types of research, organization, and writing processes that they believe will help students prioritize the values of their future instructors.

Q2: Why Do the Instructors in Each Department, as Representatives of their Field, Value What They Value? i.e.: What is the Interplay of Theory and Practice Here?

Theory

Theory has clearly made a significant impact on the practices of the three examined instructors and their surveyed colleagues who agree, in general, with the practices of these instructors. This is important when considering the disciplinary division because as Matsuda noted “ESL writing has not been considered as part of composition studies since it began to move toward the status of a profession during the 1960s” (“Composition Studies” 700). All three of these instructors, therefore, were educated and have been teaching since the two fields have become their own respective disciplines pedagogically, focusing on areas considered relevant to their perceived different student populations (712).

When looking at Shu’s educational background, the influence of early applied linguistics on her practice is evident. As addressed in chapter 3, applied linguistics traditionally takes a scientific approach to language teaching (Canagarajah “TESOL” 12) and focuses on “words, their meanings, and grammar” (Eckstein et al. “Assessment” 2), yet there are scholars examining the social influences on ESL/L2 writing that have come after Shu’s and Lee’s last formal training. ESL/L2 writing long considered “writing essentially as reinforcement for oral habits” and was therefore not a primary concern for applied linguists (Silva and Leki 5). This resulted in writing instruction that drew heavily from current-traditional practices, with a focus on fitting words into a “preexisting form with provided or self-generated content” (Silva 13-14). Robert B. Kaplan’s identification of contrastive rhetoric was specifically influential on this type of writing as a pedagogical practice, noting that cultural differences in paragraph organization meant that students should “begin the study of paragraphs by simply copying models or by manipulating

carefully controlled models” so they can learn how “syntactic patterns” work in English (“Contrastive” 15). Additionally, Santos argues in 1994 that ESL/L2 writing, because it is based on applied linguistics practices, is apolitical (1). This finding is reiterated by other scholars in the field who note that despite “controversial political issues” (Silva and Leki 8) that are central to understanding ESL/L2 writing, the field continues to be, generally, apolitical (Costino and Hyon 26; Silva and Leki 8).

These scholars bring many aspects of Shu’s practice into focus. Her background in applied linguistics make grammar teaching the forefront of her practice. Likewise, the influence of specific ESL/L2 writing theories, such as contrastive rhetoric and the resulting focus on mode writing is clear. She notes that she helps students understand “differing syntactical structures or semantic uses of language” between their native language and English to improve their writing. By considering contrastive rhetoric here, the focus on formulaic patterns of organization come into focus. Likewise, her apolitical approach that focuses on a transferrable curriculum (Hyland “General” 19) is present when considering her focus on gatekeeper skills, such as grammar. What cannot be accounted for is her lack of instruction in source use, which is valued in decades of ESL/L2 writing scholarship. This discrepancy will be addressed under “practice.”

Megan, meanwhile, has a degree in the teaching of writing and literature. Part of this training involves pedagogy in composition theory and composition instruction. Though her degree does not focus entirely on writing studies, a background in major theories may be expected. As chapter 1 outlined, the major focus in writing studies over the last several decades has entailed a shift away from current-traditional writing and towards process approaches, which Matsuda calls “the most successful in the history of pedagogical reform in the teaching of writing” (“Process” 69). Genre studies, while having been a central focus in composition

instruction for several decades, has not reached the status of process pedagogy, in part because of significant concerns over how to introduce it in ways that are meaningful for students, with concerns over the appropriateness of which genres to teach at the college (Wardle “Mutt”), concerns that genre and process approaches are not compatible (Clark “Genre” 160), or that they reinforced problematic teacher/student power dynamics (163). However, genre scholarship has still impacted practice in composition classes (Bazerman “Writing” 36-37). Here, Megan’s significant pedagogical focus on process comes into view. Just like most writing instructors, Megan focuses on teaching students a form of process that is considered transferrable to any writing situation, and she scaffolds writing assignments with this goal in mind. Likewise, although Megan does not voice her genre instruction as such, her focus on authentic audience, the purpose of source integration practices, and desire to have students transfer certain writing practices shows that genre scholarship does influence her practice.

Looking at Lee, he may be the most interesting example of how educational differences can make a significant difference in practice. His educational background in applied linguistics is demonstrated quite clearly in his valuing of teaching accuracy/correctness and organizational styles that are commonly taught in this discipline. He may also be influenced by his MFA program in the ways articulated in chapter 4. With a focus on teacher-centered classrooms, Lee may be reifying a teacher-based classroom because of a lack of theory-driven pedagogy in these programs (Bizzaro 297). This value may be reproduced in Lee’s attitude towards imitation and modeling as one of his strongest values. It may be one of the central reasons for his strong focus on “academic” writing as a central pedagogical philosophy. Although Lee is not trained in writing studies, ESL/L2 writing theory may account for his focus on source use, given the focus on source use instruction in the scholarship of that field.

Practice

While theory is often an initial pathway into best practices for many new instructors, over time, practice in response to the local teaching situation becomes highly influential as well.

One of the reasons that practice can become a driver of pedagogy is the desire to be primarily responsive to the perceived needs of the student population. When looking at ESL/L2 writing, Leki et al. note that there is no “single grand theory of L2 writing” because of the continually conflicting demands of diverse learners (72). Therefore, an approach in which teachers assess and respond to the needs of their student populations makes a great deal of sense. Likewise, teachers may find significant gaps between what they learn in the classroom during ESL teacher training programs and the lived reality of their student populations, which can cause a gap in theory and practice (Crandall and Christison 9-10). This is certainly true in composition pedagogy as well, which have highly diverse classrooms both linguistically and culturally (Matsuda “The Myth” 640-41). Composition instructors have long viewed writing as a skill, which posits writing as something that can be mastered and then used for “higher-order endeavors” (Rose “The Language” 347) rather than a discipline all its own. This mindset can encourage certain types of writing, such as product-based practices that are seen as stepping-stones to more complex writing and are therefore considered by instructors to be highly transferable (Tremmel 31-32). So, although product writing has long been unpopular in the field, the “gap between theory and practice” means that teachers still use such methods that they feel are pragmatic (Matsuda “Process” 69) rather than theory driven.

This focus on responsive rather than theory-driven pedagogical decisions can be seen in all three of the case study participants. Shu articulates this when she states that “the longer you teach, the more adjustments you make, based on not just the theory you studied as a graduate

student, but, you know, what really seems to be functional and pragmatic for the students.” This is reflective of her disinterest in teaching source use and genre flexibility because she believes that grammar improvement is so important for students in “getting a degree or obtaining academic goals.” Because she perceives the future needs of the students as grammar and sentence-based instruction, this becomes the primary focus of her instruction. However, her own preferences and avoidances in the classroom also suggest, at some level, that she remains a teacher focused on what is functional and pragmatic for her student audience but also for herself. Additionally, how she determines what is functional and pragmatic for her students could be explored further because it is not entirely made clear.

Though Megan does not articulate her responsive practices quite as forcefully, her focus on prescriptive elements of paragraph writing, such as topic sentence and claim/evidence/commentary models, which she calls “typical pattern for any body paragraph in any paragraph you write” suggests a transfer-driven focus rather than one that is theoretically engaged. Lee, too, draws upon such perceived practical realities rather than theory when he instructs students on things such as “advanced punctuation” which he says is something “writers need...” Therefore, all three instructors, to some extent, instruct based on what they think students need to be successful, even if it does not necessarily align with current scholarship.

Additionally, practice can become a primary driver of pedagogy in a department when they become reified by other instructors and by the concerns of the college as a whole. For example, grammar instruction may be a central focus in an ESL class because it is considered ““need based”” instruction with the assumption that students will need to know “dominant forms and conventions,” which may not align with reality (Whittig and Tardy 925). Teachers often believe that MLW students want grammar instruction and rise to meet this need (Borg 100). In

composition practice, this can be seen in Stephen North's concept of "lore," in which a practitioner presents a notion with a "claim that it worked, or seemed to work, or might work" (24) about how "writing is done, learned, and taught" (22). Christy Wenger equates lore to "common knowledge" (47). The idea is that such a concept is not based on theory but on what many would consider vital to teach based on departmental conversation. It can also become trope-like; because lore can seem like "common sense" it does not always get interrogated.

This element of lore and reification of practices can be seen in a variety of ways at MACC. One is through Shu's interest in teaching grammar. She notes that "...my impression is, and again, it's only based on hearsay, because I've heard different [instructors] say they don't want grammar, and they don't work on that. They don't have time to focus on that in English. And so, I'm operating with that understanding or that assumption." Here, Shu implies that because she is the last gatekeeper of grammar instruction, this is something she must focus on, because another class works on other skills and students will need to know grammar. Lore may also account for Lee seeing value in teaching source use in ESL 51, despite his colleagues who do not value this practice. For example, because Lee teaches ENG 111 and sees the value of source use, expressing that "knowing what's needed in [ENG] 111 ... has helped me inform what's needed ... in [ESL] 51." He later says that these students go into ENG 111 "not freaking out" because they know something about source use. Therefore, the practices and expectations of the ENG department have moved Lee to deny the lore that affects source use instruction in ESL.

Finally, staying current in each field can be difficult due to time and departmental constraints on instructors and departments. Most writing classes are still taught by contingent faculty who may not be trained in writing studies and may not receive professional development (Wardle "Intractable"). Most writing instructors also suffer with large teaching loads and class

sizes, which Gold and Hammond argue means that strong writing instruction cannot take place (315). While CCCC advocates for classes limited to 20 students and a teaching load of no more than 60 students per semester (Jaschik), as of 2020, 90 percent of community colleges exceed this course cap (Klausman et al. 4). Teaching writing takes a great deal of time because of the amount of reading and responding a writing teacher must do, creating what Klausman et al. call “an unfair labor situation” (3). These practices can result in faculty who are unable to do the type of work they likely would want to do, such as Shu wishing that she had time to teach source use, or Megan’s desire to spend more time on language concerns with MLWs. For other faculty, this could mean exploring topics like linguistic justice or taking up more professional development. As a result, such labor issues affect students, who are not able to learn according to the field’s best practices.

Such concerns are relevant at MACC, where adjunct faculty make up 75 percent of all teaching positions and full-time faculty teach 15 credits a semester. For most faculty, this results in 100 or more students being taught each semester. These course minimums can cause difficulty balancing all the material these instructors may want to teach in a semester. This might contextualize Shu’s difficulty in finding time to teach evidence use. She states that “we don’t have time to do research” because so much of her “focus is on the grammar and the structure and the mechanics.” Therefore, common time constraints that affect teachers with large workloads and little support appear relevant to this practice, although Lee’s instruction in source use does raise doubts about the time constraints that Shu poses as a factor. Megan, too, may be affected by such workload concerns. For example, she positions her inability to correct every error in MLW writing as a reason to send students to the writing center for additional help. She also notes that

she does not “spend much time ... talking about grammatical issues” because “I don’t do that.” Therefore, time and other constraints may prevent Megan from helping MLWs more equitably.

Ultimately, there are a variety of reasons for practice taking precedence over theory. I have articulated some of the major connections to the data of these instructors at MACC. Clearly, both theory and practice have significantly affected the ways that these instructors teach writing and shape their values.

Q3: Do Teachers in ESL and English Departments Perceive Any Effect on Student Outcomes Resulting from Students Matriculating from ESL Courses to English Courses When There are Disciplinary Differences Between How These Courses Are Taught, Based Upon Their Knowledge of What Makes a Successful College Writer?

When returning to survey data to answer this question, faculty were asked whether they perceived strengths and weaknesses among writers who were moving between the two surveyed courses. A common strength of MLWs is their strong work ethic, with many faculty mentioning that these students are hard workers. When it came to weaknesses, two instructors mentioned that students struggle with source use/plagiarism and four mentioned that these student writers are self-conscious and/or lack confidence in themselves. However, these results are overshadowed by the number of faculty who mentioned that MLWs have language problems, suggesting a focus on SWE. More than 10 faculty noted that “language problems” have been a weakness of MLW students in first-year writing classes. For example, one instructor says that language problems “make [student] writing look not as good as the writing could be if it was free of those language problems.” Another says that MLWs have “difficulty in applying the grammar to assignments without a lot of support.” A third telling example gets to the heart of this concern:

I feel that I have to discount the importance of grammar, syntax, and wording issues to avoid placing an undue disadvantage on ESL students. I'm not entirely comfortable doing so, however, because I think these issues ARE important to writing in English. However, these aren't things ESL students will be able to fix in one semester – or the most important things to be learned from the course – so it seems pointless to over-emphasize them.

On the one hand, these responses feel ironic because, as made evident throughout this examination of writing values, ENG faculty do not appear to value grammatical accuracy, with few faculty listing this as a personal writing value and Megan focusing very little on teaching sentence-level pedagogy, as described in chapter 4. On the other hand, listing such grammar issues as a weakness of MLWs proves that a “language issue” has been at the heart of this project all along – the disciplinary division of labor.

The disciplinary division, as Matsuda articulated more than 20 years ago, continues to explain this dichotomous focus/ignoring of language issues in college composition. Due to the institutional practice of separating native speaking and MLW students at the college, a practice that has existed for centuries, many composition instructors deal very little with MLWs coming out of ESL classes. Just as Matsuda describes in “The Myth of Linguistic Homogeneity in U.S. College Composition,” as early as the 1950s, some higher educational institutions were creating separate composition tracks for MLWs, “designed to keep language differences out of the required composition course” (647). He goes on to say that as time passed, instead of considering that composition classes should be multilingual spaces, such containment continues to present the “false impression” that students will work on “language differences” elsewhere (648). Gail Shuck reinforces this argument when she notes that many composition instructors use “ESL” as a

signifier for a student who belongs in a class taught by an ESL instructor rather than considering all the language varieties the student may speak (61). This belief can be recognized at MACC through the contained ESL writing classes that MLWs take, along with the “paired” section of ENG 111 with English Fundamentals to which most MLWs are funneled after ESL. Though this course also includes native-speaking English students, they are still staffed primarily by MACC faculty who are considered capable of working with language differences. Therefore, non-fundamentals classes might appear to some instructors as linguistically homogenous spaces.

Additionally, even when composition faculty do recognize their classes as multilingual spaces, because of the disciplinary division, they may expect that teaching grammar or language is not their purview or responsibility. As Matsuda points out, the disciplinary division was based on arguments that only language specialists are capable of teaching MLWs, a position that “release[d] [composition instructors] from the ‘burden’” of dealing with language and other “problems” that MLW students presented (“Composition” 712). This has led composition instructors to feel that language teaching is a “lower order concern” not worthy of their attention (Matsuda et al. “Writing Teachers” 78). This disciplinary division also engenders feelings among some faculty that because language teaching is the ESL instructor’s job, such “language differences” should “disappear after [students] complete the ESL courses,” a highly unrealistic perspective (Shuck 63). Jason Schneider notes that in conversations with his composition faculty colleagues, many thought that MLWs could fix their language “within a number of weeks,” which he connects back to Vivian Zamel’s identification of the “‘ESL problem,’” in which many instructors posited that MLW shortcomings could be fixed in remedial classes before students took mainstream English (“Strangers” 507). This, too, can be seen among MACC faculty, with

Shu articulating that students will no longer work on grammar after ESL coursework and Megan articulating “that’s not what I do” when referring to language instruction.

Finally, the disciplinary division presents itself through the lack of training that composition faculty have in teaching language instruction. A 2011 study showed that most college composition instructors have no training in working with MLWs (Ferris et al. “Responding” 223). This may result in faculty not having the “technical knowledge to effectively teach language points” (Ferris et al. “Self-Directed” 418). In addition to the disciplinary division, grammar teaching has remained unpopular in writing studies due to, as discussed in chapter 4, the perception that students do not need it because they already know English grammar (Hartwell 19), and the belief that grammar instruction is a tenet of current-traditional rhetoric, and therefore an old way of doing things (Devitt “Welcoming” 9). This can be seen in Megan’s disinterest in teaching language at the sentence level and her attitude towards teaching MLWs, noting “I wish I could help” but because they do not know how to write in English “I can’t help with that.” Therefore, Megan wishes she had skills that the disciplinary division has separated from her practice. While there has been some cross-disciplinary professional development between MACC’s ESL and ENG departments over the years, survey data shows that most faculty do not recall working closely with the other department to close such knowledge gaps.

This question shows that while it has been over 20 years since Matsuda wrote about the disciplinary division, language issues are still at the center of teaching MLWs. Although composition instructors do not value teaching SWE or focusing consistently on language instruction in their composition classes, an undercurrent of concern still exists, with composition faculty considering this an issue but lacking the resources or education to confront it. Though clearly the disciplinary division exists in other ways, such as through source use practices,

instructor response to language instruction appears to be the most significant way this division presents itself at MACC. Suggestions regarding this and other divisions will be discussed under “recommendations.”

Implications and Recommendations

Although this dissertation has certainly outlined many implications based on each discipline individually, such as a need to further explore how terms like clarity are being used and deployed by composition faculty, because the heart of this project is on the disciplinary division, I will be providing implications and recommendations based on building bridges and strengthening the cross-disciplinary practices among these departments and disciplines.

Grammar/Sentence-level Language Instruction

This was one area that significant divisions exist at MACC. Although Whittig and Tardy argue that ESL writing courses are not meant to be grammar classes (924), a heavy emphasis on both grammar instruction and written corrective feedback are common in most of these courses (Larsen-Freeman; Li and Vuono; Schenck). Shu frequently articulates that grammar is the primary focus of her instruction because students need to know how to eliminate grammatical errors from their writing. Priorities such as teaching source use are dropped from the ESL 51 course to account for time spent on language instruction. On the other hand, the composition department appears to value MLW students using SWE but does not prioritize teaching grammar. This, too, falls in line with the field, with only 12 percent of instructors in one survey indicating that they address grammar in writing classes (Matsuda “Let’s Face” 146) while still considering language assessment in grading criteria, (Matsuda “The Myth” 640). Just as Megan indicates that language instruction is “not what I do,” actions such as sending students to the writing center are ways to hold MLWs “accountable for what is not being taught” in the

classroom (Matsuda “The Myth” 640). This is particularly concerning when some faculty in other departments *want* students coming out of first-year composition to write in ways they deem linguistically acceptable (Roberts and Cimasko 137).

Both departments at MACC could address this discrepancy. Looking at the ESL department, it is unrealistic for these instructors to eliminate grammar instruction. Instead, the ESL department could shift towards a balanced pragmatic and ideological approach to language instruction. This idea has been around for decades. Cherryholmes calls “vulgar pragmatism” one in which we accept and reproduce standards without examining the implications of those practices, juxtaposing this with “critical pragmatism,” which is a “sense of crisis is brought to our choices, when it is accepted that our standards, beliefs, values, guiding texts, and discourse-practices themselves require evaluation and appraisal” (qtd. in Pennycook 256). These ideas align clearly with ESL/L2 writing’s interest in translanguaging over the past decade, which views error as “an interpretation of last resort” and instead considers the choices that go into language a “difference” (Horner et al. 303). Incorporating translanguaging and critical pragmatic ideas could allow MACC’s ESL instructors to continue to engage in grammar instruction but incorporate an ideological perspective that examines, respects, discusses, and encourages language difference. This would help remove the “eliminat[ion]” of error mindset that appears prominent in MACC’s grammar instruction.

The ENG department could consider further professional development to help instructors prepare to work with MLWs. This may help to eliminate the “I don’t do this” mindset that appears to affect language instruction in first-year composition. Because most MLWs will eventually enter ENG 112, College Composition II, preparing all instructors to help MLWs is imperative. Schneider suggests reading groups that focus on just one or two multilingualism-

related topics each semester. These could help faculty better engage with best practices (367). Additionally, the ENG department could consider a working group to discuss incorporating antiracist writing assessment into first-year composition, such as labor-based contract grading (Inoue “Antiracist”) and the new Antiracist First-Year Composition Goals, which ask instructors to incorporate convention instruction, such as grammar and punctuation use, through a discussion on the historical and political implications of such standards. This may lead to a reduction in hidden language standards that Matsuda describes as common in the field (Matsuda “The Myth” 640).

Finally, the two fields may want to discuss the vocabulary they use to discuss language values. As addressed in chapter 1, there are many overlaps in the ways these fields practice writing instruction but with a different vocabulary. ESL/L2 scholars define translingual writing as “asking students to investigate/consider how language standards emerge, how and by whom they are enforced, and to whose benefit, by bringing to light in the classroom how language standards sustain and are sustained by social inequity” (Schreiber and Watson 1). This sounds like discussions of antiracist writing ecologies in writing studies. Therefore, departments at local institutions might consider sitting down together to discuss how their theories and practices overlap and how they differ, considering what terms they are using to describe what they do and what their students do. This might help these departments, as Costino and Hyon describe it, “sidestep... our ‘scare words’” (24) to better understand how we speak about writing development to each other and our students.

Organization Instruction

The disciplinary division is less acute for organization, yet small pedagogical changes could benefit students. While both ESL and ENG are using formulaic styles of organization for

specific assigned genres, the ESL department is using five-paragraph modes writing. While this style of writing is used because it is seen by instructors as highly transferrable across the curriculum (Atkinson and Ramanathan 561), there is little evidence that such practices are consistent and easily transferrable to other disciplines (Wardle “Mutt” 781). Additionally, based on the survey data, this writing style is vilified by most MACC composition instructors, as well as those at other institutions (Tremmel 29). Teaching modes essays also appears to be concerning to many scholars in both ESL/L2 writing and writing studies. Bernstein and Lowry point out that modes essays present, in the vein of Paulo Friere’s work, a “banking model of education” in which knowledge is repeated rather than transformative (215). Because ENG 111 sets one of its major goals as the development of “critical thinking,” moving away from modes essays will smooth this transition for student writers.

The ESL department could work to introduce genre studies so students can begin to understand the rhetorical flexibility and authentic purposes and audiences for texts. For example, Johns recommends that students might analyze genres from their home language, such as looking at a wedding invitation, comparing it to an equivalent text in English and considering the conventions and purpose present as well as analyzing differences (“The Future” 60). This would scaffold well with Shu’s in-class assignment where students compare/contrast the wedding customs between their cultures. Ken Hyland points out that EAP classes commonly use authentic genre samples for “rhetorical consciousness raising” (“Genre Pedagogy” 160). This approach could continue to keep the focus on “college-level writing,” a clearly stated content summary goal, while also allowing for greater flexibility of style. ESL 51 could also consider replacing the standardized final assessment, which focuses on timed writing with consideration primarily to language. Such final assessments reinforce and justify the five-paragraph model of writing as a

necessary form (Horowitz 141). Forming a committee to examine best practices for replacing or dropping this assessment would eliminate this argument.

ENG instructors could also make a focus on genre more central to its organizational instruction. As Tardy argues, genres are “nexuses among the textual, social, and political dimensions of writing” (Johns et al. 239). If students are introduced to genre elements in ESL 51, genre in the ENG 111 course could be “a bridge between writing experts” (Costino and Hyon 35). The ENG 111 course could use the concept to examine the ideology and power inherent in certain genres while “critiquing the[se] ideological dimensions,” therefore developing “critical consciousness,” an idea that has been suggested by genre scholars in writing studies for decades (Bastian 31). This would allow students to scaffold their understanding of genre and ideology over several courses. Another bridge-building activity would be for ESL and composition instructors to discuss what we mean when we say an essay has “good” organization and consider using transparent assignment design to make our values apparent to students. Transparent assignment design involves “[c]learly explaining purpose, task, and criteria helps students target their attention on the most important and complex aspects of [an] assignment, while reducing the extraneous cognitive load caused by a confusing format or unclear description” (Little and Overman 82). Making criteria and the purpose of said criteria clear to students will go a long way in helping students transfer writing skills.

Finally, WPAs and others who work with faculty serving MLWs could focus on professional development opportunities for faculty as well as textbook selection committees that prioritize textbooks that avoid highly structured models for writing such as the “three-stage structure” (thesis, argument, conclusion) which are extremely common in writing classes. Because “authentic ... writing varies considerably” from this model (Schneer 619), books and

learning materials for faculty that promote an understanding of organizational flexibility are crucial. The textbook market continues to emphasize these common, simplistic models of writing, and writing administrators need to further consider this issue.

Source Use

This is a final significant disciplinary division that could be addressed. The ESL department is avoiding source use because it is time-consuming and involves helping students understand how to use sources ethically, something the ESL faculty feel they are not prepared to address. Although avoiding text-responsible prose appears common in ESL writing courses (Lee “A Comparison” 367), most ESL/L2 writing scholars argue that it is important to teach source use practices because they are skills that take time to develop and will be used throughout a student’s academic career (Tomas and Shapiro 1110). Additionally, MACC composition faculty consider source use a central, critical skill to develop in first-year writing, as does much of the field (Brent 50). As Lee points out, teaching source use in ESL 51 reduces student fear of the writing tasks they will likely encounter in first-year composition.

One way that ESL could bridge this divide is to incorporate source use basics in the ESL 51 course with guided practices that would reduce concerns over workload challenges. Arguments about MLW student plagiarism when using sources can often be attributed to difficulties in comprehending a source (Grabe and Zhang 14). Therefore, teachers could select sources for students to use when they are introducing source incorporation, considering the Lexile level and goals of the assignment. This controlled use of sources can also help the instructor present the idea of sources as a conversation, comparing the evidence, claims, purpose, and other features of the genre (Bazerman “A Relationship” 660). Starting to develop this understanding in ESL 51 will be useful as students enter disciplinary conversations in other

coursework. Additionally, teaching source use can help with the “plagiarism problem.” As Grabe and Zhang point out, as students become “more skilled” with source use, they do far less direct copying (14); therefore, starting source use instruction in ESL 51 will help students begin to use sources in ways considered ethical by the academy. Such a pathway may start with faculty discussions on the difference between deliberate cheating and evidence of developmental stages of learning, which can be turned into teachable moments.

ENG 111 faculty might consider assignment design expectations related to source use requirements. For example, it is not reasonable for an instructor to assign a writing topic of their choice with an assumption that all students have the “basic background knowledge of current or historical American events” (Schneider 356). Allowing students to draw on personal knowledge, as Megan already does, is useful, as is having students write about a research topic of their choice, helping them consider the background information their audience would need to engage with their work. It is also important for instructors to educate students that source use is context dependent. Instructors must understand and teach students that academic conventions are typically meant for experts rather than students (Connors “The Rhetoric” 237). This can help faculty avoid reproducing the harmful, gatekeeper mechanisms that have long been a common academic practice and may harm MLWs. Most students will not enter careers in academia, and this knowledge can help them to understand the power structures inherent in these practices, even if they are required to negotiate these expectations.

Finally, these recommendations are hardly isolated to MACC and its faculty. It appears that even today many college ESL programs are not requiring much outside source use, despite what the scholarship says is necessary (Lee “A Comparison” 367) and faculty who are not used to working with MLWs may continue to write assignment prompts that have a negative effect on

these students' success (Reid and Kroll 37). Therefore, continuing professional development work in these two areas could be useful. MACC is, in fact, engaged in professional development for diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) initiatives, such as transparent assignment design, and such initiatives will benefit MLWs as well as other students not traditionally privileged in the academy. Additional collaboration on these DEI initiatives with faculty in both ESL and ENG could strengthen the value of these initiatives and facilitate student success.

Areas for Future Research

This study has attempted to explore the disciplinary division articulated by Matsuda over twenty years ago at one large, urban community college from a faculty perspective. While the evidence showing the disciplinary division still exists is compelling, there is certainly more work that could be done to expand on the findings here. The four areas for future research that I note here could be taken up at MACC and other campuses by both writing studies and ESL/L2 writing scholars.

First, the term "clarity" was not well-defined by instructors in either department, though many faculty found this term important. A cohort of interested faculty could discuss how this term has been used and how it might be defined and implemented by faculty who intend to use this term and assess writing based upon it. A "Clarity Retreat" could help the faculty of these departments consider how to deploy this term with more pedagogical consistency. Because clarity has a complex history in the scholarship of these fields, such clarity retreats would likely be useful at any higher education institution.

Additionally, one limitation of this study taking place at a single community college is that MACC's ENG department lacks a WPA who guides the curricular, pedagogical, and professional development of faculty. In other words, while these activities are ongoing, there is

no unity or central coordination to such initiatives. This study could be carried out instead at an institution that has a strong WPA-based structure and/or trained faculty designated to work with MLWs. The results at such institutions might be quite different from what is observed at MACC. On the other hand, if the results are similar, this might reinforce areas that could be further improved. Such a study could also demonstrate any thematic generalizability that this study may have. While I addressed in chapter 2 the limitations for full generalizability of this study given the small number of participants, it is possible that the concepts I identified and the disjuncture between theory and practice could be reinforced by studies at institutions with different faculty populations and governing structures.

Once a separation between these language-related disciplines has been established at an institution experiencing a disciplinary division (including MACC), a design-based research project could attempt to further diminish gaps between theory and practice. Design-based research entails an “authentic setting” in which a problem is identified, research takes place through a recursive process of “design, enactment, analysis, and redesign” with accounts that ideally produce authentic ideas about teaching and learning (The Design-Based Research Collective 5-6). In the context of such a study, this dissertation could serve as the identification of the problem, with a small cohort of volunteer faculty serving to better understand the disciplinary division and how faculty are assessing students based upon their promoted values, ultimately coming up with a list of concrete and manageable goals for better connecting these two courses and more fairly and equitably assessing students. Then, willing faculty would implement these goals over a series of semesters, making modifications as the outcomes of the goals become more apparent. Ideally, such a study would result in MACC or other implementing

institutions finding tested ways to improve the transition between ESL and ENG courses for MLW students.

Finally, this study could focus on the student experience rather than faculty values. An ethnographic study following a group of students from ESL 21 through ENG 111 could better articulate the places where students struggle with a disciplinary division or other course content. For example, as addressed in chapter 1, approximately 49 percent of all MACC's ESL-course taking students do not take ENG 111 within two years of completing ESL coursework for reasons not entirely clear. Using ethnographic methods to follow these students through their ESL coursework could further clarify why these students disappear and might help us to have a better understanding of how to retain them if they are degree-seeking.

Final Thought

One of my goals when I began this study was to consider the ways in which we could improve the experiences of our MLW students. So, although this project addresses faculty, students, like the ones who inspired my creation of Min, are at the heart of this work. Multilingual writers, whether they have lived their entire lives in the country where they attend college, whether they are international students, or have other complex language and social histories, masterfully face many challenges when obtaining higher education. They often spend months or even years attending noncredit coursework before being told they are ready for the “real” work of college. Though scholarship is finding its way towards better understanding the ideology and power structures inherent in everything we do and “teach” students, I still found a great deal of scholarship that views our MLW students with a deficit mindset, suggesting they have trouble reading at a college level, they do not understand cultural references, they struggle to understand assignments, they have poor grammar and weak or nonexistent citation skills.

These may be based in some truth some of the time. However, these arguments attempt to represent what students cannot do instead of what they are *trying* to do in the face of many obstacles. Additionally, what is missing here are the *instructors*. If we are going to encounter our students with the mindset that they are going to lack success in our class because they cannot accomplish our goals, maybe we need to reexamine these goals and values and why we hold them. Although much scholarship has endorsed approaches that value linguistic diversity over the last several decades, practice always appears to take longer to catch up. I hope, therefore, that this project serves to help faculty consider their values and practices. As faculty members dedicated to serving MLWs ethically and conscientiously, I believe that we can do better by working together.

WORKS CITED

- Adler-Kassner, Linda, et al. "Assembling Knowledge: The Role of Threshold Concepts in Facilitating Transfer." *Critical Transitions: Writing and the Question of Transfer*, edited by Chris M. Anson and Jessie L. Moore, 2016, pp. 17-47, <https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2016.0797.2.01>.
- Adler-Kassner, Linda, et al. "The Value of Troublesome Knowledge: Transfer and Threshold Concepts in Writing and History." *Composition Forum*, vol. 26, 2012, <https://compositionforum.com/issue/26/troublesome-knowledge-threshold.php>.
- Allison, Desmond. "Response to Pennycook: Whether, Why and How." *English for Specific Purposes*, vol. 17, no. 3, 1998, pp. 313-316.
- Anson, Chris M. "Process Pedagogy and its Legacy." *A Guide to Composition Pedagogies*. 2nd ed., edited by Gary Tate, et al., Oxford University Press, 2014, pp. 212-230.
- Ary, Donald, et al. *Introduction to Research in Education*. 8th ed., Cengage Learning, 2010.
- Atkinson, Dwight, and Vai Ramanathan. "Cultures of Writing: An Ethnographic Comparison of L1 and L2 University Writing/Language Programs." *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 29, no. 3, 1995, pp. 539-568.
- Baez, Elizabeth, and Rosanne Carlo. "Encouraging Student Voices: Toward a Voice-Based and Antiracist Culture from the MA Program to Basic Writing." *Journal of Basic Writing*, vol. 40, no. 1, 2021, pp. 99-126.
- Barnard, Ian. *Upsetting Composition Commonplaces*, Utah State University Press, 2014.
- Bartholomae, David. "Inventing the University." *Journal of Basic Writing*, vol. 5, no. 1, 1986, pp. 4-23.

- Bartholomae, David. "Writing With Teachers: A Conversation with Peter Elbow." *Cross-Talk in Comp Theory: A Reader*, edited by Victor Villanueva, National Council of Teachers of English, 1997, pp. 477-489.
- Bastian, Heather. "The Genre Effect: Exploring the Unfamiliar." *Composition Studies*, vol. 38, no. 1, 2010, pp. 29-50.
- Bawarshi, Anis. *Genre and the Invention of the Writer: Reconsidering the Place of Invention in Composition*, Utah State University Press, 2003.
- Bazerman, Charles. "A Relationship Between Reading and Writing: The Conversational Model." *College English*, vol. 41, no. 6, 1980, pp. 656-661.
- Bazerman, Charles. "Writing Speaks to Situations Through Recognizable Forms." *Naming What We Know*, edited by Linda Adler-Kassner and Elizabeth Wardle, Utah State University Press, 2015, pp. 35-37.
- Bean, John. "Using Writing to Promote Thinking." *Teaching Composition at the Two-Year College*, edited by Patrick M. Sullivan and Christie Toth, Bedford/St. Martin's, 2017, pp. 185-197.
- Beaufort, Anne. "The Question of University Writing Instruction." *Teaching Composition at the Two-Year College: Background Readings*, Bedford/St. Martins, 2017, pp. 202-219.
- Beavers, Melvin, et al. "Toward Antiracist First-Year Composition Goals." 3 Sept. 2021, <https://tinyurl.com/FYCGoalsStatement>. Accessed 10 May 2022.
- Benesch, Sarah. "ESL, Ideology, and the Politics of Pragmatism." *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 27, no. 4, 1993, pp. 705-717.
- Berlin, James A. *Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1900-1985*. Southern Illinois University Press, 1987.

- Bernstein, Susan Naomi, and Elizabeth Lowry. "The Five-Paragraph Essay Transmits Knowledge." *Bad Ideas About Writing*, edited by Cheryl E. Ball and Drew M. Loewe, 2017, pp. 214-219, <https://textbooks.lib.wvu.edu/badideas/badideasaboutwriting-book.pdf>.
- Bhowmik, Subrata K., and Marcia Kim. "Preparing Diverse Learners for University: A Strategy for Teaching EAP Students." *TESOL Journal*, vol. 9, no. 3, 2018, pp. 498-524.
- Bhowmik, Subrata Kumar, et al. "Peer Collaborative Writing in the EAP Classroom: Insights from a Canadian Postsecondary Context." *TESOL Journal*, vol. 10, 2019, pp. 1-16.
- Bilton, Linda, and Sivakumar Sivasubramaniam. "An Inquiry into Expressive Writing: A Classroom-Based Study." *Language Teaching Research*, vol. 13, no. 3, 2009, pp. 301-320.
- Birnbaum, June, et al. "Case Studies: Placing Literacy Phenomena Within Their Actual Context." *Handbook of Research on Teaching the English Language Arts*, edited by James Flood, et al., Taylor & Francis Group, 2002. ProQuest Ebook Central, <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/odu/detail.action?docID=3060433>, pp. 125-143.
- Bizzaro, Patrick. "Research and Reflection in English Studies: The Special Case of Creative Writing." *College English*, vol. 66, no. 3, 2004, pp. 294-309.
- Blaauw-Hara, Mark "Why Our Students Need Instruction in Grammar and How We Should Go About It." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 34, no. 2, 2006, pp. 165-178.
- Blaauw-Hara, Mark. "Transfer Theory, Threshold Concepts, and First-Year Composition: Connecting Writing Courses to the Rest of the College." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 41, no. 4, 2014, pp. 354-365.

- Blackwell-Starnes, Katt. "Preliminary Paths to Information Literacy: Introducing Research in Core Courses." *Information Literacy: Research and Collaboration Across Disciplines*, edited by Barbara J. D'Angelo, et al., WAC Clearing House & University Press of Colorado, 2016, pp. 139-161, <https://wac.colostate.edu/books/perspectives/infolit/>.
- Booth, Wayne C. "The Rhetorical Stance." *Teaching Composition: Background Readings*, 2nd ed., edited by T.R. Johnson, Bedford/St. Martins, 2005, pp. 136-145.
- Borg, Simon. "Teacher Cognition in Language Teaching: A Review of Research on What Language Teachers Think, Know, Believe, and Do." *Language Teaching*, vol. 36, no. 2, 2003, pp. 81-109.
- Bowden, Darsie. "Voice." *Concepts in Composition: Theory and Practice in the Teaching of Writing*, edited by Irene L. Clark, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., 2003, pp. 285-303.
- Brammer, Charlotte, and Mary Rees. "Peer Review from the Students' Perspective: Invaluable or Invalid?" *Composition Studies*, vol. 35, no. 2, 2007, pp. 71-85.
- Brannon, Lil, et al. "EJ Extra: The Five-Paragraph Essay and the Deficit Model of Education." *The English Journal*, vol. 98, no. 2, 2008, pp. 16-21.
- Branson, Tyler. "First-Year Composition Prepares Students for Academic Writing." *Bad Ideas About Writing*, edited by Cheryl E. Ball and Drew M. Loewe, 2017, pp. 18-23, <https://textbooks.lib.wvu.edu/badideas/badideasaboutwriting-book.pdf>.
- Braun, Virginia, and Victoria Clarke. "Online Qualitative Surveys?!?" *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 19 Aug. 2020, <https://ijsrm.org/2020/08/19/online-qualitative-surveys/>. Accessed 3 Nov. 2021.
- Braun, Virginia, et al. "Innovations in Qualitative Methods." *The Palgrave Handbook of Critical Social Psychology*, edited by Brendan Gough, Palgrave Macmillan, 2017, pp. 243-266.

- Brent, Doug. "The Research Paper and Why We Should Still Care." *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, vol. 37, no. 1, 2013, pp. 33-53.
- Buckingham, Thomas, and William C. Pech. "An Experience Approach to Teaching Composition." *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 10, no. 1, 1976, pp. 55-65.
- Butler, Paul. "Revisiting the Evidence: A Reply to Donald Lazere." *JAC*, vol. 31, no. 1/2, 2011, pp. 314-322.
- Butler, Paul. "Style and the Public Intellectual: Rethinking Composition in the Public Sphere." *JAC*, vol. 28, no. 1/2, 2008, pp. 55-84.
- Canagarajah, Suresh. "ESL Composition as a Literate Art of the Contact Zone." *First-Year Composition: From Theory to Practice*, edited by Ronald F. Lunsford and Deborah Coxwell-Teague, Parlor Press, 2014, pp. 27-48.
- Canagarajah, Suresh. "TESOL as a Professional Community: A Half Century of Pedagogy, Research, and Theory." *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 50, no. 1, 2016, pp. 7-41.
- Canagarajah, Suresh. "Toward a Writing Pedagogy of Shuttling Between Languages: Learning from Multilingual Writers." *College English*, vol. 68, no. 6, 2006, pp. 589-604.
- Caouette, Becky L. "On The College Front: Patrick Hartwell's 'Grammar, Grammars, and the Teaching of Grammar' and the Composition of Anthology." *Language Arts Journal of Michigan*, vol. 27, no. 2, 2012, pp. 57-62.
- Caplan, Nigel A., and Monica Farling. "A Dozen Heads Are Better Than One: Collaborative Writing in Genre-Based Pedagogy." *TESOL Journal*, vol. 8, no. 3, 2017, pp. 564-581.
- Carillo, Ellen C. "Writing Knowledge Transfers Easily." *Bad Ideas About Writing*, edited by Cheryl E. Ball and Drew M. Loewe, 2017, pp. 34-37, <https://textbooks.lib.wvu.edu/badideas/badideasaboutwriting-book.pdf>.

- “CCCC Statement on Second Language Writing and Writers.” *Conference on College Composition and Communication*, 2014,
<https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/secondlangwriting>. Accessed 19 Apr. 2019.
- Charmaz, Kathy. *Constructing Grounded Theory*. Sage, 2006.
- Charney, Davida H., & Richard A. Carlson. Learning to Write in a Genre: What Student Writers Take from Model Texts.” *Research in the Teaching of English*, vol. 29, no. 1, 1995, pp. 88-125.
- Cherryholmes, Cleo. *Power and Criticism: Poststructural Investigations in Education*, Teachers College Press, 1988.
- Clark, Irene. “A Genre Approach to Writing Assignments.” *Composition Forum*, vol. 14, no. 2, 2005, <https://compositionforum.com/issue/14.2/clark-genre-writing.php>.
- Clark, Irene. “Audience.” *Concepts in Composition*. 3rd ed., edited by Irene L. Clark, Routledge, 2019, pp. 119-140.
- Clark, Irene. “Genre, Transfer, and Related Issues.” *Concepts in Composition*. 3rd ed., edited by Irene L. Clark, Routledge, 2019, pp. 159-204.
- Clark, Irene. “Invention.” *Concepts in Composition*. 3rd ed., edited by Irene L. Clark, Routledge, 2019, pp. 52-86.
- Cole, Daniel. "What If the Earth is Flat? Working With, Not Against, Faculty Concerns About Grammar in Student Writing." *The WAC Journal*, vol. 25, 2014, pp. 7-35.
- “Conference on College Composition and Communication Committee on Language Policy.
 “Students’ Right to Their Own Language.” *CCC*, vol. 25, no. 3, 1974, pp. 1-32. Rpt. in *Students’ Right to Their Own Language: A Critical Sourcebook*. Ed. Staci Perryman-Clark, et al., Bedford/St. Martin’s, 2015, 19-57.

- Connor, Ulla. "New Directions in Contrastive Rhetoric." *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 36, no. 4, 2002, pp. 493-510.
- Connors, Robert J. "The Erasure of the Sentence." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 52, no. 1, 2000, pp. 96-128.
- Connors, Robert J. "The Rhetoric of Citation Systems, Part II: Competing Epistemic Values in Citation." *Rhetoric Review*, vol. 17, no. 2, 1999, pp. 219-245.
- Costino, Kimberly A., and Sunny Hyon. "Sidestepping Our 'Scare Words': Genre as a Possible Bridge Between L1 and L2 Compositionists." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 20, 2011, pp. 24-44.
- Coxwell-Teague, Deborah, and Ronald F. Lunsford. "Setting the Table: Composition in the Last Half of the Twentieth Century." *First Year Composition: From Theory to Practice*, edited by Deborah Coxwell-Teague and Ronald F. Lunsford, Parlor Press, 2013, pp. xiii-xxvii.
- Crandall, JoAnn, and MaryAnn Christison. "An Overview of Research in English Language Teacher Education and Professional Development." *Teacher Education and Professional Development in TESOL: Global Perspectives*, edited by JoAnn Crandall and MaryAnn Christison, The International Research Foundation for English Language Education and Routledge, 2016, pp. 3-34.
- Creswell, John W. *Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. 2nd ed., Sage, 2007.
- D'Alessio, Diane, and Margaret Riley. "Scaffolding Writing Skills for ESL Students in an Education Class at a Community College." *The WAC Journal*, vol. 13, 2002, pp. 79-89.
- D'Angelo, Frank J. "The Topic Sentence Revisited." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 37, no. 4, 1986, pp. 431-441.

- De Vries, Kimberly. "'Writing' Clearly': Differing Perceptions of Clarity in Chinese and American Texts." *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Contrastive and Translation Studies Between Chinese and English*, 2002, pp. 1-15.
- Dean, Deborah. *Genre Theory: Teaching, Writing, and Being*, National Council of Teachers of English, 2008.
- Denzin, Norman K. *The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods*. McGraw-Hill, 1978.
- DePalma, Michael-John, and Jeffrey M. Ringer. "Toward a Theory of Adaptive Transfer: Expanding Disciplinary Discussions of 'Transfer' in Second-Language Writing and Composition Studies." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 20, 2011, pp. 134-147.
- Detmering, Robert, and Anna Marie Johnson. "'Research Papers Have Always Seemed Very Daunting.': Information Literacy Narratives and the Student Research Experience." *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2012, pp. 5-22.
- Devitt, Amy J. "Generalizing About Genre: New Conceptions of an Old Concept." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 44, no. 4, 1993, pp. 573-586.
- Devitt, Amy J. *Writing Genres*. Southern Illinois University Press, 2004.
- Devitt, Bonnie. "Welcoming Grammar Back into the Writing Classroom." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 30, no. 1, 2002, pp. 8-17.
- Diana. Personal Interview. 15 May 2020.
- Donnelly, Dianne J. *Establishing Creative Writing Studies as an Academic Discipline*. 2009. University of South Florida, PhD dissertation.

- Downs, Douglas, and Elizabeth Wardle. "Teaching about Writing, Righting Misconceptions: (Re)envisioning 'First-Year Composition' as 'Introduction to Writing Studies.'" *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 58, no. 4, 2007, pp. 552-584.
- Dufour, Monique, and Jennifer Ahern-Dodson. "Good Writers Always Follow My Rules." *Bad Ideas About Writing*, edited by Cheryl E. Ball and Drew M. Loewe, 2017, pp. 121-125, <https://textbooks.lib.wvu.edu/badideas/badideasaboutwriting-book.pdf>.
- Dujsik, Darunee. *The Effects of Pre-Writing Strategy Training Guided by Computer-Based Procedural Facilitation on ESL Students' Strategy Use, Writing Quantity, and Writing Quality*. 2008. University of South Florida, PhD dissertation.
- Duncan, Mike. "Whatever Happened to the Paragraph?" *College English*, vol. 69, no. 5, 2007, pp. 470-495.
- Eckstein, Grant, and Dana Ferris. "Comparing L1 and L2 Texts and Writers in First-Year Composition." *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 52, no. 1, 2018, pp. 137-162.
- Eckstein, Grant, et al. "Assessment of L2 Student Writing: Does Teacher Disciplinary Background Matter?" *Journal of Writing Research*, vol. 10, no. 1, 2018, pp. 1-23.
- Eckstein, Grant, et al. "Multi-Draft Composing: An Iterative Model for Academic Argument Writing." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, vol. 10, 2011, pp. 162-172.
- Eckstein, Grant, et al. "Reading L1 and L2 Writing: An Eye Tracking Study of TESOL Rater Behavior." *TESL-EJ: The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*, vol. 23, no. 1, 2019, pp. 1-24.
- Ede, Lisa, and Andrea Lunsford. "Audience Addressed/Audience Invoked: The Role of Audience in Composition Theory and Pedagogy." *Cross-Talk in Comp Theory: A*

Reader, edited by Victor Villanueva, National Council of Teachers of English, 1997, pp. 155-171.

Elbow, Peter. “‘Personal Writing’ and ‘Expressivism’ as Problem Terms.” *Critical Expressivism: Theory and Practice in the Composition Classroom*, edited by Tara Roeder and Roseanne Gatto, 2014, pp. 15-32.
<https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/books/expressivism/elbow.pdf>.

Elbow, Peter. “Being a Writer vs. Being an Academic: A Conflict in Goals.” *Cross-Talk in Comp Theory: A Reader*, edited by Victor Villanueva, National Council of Teachers of English, 1997, pp. 489-500.

Elbow, Peter. *Writing Without Teacher*, Oxford University Press, 1973.

“English Language Learners (ELL) Students Enrolled in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools, by State: Selected Years, Fall 2000 Through Fall 2018.” *National Center for Education Statistics*, 2020,
https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d20/tables/dt20_204.20.asp.

Enos, Richard Leo. “Ancient Greek Writing Instruction and its Oral Antecedents.” *A Short History of Writing Instruction: From Ancient Greece to the Modern United States*, 4th ed., edited by James J. Murphy and Chris Thaiss, Routledge, 2020, pp. 8-39.

“Enrollment Trends: International Student Data.” *Open Doors*, 2021,
<https://opendoorsdata.org/data/international-students/enrollment-trends/>.

Fernsten, Linda A. “Writer Identity and ESL Learners.” *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, vol. 51, no. 1, 2008, pp. 44-52.

Ferris, Dana, et al. “Responding to L2 Students in College Writing Classes: Teacher Perspectives.” *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 45, no. 2, 2011, pp. 207-234.

- Ferris, Dana, et al. "Self-Directed Language Development: A Study of First-Year College Writers." *Research in the Teaching of English*, vol. 51, no. 4, 2017, pp. 418-440.
- Ferris, Dana, et al. "Self-Directed Language Development: A Study of First-Year College Writers." *Research in the Teaching of English*, vol. 51, no. 4, 2017, pp. 418-440.
- Ferris, Dana R. "The Case for Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes: Response to Truscott (1996)." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 8, no. 1, 1999, pp. 1-11.
- Fetterman, David. "Emic/Etic Distinction." *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*, edited by Lisa M. Given, Sage, 2008, pp. 249-250.
- Fink, Arlene. *The Survey Handbook*. 2nd ed., Sage, 2003.
- Fleisher, Kass. "Scenes from the Battlefield: A Feminist Resists the Writing Workshop." *The Iowa Review*, vol. 32, no. 1, 2002, pp. 109-115.
- Flower, Linda, and John R. Hayes. "A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing." *Cross-Talk in Comp Theory: A Reader*, edited by Victor Villanueva, National Council of Teachers of English, 1997, pp. 251-276.
- Ford, James E., and Dennis R. Perry. "Research Paper Instruction in the Undergraduate Writing Program." *College English*, vol. 44, no. 8, 1982, pp. 825-831.
- Fregeau, Lauren A. "Preparing ESL Student for College Writing: Two Case Studies." *The Internet TESL Journal*, vol. 5, no. 10, 1999, <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Fregeau-CollegeWriting>.
- Fulkerson, Richard. "Composition at the Turn of the Twenty-First Century." *Teaching Composition at the Two-Year College*, edited by Patrick M. Sullivan and Christie Toth, Bedford/St. Martins, 2017, pp. 109-138.
- Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. Basic Books, 1973.

- Glaser, Barney C., and Anselm L. Strauss. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Aldine Publishing Company, 1967.
- Goldblatt, Eli. "Don't Call it Expressivism: Legacies of a 'Tacit Tradition.'" *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 68, no. 3, 2017, pp. 438-465.
- Goldstein, Lynn. "For Kyla: What Does the Research Say About Responding to ESL Writers." *On Second Language Writing*, edited by Tony Silva and Paul Kei Matsuda, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., 2001, pp. 73-89.
- Gorrell, Robert M. "How to Make Mulligan Stew: Process and Product Again." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 34, no. 3, 1983, pp. 272-277.
- Goundar, Prashneel Ravisan and Bogitini Lia J.K.D. "First Year Fijian Undergraduate University Students Academic Essay Writing." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2019, pp. 172-177.
- Grabe, William, and Cui Zhang. "Reading and Writing Together: A Critical Component of English for Academic Purposes Teaching and Learning." *TESOL Journal*, vol. 4, no. 1, 2013, pp. 9-24.
- Grabe, William. "Notes Toward a Theory of Second Language Writing." *On Second Language Writing*, edited by Tony Silva and Paul Kei Matsuda, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2001, pp. 39-57.
- Gray, Phebe Xu. "The Formation and Development of TESOL: A Brief History." *International Education*, vol. 27, 1997,
<http://eds.a.ebscohost.com.proxy.lib.odu.edu/ehost/detail/detail?vid=2&sid=d561380b-c307-4433-a9e2->

e6fa1296b70a%40sessionmgr4010&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRI#AN=507597464&db=eue. Accessed 17 Aug. 2021.

- Great Writing: From Great Essays to Research*. 5th ed., edited by Keith S. Folse and Tison Pugh, National Geographic Learning, a Cengage Learning Company, 2020.
- Hairston, Maxine. "Diversity, Ideology, and Teaching Writing." *Cross-Talk in Comp Theory: A Reader*, edited by Victor Villanueva, National Council of Teachers of English, 1997, pp. 659-675.
- Hancock, Dawson R., and Robert Algozzine. *Doing Case Study Research: A Practical Guide for Beginning Researchers*. 3rd ed., Teachers College Press, 2017.
- Hartwell, Patrick. "Grammar, Grammars, and the Teaching of Grammar." *College English*, vol. 47, no. 2, 1985, pp. 105-127.
- Hashimoto, I. "Voice as Juice: Some Reservations about Evangelic Composition." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 38, no. 1, 1987, pp. 70-80.
- Hatch, J. Amos. *Doing Qualitative Research in Education Settings*. State University of New York Press, 2002.
- Head, Alison J., and Michael B. Eisenberg. "Assigning Inquiry: How Handouts for Research Assignments Guide Today's College Students." *Project Information Literacy Progress Report: University of Washington Information School*, 2010, pp. 1-41.
- Helms-Park, Rena, and Paul Stapleton. "Questioning the Importance of Individualized Voice in Undergraduate L2 Argumentative Writing: An Empirical Study with Pedagogical Implications." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 12, 2003, pp. 245-265.
- Hood, Carra Leah. "Ways of Research: The Status of the Traditional Research Paper Assignment in First-Year Writing/Composition Courses." *Composition Forum*, 22, 2010.

- Horner, Bruce, et al. "Opinion: Language Difference in Writing: Toward a Translingual Approach." *College English*, vol. 73, no. 3, 2011, pp. 303-321.
- Horowitz, Daniel. "Process, Not Product: Less Than Meets the Eye." *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 20, no. 1, 1986, pp. 141-144.
- Howard, Rebecca Moore. "Plagiarism, Authorships, and the Academic Death Penalty." *College English*, vol. 57, no. 7, 1995, pp. 788-806.
- Hyland, Ken. "General and Specific EAP." *The Routledge Handbook of English for Academic Purposes*, edited by Ken Hyland and Philip Shaw, Routledge, 2016, pp. 17-29, <https://doi-org.proxy.lib.odu.edu/10.4324/9781315657455>.
- Hyland, Ken. "Genre and Second Language Writing: Framing the Issue." *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, 1st ed., edited by John I. Liantas, John Wiley & Sons, 2018, pp. 2359-2364.
- Hyland, Ken. "Genre Pedagogy: Language, Literacy and L2 Writing Instruction." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 16, 2007, pp. 148-164.
- Hyland, Ken. "Genre-Based Pedagogies: A Social Response to Process." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 12, 2003, pp. 17-29.
- Inoue, Asao B. *Antiracist Writing Assessment Ecologies: Teaching and Assessing Writing for a Socially Just Future*. The WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press, 2015, <https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2015.0698>.
- Inoue, Asao. "How Do We Language So People Stop Killing Each Other, Or What Do We Do About White Language Supremacy?" *Opening Session of CCCC*, 14 Mar. 2019, https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1C2gGz2SEzt8fcb1WdsGPjWkQ98AC-80nTY-zeSX5UPg/edit#slide=id.g3fd0a840bc_0_179.

- Inoue, Asao. "Why I Left the CWPA (Council of Writing Program Administrators)." *Asao B. Inoue's Infrequent Words*, Blogspot, 18 Apr. 2021, <http://asaobinoue.blogspot.com/2021/04/why-i-left-cwpa-council-of-writing.html>. Accessed 8 Jun. 2022.
- James, Mark Andrew. "An Investigation of Learning Transfer in English-For-General-Academic-Purposes Writing Instruction." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 19, 2010, pp. 183-206.
- Jamieson, Sandra. "What the Citation Project Tells Us About Information Literacy in College Composition." *Information Literacy: Research and Collaboration Across Disciplines*, edited by Barbara J. D'Angelo, et al., WAC Clearing House & University Press of Colorado, 2016, pp. 115-138, <https://wac.colostate.edu/books/perspectives/infolit/>.
- Janopolous, Michael. "University Faculty Tolerance of NS and NNS Writing Errors: A Comparison." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 1, no. 2, 1992, pp. 109-121.
- Jansen, Harrie. "The Logic of Qualitative Survey Research and its Position in the Field of Social Research Methods." *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 2010, vol. 11, no. 2, <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs1002110>.
- Jaschik, Scott. "Composition, Overcrowded." *Inside Higher Ed*, 16 Mar. 2009, <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2009/03/16/composition-overcrowded>. Accessed 14 Jun. 2022.
- Johns, Ann M. "Genre and Pedagogical Purposes." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 4, no. 2, 1995, pp. 181-190.
- Johns, Ann M. "Genre Awareness for the Novice Academic Student: An Ongoing Quest." *Language Teaching*, vol. 41, no. 2, 2008, pp. 237-252.

- Johns, Ann M. "The Future of Genre in L2 Writing: Fundamental, But Contested, Instructional Decisions." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 20, 2011, pp. 56-68.
- Johns, Ann M. "Too Much on Our Plates: A Response to Terry Santos' 'Ideology in Composition: L1 and ESL.'" *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 2, no. 1, 1993, pp. 83-88.
- Johns, Ann M. "Written Argumentation for Real Audiences: Suggestions for Teacher Research and Classroom Practice." *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 27, no. 1, 1993, pp. 75-90.
- Johns, Ann M., et al. "Crossing the Boundaries of Genre Studies: Commentaries by Experts." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 15, no. 3, 2006, pp. 234-249.
- Johnson, T.R. "'Clarity' Really Means Rhythm: Toward a Psychoanalytic Poetics of Prose." *Style and the Future of Composition Studies*, edited by Paul Butler, Brian Ray, and Star Medzerian Vanguri, University Press of Chicago, 2020, pp. 53-65.
- Kantz, Margaret. "Helping Students use Textual Sources Persuasively." *College English*, vol. 52, no. 1, 1990, pp. 74-91.
- Kaplan, Robert. "Contrastive Rhetoric and the Teaching of Composition." *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 1, no. 4, 1967, pp. 10-16.
- Kaplan, Robert. "Cultural Thought Pattern in Intercultural Communication." *Landmark Essays on ESL Writing*, edited by Tony Silva and Paul Kei Matsuda, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., 2001, pp. 11-25.
- Keck, Casey. "Copying, Paraphrasing, and Academic Writing Development: A Re-Examination of L1 and L2 Summarization Practices." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 25, 2014, pp. 4-22.

- Kessler, Matthew Jeffrey. *Teaching and Learning in a Content-Based Classroom: Understanding Pedagogy and the Development of L2 Writers' Metacognitive Genre Awareness*. 2020. Michigan State University, PhD dissertation.
- Klausman, Jeffrey, et al. "TYCA Working Paper #1: Two Year College English Faculty Teaching Workload." *Two Year College English Association Workload Task Force*, Nov. 2020, <https://ncte.org/groups/tyca/tyca-position-statements/>.
- Kolln, Martha. "Rhetorical Grammar: A Modification Lesson." *English Journal*, vol. 85, no. 7, 1996, pp. 25-31.
- Kreuter, Nate. "The Ethics of Clarity and Obscuration." *Composition Forum*, vol. 27, 2013, <http://compositionforum.com/issue/27/clarity.php>.
- Kurzer, Kendon. "Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback in Developmental Multilingual Writing Classes." *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 52, no. 1, 2018, pp. 5-33.
- Labaree, Robert V. "The Risk of 'Going Observationalist': Negotiating the Hidden Dilemmas of Being an Insider Participant Observer." *Qualitative Research*, vol. 2, no. 1, 2002, pp. 97-122.
- LaFemina, Gerry. "Demystifying and Demythifying the Workshop: On the Supposed 'Lore' of Creative Writing Pedagogy, *Association of Writers and Writing Programs*, 2011, https://www.awpwriter.org/magazine_media/writers_notebook_view/196/demystifying_and_demythifying_the_workshop_on_the_supposed_lore_of_creative_writing_pedagogy.
- Larsen-Freeman, Diane. "Research Into Practice: Grammar Learning and Teaching." *Language Teaching*, vol. 48, no. 2, 2015, pp. 263-280.

Leahy, Anna. "Teaching as a Creative Act.: Why the Workshop Works in Creative Writing."

Does the Writing Workshop Still Work?, edited by Dianne Donnelly, Multilingual Matters, 2010, pp. 63-77.

Lee, Icy. "Teaching Coherence to ESL Students: A Classroom Inquiry. *Journal of Second*

Language Writing, vol. 11, 2002, pp. 135-159.

Lee, Jooyoung. "A Comparison of Writing Tasks in ESL Writing and First Year Composition

Courses: A Case Study of One US University." *Language Teaching Research*, vol. 25, no. 3, 2021, pp. 360-377.

Lee, Young-Ju. "The Process-Oriented ESL Writing Assessment: Promises and Challenges."

Journal of Second Language Writing, vol. 15, 2006, pp. 307-330.

Leki, Ilona, et al. *A Synthesis of Research on Second Language Writing in English*. Routledge,

2008.

Leki, Ilona, and Joan Carson. "'Completely Different Worlds': EAP And the Writing

Experiences of ESL Students in University Courses." *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 31, no. 1, 1997, pp. 39-69.

Leki, Ilona. "Writing, Literacy, and Applied Linguistics." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*,

vol. 20, 2000, pp. 99-115.

Li, Shaofeng, and Alyssa Vuono. "Twenty-Five Years of Research on Oral and Written

Corrective Feedback in *System*." *System*, vol. 84, 2019, pp. 93-109.

Lichtman, Karen, and Bill VanPatten. "Was Krashen Right? Forty Years Later." *Foreign*

Language Annals vol. 54, 2021, pp. 283-305.

Little, Deandra, and Amy Overman. "Designing Transparent Assignments in Interdisciplinary

Contexts." *Transparent Design in Higher Education Teaching and Leadership: A Guide*

- to Implementing the Transparency Framework Institution-Wide to Improve Learning and Retention*, edited by Mary-Ann Winkelmes, et al., Stylus Publishing, LLC, 2019, pp. 81-97. *ProQuest Ebook Central*,
<https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/odu/detail.action?docID=5752578>.
- Liu, Gi-Zen, et al. "Best Practices in L2 English Source Use Pedagogy: A Thematic Review and Synthesis of Empirical Studies." *Educational Research Review*, vol. 19, 2016, pp. 36-57.
- Lockett, Alexandria. "The Traditional Research Paper is Best." *Bad Ideas About Writing*, edited by Cheryl E. Ball and Drew M. Loewe, 2017, pp. 236-241,
<https://textbooks.lib.wvu.edu/badideas/badideasaboutwriting-book.pdf>.
- Lunsford, Andrea, and Karen J. Lunsford. "'Mistakes are Facts of Life': A National Comparative Study." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 59, no. 4, 2008, pp. 781-806.
- Lynch, Paul. "The Sixth Paragraph: A Re-Vision of the Essay." *Writing Spaces: Readings on Writings*, vol. 2, 2011, pp. 286-301, https://writingspaces.org/?page_id=267.
- Lyster, Roy. "Roles for Corrective Feedback in Second Language Instruction." *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*, edited by Carol A. Chapelle, John Wiley & Sons, 2018, pp. 1-6.
- Maid, Barry, and Barbara D'Angelo. "Threshold Concepts: Integrating and Applying Information Literacy and Writing Instruction." *Information Literacy: Research and Collaboration Across Disciplines*, edited by Barbara J. D'Angelo, et al., WAC Clearing House & University Press of Colorado, 2016, pp. 37-50,
<https://wac.colostate.edu/books/perspectives/infolit/>.

- Manning, Ambrose N. "The Present State of the Research Paper in Freshman English: A National Survey." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 12, no. 2, 1961, pp. 73-78.
- Matsuda, Paul Kei and Ryan Skinnell. "Considering the Impact of the WPA Outcomes Statement on Second Language Writers." *The WPA Outcomes Statement – A Decade Later*." University of North Texas Libraries, UNT Digital Library, 2012, <https://digital.library.unt.edu>; crediting UNT College of Arts and Sciences, pp. 230-241. Accessed 17 Aug. 2021.
- Matsuda, Paul Kei, et al. "Writing Teachers' Perceptions of the Presence and Needs of Second Language Writers: An Institutional Case Study." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 22, 2013, pp. 68-86.
- Matsuda, Paul Kei. "Composition Studies and ESL Writing: A Disciplinary Division of Labor." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 50, no. 4, 1999, pp. 699-721.
- Matsuda, Paul Kei. "Contrastive Rhetoric in Context: A Dynamic Model of L2 Writing." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 6, no. 1, 1997, pp. 45-60.
- Matsuda, Paul Kei. "Identity in Written Discourse." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, vol. 35, 2015, pp. 140-159.
- Matsuda, Paul Kei. "Let's Face It: Language Issues and the Writing Program Administrator." *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, vol. 36, no. 1, 2012, pp. 141-163.
- Matsuda, Paul Kei. "Process and Post-Process: A Discursive History." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 12, 2003, pp. 65-83.

- Matsuda, Paul Kei. "The Myth of Linguistic Homogeneity in U.S. College Composition." *College English*, vol. 68, no. 6, 2006, pp. 637-651.
- McClure, Randall and Kellian Clink. "How Do You Know That? An Investigation of Student Research Practices in the Digital Age." *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, vol. 9, no. 1, 2009, pp. 115-132.
- Melzer, Dan. "Writing Assignments Across the Curriculum: A National Study of College Writing." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 61, no. 2, 2009, pp. W240-61.
- Merkel, Warren. "A Case Study of Undergraduate L2 Writers' Concerns with Source-Based Writing and Plagiarism." *TESOL Journal*, vol. 11, 2020, pp. 1-16.
- Merriam, Sharan B. *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education*. 2nd ed., Jossey-Bass, 1998.
- Micciche, Laura R. "Making a Case for Rhetorical Grammar." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 55, no. 4, 2004, pp. 716-737.
- Mid Atlantic Community College. "2014 Faculty Survey Results." Unpublished internal document.
- Miller-Cochran, Susan. "Beyond 'ESL Writing': Teaching Cross-Cultural Composition at a Community College." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 40, no. 1, 2012, pp. 20-30.
- Miller, Carolyn R. "Genre as Social Action." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, vol. 70, 1984, pp. 151-167.
- Morse, Janice M. "'Perfectly Healthy, But Dead': The Myth of Inter-Rater Reliability." *Qualitative Health Research*, vol. 7, no. 4, 1997, pp. 445-447.

- Moxley, Joseph M. "Clarity." *Writing Commons: The Encyclopedia for Writers, Researchers, and Knowledge Workers*, <https://writingcommons.org/section/style/clarity/>.
- Murray, Donald. "Teach Writing as a Process Not Product." *Cross Talk in Comp: A Reader*, edited by Victor Villanueva, Jr., National Council of Teachers of English, 1997, pp. 3-6.
- Myskow, Gordon, and Kana Gordon. "A Focus on Purpose: Using a Genre Approach in an EFL Writing Class." *ELT Journal*, vol. 64, no. 3, 2010, pp. 283-292.
- Nash, Robert. *Liberating Scholarly Writing: The Power of Personal Narrative*, Information Age Publishing, Incorporated, 2019. *ProQuest Ebook Central*, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/odu/detail.action?docID=5730718>.
- Nelms, Gerald, and Rhonda Leathers Dively. "Perceived Roadblocks to Transferring Knowledge from First-Year Composition to Writing-Intensive Major Courses: A Pilot Study." *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, vol. 31, no. 1-2, 2007, pp. 214-39.
- Nelson, Katherine. "'And the Greatest of These is Clarity': Clarity's Worth to a Contemporary Style Pedagogy." *Locutorium*, vol. 8, 2013, <https://locutorium.byu.edu/issues/volume-8-2013-2/and-the-greatest-of-these-is-clarity/>.
- Newkirk, Thomas. "Selfhood and the Personal Essay: A Pragmatic Defense." *Critical Expressivism: Theory and Practice in the Composition Classroom*, edited by Tara Roeder and Roseanne Gatto, 2014, pp. 33-53, <https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/books/expressivism/newkirk.pdf>.
- Newkirk, Thomas. "The Politics of Intimacy: The Defeat of Barrett Wendell at Harvard." *Taking Stock: The Writing Process Movement in the '90s*, edited by Lad Tobin and Thomas Newkirk, Boynton/Cook, 1994, pp. 115-131.

- North, Stephen. *The Making of Knowledge in Composition: Portrait of an Emerging Field*, Boynton/Cook Publishers, 1987.
- Norton, Bonny, and Margaret Early. "Researcher Identity, Narrative Inquiry, and Language Teaching Research." *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 45, no. 3, 2011, pp. 415-439.
- O'Connor, Cliodhna, and Helene Joffe. "Intercoder Reliability in Qualitative Research: Debates and Practical Guidelines." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, vol. 19, 2020, pp. 1-13.
- "OIR Factbook." https://www.nvcc.edu/oieess/_docs/oir/Fact-Book-2016-2021.pdf. Accessed 20 Aug. 2021.
- Ong, Walter J. "A Writer's Audience is Always a Fiction." *PMLA*, vol. 90, no. 1, 1975, pp. 9-21.
- Palmquist, Mike, and Barbara Wallraff. *In Conversation: A Writer's Guidebook*, Bedford/St. Martin's 2017.
- Pattanayak, Anjali. "There is One Correct Way of Writing and Speaking." *Bad Ideas About Writing*, edited by Cheryl E. Ball and Drew M. Loewe, 2017, pp. 82-88, <https://textbooks.lib.wvu.edu/badideas/badideasaboutwriting-book.pdf>.
- Patton, Michael Quinn. *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. 3rd ed., Sage Publications, Inc., 2002.
- Pecorari, Diane, and Bojana Petric. "Plagiarism in Second-Language Writing." *Language Teaching*, vol. 47, no. 3, 2014, pp. 269-302.
- Pecorari, Diane. "Plagiarism in Second Language Writing: Is it Time to Close the Case?" *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 30, 2015, pp. 94-99.
- Pemberton, Michael A. "Modeling Theory and Composing Process Models." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 44, no. 1, 1993, pp. 40-58.

- Pennycook, Alastair. "Vulgar Pragmatism, Critical Pragmatism, and EAP." *English for Specific Purposes*, vol. 16, no. 4, 1997, pp. 253-269.
- Plakans, Lia, and Atta Gebril. "Exploring the Relationship of Organization and Connection with Scores in Integrated Writing Assessment." *Assessing Writing*, vol. 31, 2017, pp. 98-112.
- Polio, Charlene. "Keeping the Language in Second Language Writing Classes." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 46, 2019, pp. 1-5.
- Ponterotto, Joseph G. "Brief Note on the Origins, Evolution, and Meaning of the Qualitative Research Concept Thick Description." *The Qualitative Report*, vol. 11, no. 3, 2006, pp. 538-549.
- Prendergast, Catherine. "Fighting Style: Reading the Unabomber's Strunk and White." *College English*, vol. 72, no. 1, 2009, pp. 10-28.
- Qu, Weiguo. "For L2 Writers, it is Always the Problem of the Language." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 38, 2017, pp. 92-93.
- "Race and Ethnicity of U.S. Undergraduates."
<https://www.equityinhighered.org/indicators/enrollment-in-undergraduate-education/race-and-ethnicity-of-u-s-undergraduates/>. Accessed 25 Aug. 2021.
- Racelis, Juval V., and Paul Kei Matsuda. "Integrating Process and Genre into the Second Language Writing Classroom." *Language Teaching*, vol. 46, no. 3, 2013, pp. 382-393.
- Raimes, Ann. "Tradition and Revolution in ESL Teaching." *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 17, no. 4, 1983, pp. 535-552.
- Raimes, Ann. "What Unskilled ESL Students Do as They Write: A Classroom Study of Composing." *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 19, no. 2, 1985, pp. 229-258.

- Reid, Joy, and Barbara Kroll. "Designing and Assessing Effective Classroom Writing Assignments for NES and ESL Students." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 4, no. 1, 1995, pp. 17-41.
- Richards, Jack C., and Theodore S. Rodgers. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. 3rd ed., Cambridge, 2014.
- Ritter, Kelly. "Ethos Interrupted: Diffusing 'Star' Pedagogy in Creative Writing." *College English*, vol. 69, no. 3, 2007, pp. 283-292.
- Roberts, Felicia, and Tony Cimasko. "Evaluating ESL: Making Sense of University Professors' Responses to Second Language Writing." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 17, 2008, pp. 125-143.
- Rosati, Annette C. "(Dis)Placement of Current-Traditional Rhetoric's Approach in a Composition Class." Conference on Rhetoric and the Teaching of Writing, 11 July 1990, Indiana, PA. Speeches/Conference Papers.
- Rose, Mike. "Remedial Writing Courses: A Critique and a Proposal." *College English*, vol. 45, no. 2, 1983, pp. 109-128.
- Rose, Mike. "The Language of Exclusion: Writing Instruction at the University." *College English*, vol. 47, no. 4, 1985, pp. 341-359.
- Rule, Hannah J. "Sensing the Sentence: An Embodied Simulation Approach to Rhetorical Grammar." *Composition Studies*, vol. 45, no. 1, 2017, pp. 19-38.
- Ryder, Phyllis Mentzell. "Rhetorical Publics: Beyond Clarity and Efficiency." *Enculturation: A Journal of Rhetoric, Writing, and Culture*, vol. 6, no. 1, 2008, <http://enculturation.net/6.1/ryder>. Accessed 15 July 2022.
- Saldaña, Johnny. *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. Sage, 2009.

- Santos, Terry. "Ideology in Composition: L1 and ESL." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 1, no. 1, 1992, pp. 1-15.
- Scheidt, Donna, et al. "Writing Information Literacy in First-Year Composition: A Collaboration Among Faculty and Librarians." *Information Literacy: Research and Collaboration Across Disciplines*, edited by Barbara J. D'Angelo, et al., WAC Clearing House & University Press of Colorado, 2016, pp. 211-233, <https://wac.colostate.edu/books/perspectives/infolit/>.
- Schenck, Andrew. "Learning to Improve Grammar Instruction Through Comprehensive Analysis of Past Research." *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, vol. 55, no. 2, 2017, pp. 165-195.
- Schneer, David. "Rethinking the Argumentative Essay." *TESOL Journal*, vol. 5, no. 4, 2014, pp. 619-653.
- Schneider, Jason. "Learning How to Support Multilingual Writers: A Framework for Faculty Education." *Pedagogy: Critical Approaches to Teaching Literature, Language, Composition, and Culture*, vol. 18, no. 2, 2018, pp. 345-374.
- Schreiber, Brooke R., and Missy Watson. "Translingualism ≠ Code-Meshing: A Response to Gevers' 'Translingualism Revisited.'" *Baruch College Publications and Research*, 2018, https://academicworks.cuny.edu/bb_pubs/1204/. Accessed 15 Jun. 2022.
- Shannon, John. "TESOL's Process Versus Product Debate." *Education Resources Information Center*, 1994, pp. 1-9, <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED375626>. Accessed 17 Jun. 2022.
- Shuck, Gail. "Combating Monolingualism: A Novice Administrator's Challenge." *WPA*, vol. 30, no. 1-2, 2006, pp. 59-82.

- Silva, Tony, and Ilona Leki. "Family Matters: The Influence of Applied Linguistics and Composition Studies on Second Language Writing Studies: Past, Present, and Future." *The Modern Language Journal*, vol. 88, no. 1, 2004, pp. 1-13.
- Silva, Tony. "Second Language Composition Instruction: Developments, Issues, and Directions in ESL." *Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the Classroom*, edited by Barbara Kroll, Cambridge University Press, 2012, pp. 11-23.
- Sommers, Nancy. "Revision Strategies of Student Writers and Experienced Adult Writers." *Cross-Talk in Comp Theory: A Reader*, edited by Victor Villanueva, National Council of Teachers of English, 1997, pp. 43-54.
- Sopher, H. "The Elements of Clarity—An Approach to the Study of Style." *ELT Journal*, vol. 26, no. 1, 1971, pp. 20-31.
- Spack, Ruth. "Invention Strategies and the ESL College Composition Student." *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 18, no. 4, 1984, pp. 649-670.
- Spigelman, Candace. "Argument and Evidence in the Case of the Personal." *College English*, vol. 64, no. 1, 2001, pp. 63-87.
- Stake, Robert. *The Art of Case Study Research*. Sage, 1995.
- Stapleton, Paul. "Critiquing Voice as a Viable Pedagogical Tool in L2 Writing: Returning the Spotlight to Ideas." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 11, 2002, pp. 177-190.
- Stewart, Mary Amanda. "Writing with Power, Sharing their Immigrant Stories: Adult ESOL Students Find Their Voices Through Writing." *TESOL Journal*, vol. 1, no. 2, 2010, pp. 269-283.

- Stolarek, Elizabeth A. "Prose Modeling and Metacognition: The Effect of Modeling on Developing a Metacognitive Stance Toward Writing." *Research in the Teaching of English*, vol. 28, no. 2, 1994, pp. 154-174.
- Stoller, Fredricka L. "Time for a Change: A Hybrid Curriculum for EAP Programs." *TESOL Journal*, vol. 8, no. 1, 1999, pp. 9-13.
- Strunk, William, and E.B. White. *The Elements of Style*, 4th ed., Pandora's Box Classics, 2017. EBSCOhost, <https://search-ebSCOhost-com.proxy.lib.odu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=2181327&scope=site>.
- Students' Right to Their Own Language: A Critical Sourcebook*, edited by Staci Perryman-Clark, et al., Bedford/St. Martin's, 2014, pp. 150-162.
- Sumpter, Matthew. "Shared Frequency: Expressivism, Social Constructionism, and the Linked Creative Writing-Composition Class." *College English*, vol. 78, no. 4, 2016, pp. 340-361.
- Swales, John. *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*, Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Tardy, Christine M., and Erin Whittig. "On the Ethical Treatment of EAL Writers: An Update." *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 51, no. 4, 2017, pp. 920-930.
- Tardy, Christine M., and Soomin Jwa. "Composition Studies and EAP." *The Routledge Handbook of English for Academic Purposes*, edited by Ken Hyland and Philip Shaw, Routledge, 2016, pp. 56-68.
- Taylor, Steven J., et al. *Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods: A Guidebook and Resource*, John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated, 2015. *ProQuest Ebook Central*, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/odu/detail.action?docID=4038514>.

- The Design-Based Research Collective. "Design-Based Research: An Emerging Paradigm for Educational Inquiry." *Educational Researcher*, vol. 32, no. 1, 2003, pp. 5-8.
- "This Ain't Another Statement! This is a DEMAND for Black Linguistic Justice!" *Conference on College Composition and Communication*, July 2020,
<https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/demand-for-black-linguistic-justice>.
- Thomas, Patrick. "Writers Must Develop a Strong, Original Voice." *Bad Ideas About Writing*, edited by Cheryl E. Ball and Drew M. Loewe, 2017, pp. 126-130,
<https://textbooks.lib.wvu.edu/badideas/badideasaboutwriting-book.pdf>.
- Thonney, Teresa. "Teaching the Conventions of Academic Discourse." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 38, no. 4, 2011, pp. 347-362.
- Tobin, Lad. "You Are Invited...To Leave." *Fourth Genre: Explorations in Nonfiction*, vol. 1, no. 2, 1999, pp. 45-49.
- Tomas, Zuzana, and Shawna Shapiro. "From Crisis to Opportunity: Turning Questions About 'Plagiarism' into Conversations about Linguistically Responsive Pedagogy." *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 55, no. 4, 2021, pp. 1102-1113.
- Tremmel, Michelle. "What to Make of the Five-Paragraph Theme: History of the Genre and Implications." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 39, no. 1, 2011, pp. 29-42.
- Trimbur, John. "Taking the Social Turn: Teaching Writing Post-Process." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 45, no. 1, 1994, pp. 108-118.
- Truscott, John. "The Case Against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes." *Language Learning*, vol. 46, 1996, pp. 327-369.
- van Blankenstein, Floris M., et al. "How Do Self-Efficacy Beliefs for Academic Writing and Collaboration and Intrinsic Motivation for Academic Writing and Research Develop

- During an Undergraduate Research Project?" *Educational Studies*, vol. 45, no. 2, 2019, pp. 209-225.
- Vann, Roberta J., et al. "Error Gravity: A Study of Faculty Opinions of ESL Errors." *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 18, no. 3, 1984, pp. 427-440.
- Vieregge, Quentin. "The Five-Paragraph Essay is Rhetorically Sound." *Bad Ideas About Writing*, edited by Cheryl E. Ball and Drew M. Loewe, 2017, pp. 209-213, <https://textbooks.lib.wvu.edu/badideas/badideasaboutwriting-book.pdf>.
- Villanueva, Victor. "Talking about Selves and Schools: On Voice, Voices, and Other Voices." *Cross-Talk in Comp Theory: A Reader*, edited by Victor Villanueva, National Council of Teachers of English, 1997, pp. 475-477.
- Vorobel, Oksana, and Camilla Vásquez. "A Teacher's Perspectives on Peer Review in ESL Classes." *Writing & Pedagogy*, vol. 6, no. 2, 2014, pp. 307-335.
- Vorobel, Oksana, and Deoksoon Kim. "Upper-Intermediate-Level ESL Students' Summarizing in English." *TESOL Journal*, vol. 2, no. 3, 2011, pp. 330-354.
- Wardle, Elizabeth. "'Mutt Genres' and the Goal of FYC: Can We Help Students Write the Genres of the University?" *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 60, no. 4, 2009, pp. 765-789.
- Wardle, Elizabeth. "Intractable Writing Program Problems, *Kairos*, and Writing About Writing: A Profile of the University of Central Florida's First-Year Composition Program." *Composition Forum*, vol. 27, 2013, <http://compositionforum.org/issue/27/ucf.php>.
- Wells, Jennifer. "They Can Get There from Here: Teaching for Transfer through a 'Writing about Writing' Course." *The English Journal*, vol. 101, no. 2, 2011, pp. 57-63.

Wenger, Christy I. “‘Feeling Lore’: The ‘Problem’ of Emotion in the Practice of Teaching.”

English Teaching: Practice and Critique, vol. 10, no. 3, Sept. 2011, pp. 45-59.

White, Ed. “My Five-Paragraph Theme Theme.” *College Composition and Communication*, vol.

59, no. 3, 2008, pp. 524-525.

Williams, Jessica. “Focus on Form in Communicative Language Teaching: Research Findings

and the Classroom Teacher.” *TESOL Journal*, vol. 4, no. 4, 1995, pp. 12-16.

Witte, Alison C. “Research Starts with Answers.” *Bad Ideas About Writing*, edited by Cheryl E.

Ball and Drew M. Loewe, 2017, pp. 226-230,

<https://textbooks.lib.wvu.edu/badideas/badideasaboutwriting-book.pdf>.

“WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition (3.0), Approved July 17, 2014.” *Council*

of Writing Program Administrators, 2019,

https://wpacouncil.org/aws/CWPA/pt/sd/news_article/243055/_PARENT/layout_details/false.

Yancy, Kathleen, et al. *Writing Across Contexts: Transfer, Composition, and Sites of Writing*,

Utah State University Press, 2015.

Yang, Ling, and David Cahill. “The Rhetorical Organization of Chinese and American Students’

Expository Essays: A Contrastive Rhetoric Study.” *International Journal of English*

Studies, vol. 8, no. 2, 2008, pp. 113-132.

Yin, Robert K. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. 3rd ed., Sage, 2003.

Yoshimura, Fumiko. “Another Possible Reason for Plagiarism: Task Representations of

Summary Writing.” *TESL-EJ: The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*,

vol. 22, no. 3, 2018, pp. 1-17.

Zamel, Vivian. "Responding to Student Writing." *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 19, no. 1, 1985, pp. 79-101.

Zamel, Vivian. "Strangers in Academia: The Experiences of Faculty and ESL Students Across the Curriculum." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 46, no. 4, 1995, pp. 506-521.

Zorn, Jeff. "'Students' Right to Their Own Language': A Counter-Argument." *Academic Questions*, vol. 23, no. 3, 2010, pp. 311-326. Rpt. in *Students' Right to Their Own Language: A Critical Sourcebook*, edited by Staci Perryman-Clark, et al., Bedford/St. Martin's, 2014, pp. 150-162.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY TO ESL AND COMPOSITION FACULTY

Thank you so much for agreeing to participate in this survey. My research is attempting to understand the different goals and needs of our ESL and English departments in an effort to help us better support our ESL students. Below, I will ask questions related to your teaching of writing and your experience with second language writers. Please know that your answers will be anonymous, and no effort will be made to identify you or to use this data for any purposes other than my own research. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me individually at aflessert@nvcc.edu or 703-425-5935.

1. What courses are you currently teaching?
2. How long have you been teaching at NOVA specifically?
3. How long have you been teaching your subject to adults (this includes other places of employment)?
4. What is your educational background/degree path (current or former) that led to your current position?
5. What do you think are key qualities to good student writing?
6. Are those key qualities ones you feel that you are able to emphasize in your classroom? Why or why not?
7. If so, how do you emphasize them through your curriculum?
8. Do you feel that the course outcomes listed on the syllabus of the courses you teach align well with your goals for your students and with their needs as writers, here at NOVA and beyond?
9. Where do you think that NOVA students need the most improvement in their writing?
10. If you work with second language writers (SLW), please continue to answer the following sub-questions:
 - a. How do you think ESL students perform in writing classes after they complete their ESL courses?
 - b. What is your impression of the NOVA ESL students' greatest strengths and weaknesses in your writing classroom?
 - c. Do you feel that your educational training (i.e., education at a university) or educational institution (i.e., experiences teaching these courses) has prepared you to work with these strengths and weaknesses? If so, which has prepared you best? Why?
 - d. Do you feel like we have a good working relationship between the ESL/composition department, including ideas for how to best work with second language writers?
 - e. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve these relationships?

Thank you so much for taking the time to respond.

APPENDIX B

FIRST OBSERVATION INTERVIEW

1. Tell me about your academic background. How did you get interested in teaching this subject? What was your training like? How long have you been teaching your subject to adults (including other places of employment)?
2. Tell me more about your professional background.
3. What brought you to NOVA? What was your process for getting hired? Did you feel there was any emphasis on a particular skill or part of your background that made you a good fit for this position? Tell me more about your professional background.
4. Talk about your overall teaching philosophy and how it relates to your own pedagogy – theory or practice? Why? Any examples?
5. What are some of the teaching/pedagogical strategies that you are most drawn to? Did you develop these strategies through practice or through theory? Both?
6. What do you see as the most important learning outcomes for your students? Do these align with course content summaries, or do you feel that they are something not well captured? What do you find to be the most important thing(s) you teach your students?
7. Do the students agree with this assessment, or do they often want something else?
8. Do you feel students struggle in some areas? What are those areas? Do they not struggle in others? What are those? What do you spend the most time teaching? Does that align with what you think is most important?
9. In an ideal world in which you had unlimited resources and no institutional constraints, how would you design the ESL students' experience with learning how to write? What realities at NOVA do you perceive preventing you from achieving these goals?
10. What connections do you see between your discipline and your sister discipline (ESL or composition, whichever the case may be)? Do you feel these two fields of study do a good job of overlapping? Do you feel they overlap well at NOVA? Why or why not?
11. Do you feel students have any struggles that could be addressed by greater connections between these two departments at NOVA?
12. Do you have anything else you'd like to add?

APPENDIX C

SECOND OBSERVATION INTERVIEW

1. Tell me about the observation class – tell me about X, Y, Z (obviously filled in at the time of the interview) activities that you worked on this class meeting.
2. What is the ultimate learning outcome of this lesson, and how does it fit into the broader goals of the course, both yours and the department's?
3. What was your process for lesson planning this class period? Were these new activities, or tried and true ones? Can you talk about how this practice has evolved since you started teaching?
4. What pedagogical theories informed your activities and pedagogy? What classroom experiences in the past informed your activities and pedagogy?
5. During parts where students struggled/were successful, did you find these to be common struggles/successes in your experience, or unusual in any way?
6. How did you scaffold this lesson? What will you review, and what will be further scaffolded from this lesson in the future?
7. What are your broader goals for the course? What do you “wish” for your students as writers when they leave your classroom? For future classes? For the workplace? Is this an interest or concern?
8. Anything else you'd like to add?

VITA

Amy M. Flessert
 Old Dominion University
 Department of English
 5000 Batten Arts & Letters
 Norfolk, VA 23529
 afles001@odu.edu

EDUCATION

Ph.D. in English

Old Dominion University, 2022

Emphases: Rhetoric, Writing and Discourse Studies; Technology and Media Studies

Dissertation: *ESL to Composition Transitions: Investigating the Differences in Disciplinary Values Among Two-Year College Faculty*

Teaching English at the Community College Certification

Marymount University, 2014

M.A. in English

Marymount University, 2014

Thesis: *A Composition Program Internship at NOVA: Learning by Doing*

B.A. in English

University of Minnesota – Twin Cities, 2008

Concentration: Creative writing

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Associate Professor of English, Northern Virginia Community College, 2020-Present

Assistant Professor of English, Northern Virginia Community College, 2017-2020

Instructor of English, Northern Virginia Community College, 2014-2017

Instructor of ESL, California University of Management and Sciences, 2013-2014

SELECT PRESENTATIONS & PUBLICATIONS

CCCC – Portland, Oregon Convention Center, March 2017. Paper Title: Cultivating Habits of Mind in ESL Writing at the Two-Year College.

“Teaching Social Media in a Post-Truth Era.” *Media Commons: A Digital Scholarly Network*.