

The Re-invention of FYC Teacher Development: Listening to Teachers' Concerns Amidst an
Increasingly Globalized University

Norah Fahim

A dissertation

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Washington

2019

Reading Committee:

Sandra Silberstein, Chair

Suhanthie Motha

Priti Sandhu

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:

Department of English

© Copyright 2019
Norah Fahim

University of Washington

Abstract

The Re-invention of FYC Teacher Development: Responding to Teachers' Concerns in an
Increasingly Multilingual University

Norah Fahim

Chair of the Supervisory Committee:

Sandra Silberstein, Professor of English

Department of English

Only in recent years has there been acknowledgment of the anxiety experienced by First Year Composition TAs when their department-based pedagogical professional development does not address the needs of an increasingly diverse student population. This dissertation documents how a University First Year Writing Program (FYWP) responded to moments of professional and pedagogical uncertainty and frustration experienced by Teaching Assistants facing the sudden increase of multilingual students in their writing classes. To address these increasing anxieties the FYWP overhauled its teacher development program, providing resources that normalized the presence of multilingual students and, more specifically, developed and implemented a Statement on Supporting Multilingual Language Learners. This dissertation reports how these shifting student demographics created an incentive for the FYWP to revisit its approach to

professional development and resulted in opportunities for cross-disciplinary collaboration within the department. Through narrative inquiry, this study analyzes two types of narratives that were collected over the course of two academic years: First, the narratives of Writing Program Administrators (WPAs) in order to provide an administrative perspective, second, the narratives of and novice Teaching Assistants (TAs) to investigate the range of perspectives expressed by these TAs on their updated orientation, the newly available departmental policies, and the range of new MLL-based resources.

Table of Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>iv</i>
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Beginning to Think about Teaching	1
1.2 Background	3
1.3 Chapters Overview	7
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	10
2.1 Introduction.....	10
2.2 A Review of Research on The History of First Year Composition	10
2.2.1 The Origins of FYC	11
2.2.2 Controversies Within the Historical Priorities of FYC	12
2.2.3 Current Critical Views of the FYC Requirement	13
2.2.4 Ethical Questions Regarding the Labor Force for Composition Teaching.....	14
2.2.5 Lack of Status for FYC Instructors.....	16
2.2.6 Historical and Continuing Current Biases Towards FYC	18
2.2.7 The Politics of Situating FYC	20
2.2.8 University-Wide Expectations of FYC Courses and Future Directions	21
2.3 A Review of Research and Institutional Shifts in FYC for Multilingual Students	22
2.3.1 On the Internationalization of Higher Education within the USA	22
2.3.2 On Terminology: Why “international” students cannot be a generalizable term.....	23
2.3.3 An Alternative Terminology: Multilingual Learner/Student/Writer/Speaker	25
2.3.4 TESOL and FYC: A History of Collaboration and Separation.....	26
2.3.5 FYC and TESOL: A Disciplinary Division of Labor?	27
2.3.6 Recent Institutional Shifts Towards an Interdisciplinary Approach	29
2.3 A Review of Research on Teacher Identity	32
2.3.1 Overview of Teacher Identity Research.....	33
2.3.2 Shifts in Perceptions of Identity Formation.....	33
2.3.3 Teacher’s Personal and Professional Identities.....	34
2.3.4 Discourses in Identity Formation	35
2.4. Situated-Learning & Communities of Practice	36
2.5 The Research Gap	38
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	39
3.1 Research Questions.....	39
3.2 Qualitative Research Methods:	40
3.2.1 Ethnographic Case Study.....	41
3.2.2 Narrative Inquiry.....	42
3.3 The Research Site and the First Year Composition Course	43
3.3.1 First Year Writing Program (FYWP).....	44
3.3.2 First Year Composition Class (ENGL 101)	46
3.4 Participants	48
3.4.1 Participants Group A: Novice TAs.....	49

3.4.2 Participants Group B: FYWP Administrators.....	50
3.5 Researcher's Positionality.....	51
3.6 Data Collection	54
3.6.1 Audio Recording and Observation of the TA Orientation	55
3.6.2 Field notes.....	56
3.6.3 Audio Recording and Observation of the Composition Pedagogy Course (ENGL 500).....	56
3.6.4 Interviews	56
3.6.5 Document Collection.....	58
3.7 Data Analysis	60
CHAPTER 4:.....	63
<i>WRITING PROGRAM ADMINISTRATORS' PERSPECTIVES IN THE FIRST YEAR</i>	
<i>WRITING PROGRAM</i>	<i>63</i>
4.1 Introduction.....	63
4.1.2 Institutional Context.....	64
4.1.3 Broader Institutional Changes Preceding Local FYWP Changes	65
4.2 Themes Revealed in Interviews with WPAs	68
4.2.1 Listening	68
4.2.2 Supporting and Safety	73
4.2.3 Experimenting.....	75
4.2.4 Normalizing the Needs of Multilingual Students	78
4.3 Pedagogy and Resource-Based Shifts for MLL Support.....	85
4.3.2 Developing the Statement on Supporting Multilingual Learners.....	86
4.3.2 Updating FYWP Textbook to be More Inclusive.....	90
4.4 Developing as Teachers & Researchers.....	91
<i>CHAPTER 5: NOVICE TAS' EXPERIENCES: BEGINNING NERVOUSNESS TO</i>	
<i>EVENTUAL CONFIDENCE AND TRUST</i>	<i>96</i>
2.1 Introduction.....	96
5.2 Beginnings	98
5.2.1 Beginnings: From Nervousness to Confidence	98
5.2.3. Beginnings: From Mutual Trust to a Sense of Support.....	112
5.3 Supporting Novice TAs working with Multilingual Students.....	115
5.3.1 Departmental Rhetoric and Pedagogical Guidelines for Working with MLLs	116
5.3.3. From Concerns to Calm Conclusions.....	128
5.3.4 Conviction that FYWP Policies will Enhance Student Learning.....	130
5.4 Continued TA Reflections	132
5.4.2 Normalizing MLL Students' Needs.....	144
5.4.3 A Consensus on Purpose and Methods.....	154
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS and RECOMMENDATIONS	156
6.1 Summary	156
6.2 Current-Day Political Ramifications	156
6.3 Limitations of the Study	157

6.4 Recent Developments in the FYWP.....	158
6.5 Where Do We Go from Here? Recommendations for FYC professional Development Programs.....	161
REFERENCE LIST.....	164
<i>Inside Higher Education. New International Enrollments Decline Again., 2018, https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/11/13/new-international-student-enrollments-continue-decline-us-universities. Accessed 10 Jan. 2019.</i>	169
<i>U.S. Department of State. Supreme Court Decision on Presidential Proclamation 9645., 2018, https://travel.state.gov/content/travel/en/us-visas/visa-information-resources/presidential-proclamationarchive/june_26_supreme_court_decision_on_presidential_proclamation9645.html. Accessed 27 Jan. 2019.....</i>	175
APPENDIX A: STATEMENT ON SUPPORTING MULTILINGUAL LEARNERS	177
APPENDIX B: FYWP COURSE OUTCOMES.....	180
APPENDIX C: FYWP COURSE OFFERINGS	181
APPENDIX D: SUPPORT RESOURCES FOR MLLS	182

Acknowledgements

There are so many wonderful people whom I would like to thank for their advice and support during the process that led this is final version of my research: mentors, colleagues, family, and friends.

I would like to thank my dissertation committee for their constant support and guidance throughout my research and writing journey. Professor Sandra Silberstein, my committee chair has always greatly encouraged me with my pedagogical, professional, and research goals. Sandy has constantly been a source of confidence to me and welcomed me as family. I'd like to thank Sandy for all the incredibly helpful conversations we had throughout my dissertation writing process and for the ways in which she encouraged me to remain focused on my research contribution. I would also like to thank Professor Suhanthie Motha who was one of my first professors when I enrolled in graduate school; it was her kind and welcoming manner that helped me become even more engaged in my scholarship. Our discussions have prompted me to think about the importance of our pedagogies and the responsibilities we have towards our students and research participants. I would like to thank Professor Priti Sandhu who has provided me with valuable insights into the methods of my research and the discussions within the field, and who encouraged me to find ways to utilize my dissertation findings even further. Professors Silberstein, Motha, and Sandhu have all been such supportive mentors and role models, and to them I am very grateful.

I would like to thank other faculty members who have taken on the role of mentors, despite their ever-increasing responsibilities. I'd like to thank Dr. Elizabeth Simmons-O'Neill who enthusiastically welcomed our discussions on teaching and ways to provide better resources for multilingual students. I'd like to also thank Professor Candice Rai who always made time for our meetings and who offered me helpful and timely advice from very early on. In addition, I'd like to thank Professor Manka Varghese for readily offering advice the moment I sought it and for being supportive of my research. Finally, I'd like to thank Professor Anis Bawarshi for his constant encouragement and optimistic outlook. By example, he

taught me the importance of listening and that often solutions can be found through sincere moments of collaboration between people who care about a common cause.

My colleagues also formed an integral part of my research journey. I'd like to thank Xuan Zhang, Holly Shelton, and Jennifer Eidum who were part of my TESOL cohort and with whom I have the fondest memories of conversations around teaching, research, and life. We continue to share a common and earnest enthusiasm for all the work we do around multilingual student support and advocacy. I'd also like to thank Dan Zhu and Bonnie Vidrine for our collaborations and meaningful pedagogy-based discussions.

I would like to especially thank my research participants for their generosity of time and for the sincere and meaningful conversations we had around teaching.

I could not have reached this point in my academic career without the never-ending support of my family. I would like to thank my dear husband. Thank you, Samer, for all your encouragement, support, and your enthusiasm with my every achievement. Thank you for always being a wonderful father to Laila. I would like to thank my dear daughter Laila. You are my sunshine and without knowing it, through your wonderful presence, you have instilled in me much hope and joy. You bring perspective to everything I do.

I would also like to thank my parents who blessed me with conversations and experiences that drove my curiosity to learn. You have always been supportive of my dreams and helped me find a way towards them. I would like to thank my dear Aunt Azza and Uncle Bahaa for your support and guidance, and for always being available when I sought your advice. My grandparents, who are no longer here, still offered me constant encouragement and form some of my fondest memories. With marriage, I became blessed with an extended family. Thank you Tant Faten, Uncle Mohamed and Tamer for your encouragement and joy upon my completion of this final process.

Finally, I'd like to thank my friends Sarah Badr, Sarah El-Kazaz, and Dina Hafez (and her wonderful family) who through their own dissertation experiences and understanding of my experiences helped me with their generous advice and sense of humor too. I'd also like to thank Mona who keenly followed my progress and provided me with encouragement over the years. I am grateful to God for all the precious family members, mentors, and friends I have been blessed with. You all make this world a better place. I intend through my research and teaching endeavors to keep on giving and learning. We *all* have so much more meaningful work still left to do.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Beginning to Think about Teaching

The concept of teacher education was a relatively new concept to me when I first enrolled in my TESOL Master's Program here in the US at Pacific University. Prior to my enrollment in a master's program, I had been teaching in Cairo at a private four-year university for two years following my graduation with a B.A. in English Language and Translation. At my new institution, I had received what I thought to be a helpful overview of the materials I was expected to teach for an academic writing course, and I had a clear understanding of the assignments that were required of all students. That was mostly the extent of my preparation during my first year of teaching. Later on, we participated in some workshops which touched upon a few pedagogical points. I had little choice with regards to the range of materials and assignments I could develop. Frankly that scenario suited me quite well since I had never taught before. I now realize that had I been asked to devise an entire syllabus as well as a range of course assignments, I would have likely felt inundated and overwhelmed by the task ahead.

For those of us who are now well-seasoned teachers, it does us well to think back to our very first teaching experiences. Many experienced teachers will tell you of the anticipation they still feel when they are about to meet a new group of students. As time progresses, and as experiences turn into eventual teaching successes, we can look forward to meeting a new group of students with each new class we teach. This dissertation takes us back to the first formative period of becoming a teacher, where novice teachers learn how to use the tools of their trade through the act of teaching itself, and as they eventually begin to develop perceptions of themselves as (professional) teachers. Through this study, I trace the professional development experiences and narratives of non-TESOL trained novice Teaching Assistants (TAs) teaching

first-year writing (FYW) during their first-year at an R1 institution in the US, “Pacific University”, which had recently witnessed a sustained increase in international and multilingual student enrollment. While these novice teachers need to learn the ropes of their new profession and balance their own graduate work, they are *also* expected to meet the learning needs of first-year students who come from diverse language backgrounds. Through this study, I offer an insider’s perspective of the institutional planning and the decision-making involved in revamping the professional development training and materials, as recounted by the Writing Program Administrators (WPAs) in a First-Year Writing Program (FYWP). To gain a more nuanced understanding of the impact of these institutionally-based changes, I also offer an insider’s perspective by analyzing narratives of novice TAs who had recently been through this newly re-imagined TA professional development.

It is worth noting that while “Teaching Assistant” is the official title of the novice TAs participating in this study, the newly appointed TAs who teach ENGL 101 (the main composition course), are not TAs in the typical sense. They are the instructor of record of their classes, for which they are entirely responsible within the program goals and structure. TAs are expected to teach towards four main course outcomes (Appendix B), design their course assignments as well as grade all student papers. While TAs are expected to teach towards pre-assigned course outcomes, and are encouraged to use the main FYWP textbook, overall TAs are responsible for developing their own course materials which include lesson plans, in-class worksheets, assignments, as well as providing the main course readings, which could be from the main FYWP textbook but may also be chosen from other sources.

When I was an undergraduate student of English Language and Translation at Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt, I had never enrolled in a First Year Writing (FYW) or a First Year

Composition (FYC) course. At first, I thought this was a situation unique to my educational background, having received my undergraduate education in a country other than the US. However, upon interviewing my main research participants (novice TAs), none of them had received a FYC course such as that offered by Pacific University when they were undergraduates themselves. In many ways the TAs were, myself included, learning FYC and its foundations along with their students for the first time. This feeling of additional unpreparedness when teaching FYC is exemplified by Estrem and Reid's (2012) study on FYC teacher learning, whereby new TAs "are often simultaneously new to graduate study, new to teaching, and new to the concept of composition studies as a field" (p. 449). They also have multiple demands placed on them; Reid (2013, p. 198) appropriately reminds us that "TAs may feel pulled away from pedagogical learning [on FYC] by coursework from their chosen field or by daily demands from their new students" and that novice TAs also need to manage their time into order to meet their commitments for required pedagogical workshops. Moreover, whether TAs are expected to "rush" into their new classroom, or whether departments guide novice TAs through "more abstract learning without a classroom to practice in" (Reid, 2013, p. 198), TAs are still faced with an unfamiliar task when they first start teaching. In addition, while novice TAs encounter an array of new challenges to work through and pedagogical learnings to undertake, they are also now working with an increasingly diverse student population, one which requires a certain level of dexterity and experience for meeting the range of students' learning needs.

1.2 Background

In light of the updated Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) Statement on Preparing Teachers of College Writing (NCTE.org), there is an ever pressing call for action to provide graduate TAs with multiple professional development opportunities to aid

student learning and success, specifically when “working with diverse populations such as non-native speakers of English (L2 writers), students with special learning needs, non-traditional students, and at-risk student populations.” The data collected for this research, during the 2013-15 academic years, represent a moment of steep increase in international student enrollment. Pacific University (PU), like numerous academic institutions across the US, has witnessed a precipitous increase in international student enrollment, amounting to 7,832 international students (including graduate students) most recently in the 2018-2019 academic year. This figure presents a 66.7% increase from the 2011-2012 academic year (Pacific University International Student Statistics). Notably, these figures do not encompass the numbers of local multilingual students since PU has no formal means of obtaining figures on students’ linguistic backgrounds and home-language use.

While the increase in international and domestic multilingual student enrollment in US academic institutions is now familiar to many compositionists and second language writing scholar-teachers, one question that unites our responsibilities is: how can FYC programs, specifically those working with novice TAs specializing in various subfields in English Studies, provide more relevant professional development to help address the needs of an increasingly multilingual student population in mainstream composition courses? Given recent changes in student demographics, this question is especially pertinent when FYC TAs (like many writing instructors) are encountering a considerable demand on their time, and a heightened sense of uncertainty regarding the extent of their professional responsibilities when giving written feedback and meeting with students during office hours, especially when they have limited experience working with L2 students in general.

This study investigates programmatic changes taken by Pacific University's FYWP as a response to heightened sentiments of professional uncertainty expressed by TAs working with an increasingly multilingual student population. Through this study's use of narrative inquiry, I offer an insider's perspective on the institutional decisions of WPAs, as well as novice TAs' perspectives of these changes as they embarked on their first year of teaching. The data involved in this dissertation is twofold; first the interview data relates to realizations about the gaps in professional development as expressed by WPAs after working with a previous cohort of novice FYC TAs and specifically learning about TAs' pedagogical and professional concerns when working with an increasingly multilingual student population. Second, this profile presents more recent interview data from novice TAs who participated in the newly revamped TA orientation, where new changes were introduced in the academic year of 2013-2014.

For further context, most research within composition studies to date has focused on students' perspectives on teacher's written feedback, as well as researchers' judgments on best pedagogical practices for working with diverse classroom populations; rarely are teachers themselves consulted on their experiences (as noted by Ferris et al. 2011; Ruecker et al. 2014). The globalization of higher education presents both opportunities and challenges for US universities. As program administrators update classroom practices to align with composition research, writing programs need to incorporate local practices and the work experiences of writing instructors into programmatic changes (LaFrance & Nicolas, 2012; Tardy, 2011). Tardy (2011) and Ferris et al. (2011) have worked at investigating FYC teachers' experiences when working with diverse student populations through survey-based data, and they highlight the necessity for a more extensive understanding of FYC teachers' experiences.

Historically, the needs of multilingual students have been relegated to remedial courses, Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) programs, or exclusively to second language writing (SLW) classes. However, the recent increase of international and domestic multilingual students throughout the US has led to a new urgency to address the needs of multilingual writers throughout the writing curriculum. With the changing classroom demographics of FYC classes, there is a need to "develop a full appreciation for insights related to language differences and to incorporate these insights into scholarships and pedagogy" (Matsuda, 2014, p. 483). There is a noted lack of ethnographic research that can clarify the potential for cross-disciplinary work within and across the fields of SLW and Composition. Furthermore, the disjunction between these two fields as noted by Atkinson and Ramanathan (1995) has indicated the falsity of what Matsuda (1999) calls the "disciplinary labor division" of second language writing and FYC. Ferris (2009) also highlights this flawed perception of many composition teachers who see SLW issues as separate from the needs of the majority of their students. Ferris (2009) states that mainstream [or local] students can also benefit from the teaching practices originating from the field of SLW and that teacher training programs for FYC instructors need to incorporate such practices in their teacher training. Central to my research is the context of a First Year Writing Program (FYWP) at an R1 University, Pacific University, that perceives international and multilingual students as part of a resourceful multicultural student body. This FYWP has re-envisioned its teacher training by incorporating methods from SLW to meet the developing needs of TAs, many of them novice, and their increasingly diverse student population. This dissertation, through narrative inquiry, aims to address a gap in ethnographic research by better understanding the experiences of novice TAs and provides them a voice as they navigate their first year of teaching. These voices help us gain an insider's

perspective on the needs of novice teachers, the extent to which they are (or are not) influenced by programmatic changes in their pedagogy and uptake pedagogical practices, and their perceptions of professionalism during their first year of teaching. Moreover, this research, also through narrative inquiry, helps us develop a deeper understanding of the programmatic changes proposed by Writing Program Administrators (WPAs) in order to provide a broader image of the institutional and socio-political context (and communities of practices) in which novice TAs first start learning to teach amidst a changing student demographic.

1.3 Chapters Overview

This dissertation contains six chapters. The introduction, Chapter 1, provides readers with an overview of the study, as well as the purpose that drives my research given the current gap in ethnographic research that looks into the experiences of novice TAs working with an increasingly multilingual student population. Chapter 2 is written in the form of a literature review where I first present the history of FYC and the specific historical instances that led to the institutionalization of the FYC writing course within the US. I then offer background information on the intersection of FYC scholarship with research on SLW as more multilingual students enroll in FYC courses. I identify some of the scholarly arguments that call for a better integration of the disciplinary fields of FYC and SLW. In the review of the literature, I also present some theoretical frameworks which guide parts of this study which include Lave and Wenger's (1991) Community of Practice (CoP) as well as Situated Learning (1991); CoP can help with understanding the broader context of the first-year writing program that is the focus of this study. The third chapter in this dissertation provides an overview of the methods used for inquiry, the research setting (that of a first-year writing program), the participant selection process, the

research questions that guided this research, as well as my methods of data analysis while employing narrative inquiry.

Chapters 4 and 5 showcase the perspectives of Writing Program Administrators (WPAs) and novice TAs, respectively. Both these perspectives, obtained through narrative inquiry, provide us with a more nuanced understanding of the community of practice of a teacher development program that has been witnessing a recent increase in multilingual student enrollment and has undergone programmatic changes to address the needs of students as well as novice TAs. These two chapters help address the following research questions (among others): *What connections (and uptake) do TAs make between the resources and materials provided by the FYWP and their sense of professional development? And how do TAs position themselves in relation to the suggested FYWP policies that pertain to working with multilingual learners?* Chapter 4 offers the perspectives of WPAs who were involved with the revamping of the TA professional development program. Chapter 4 also provides contextual information on the concerns of previous cohorts of TAs who found that their teaching pedagogies were no longer effective given the shifts in student demographics. Additionally, Chapter 4 also introduces the “Statement on Supporting Multilingual Language Learners” which was developed by the FYWP to better guide TAs in their teaching practices. This Statement aims to “help empower students—multilingual learners and native [English] speakers alike—to become self-editors of their own work and to research their grammar errors as a means to learn through self-correction.” The findings presented in Chapter 5 help inform our understanding of novice teachers’ professional needs, their approach towards adopting department-based pedagogies when working with MLLs, and their overall sense of professional development and competence as they gained more experience with teaching. Chapter 5, which exclusively investigates novice TAs’ narratives, first examines

the initial and general experiences of teaching and a sense of preparedness and then transitions into documenting the participants' experiences when working with multilingual students.

Finally, Chapter 6 offers a conclusion of this study, as well as future implications and recommendations for other FYWPs aiming to re-examine and update their professional development programs within the contexts of two- or four-year institutions that are working with an increasingly diverse student population. Chapter 6 offers recommendations and presents the implications of such programmatic changes in professional development and how these changes can also benefit all students, whether they be multilingual or mainstream/local students.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This literature review aims to first provide historical context regarding the teaching of First Year Composition (FYC), which is the main writing course many novice Teaching Assistants (TAs) teach in their first year of graduate school. This first component of the literature review discusses the somewhat polemical historical reasons for requiring students to enroll in FYC courses back in the late 1800s, followed by an overview of the more recent perceptions towards composition studies. The second component of this chapter discusses more recent literature which examines FYC courses that are specifically designed for multilingual learners (MLLs); in addition, this second component highlights the increased attention shown by professionals from the fields of Composition and TESOL regarding the importance of bridging the disciplinary divides between both these disciplines to the benefit of students as well as their instructors. Finally, the third component of this chapter reviews relevant research on teachers' identity construction and explores the variables that influence teachers' identity construction; these variables can help shed light on the broader institutional contexts, or communities of practice, when learning to teach FYC and can also help clarify the socio-political contexts in which teachers find themselves.

2.2 A Review of Research on The History of First Year Composition

First-Year Writing (FYW) or First-Year Composition (FYC) frequently referred to as Freshman Composition, is a general writing course that is typically designed to serve the writing needs of most academic disciplines in order to help students in their college writing, as well as their future professional writing. Robert Connors (1997), in his often-referenced overview

Composition-Rhetoric: Backgrounds, Theory, and Pedagogy, argues that composition has typically been “shaped by perceived social and cultural needs” (p. 112). In terms of locating FYC, Crowley believes that composition, as a universally required course for all students, is designed with the intent to socialize students into the academic expectations and ways of academia (Crowley, 1998, as cited in Ritter 2009, p. 15). Douglas Hesse, a past president-elect of the National Council of Teachers of English, rightly points out that “first-year writing is not a monolithic thing across the country” since different departments across different institutions have notable variances in their curricula as well as “the conditions in which those programs exist” (as cited in Straumsheim, 2015). Given these differences across different programs, it is understandable there may be limited consensus on the best approach towards the professional development that is offered to the vast numbers of TAs teaching FYC across the US.

2.2.1 The Origins of FYC

There has been some debate among historians as to the exact start of composition studies (Ritter & Matsuda, 2012). Perhaps the most agreed upon origin of FYC dates back to the late 19th century at Harvard University (see Crowley 1998; Downs 2013). For historical context, until around 1850, colleges within the USA traditionally adopted a British approach to higher education, one in which medicine, law, and divinity were taught to men from the upper classes. As different disciplines progressed (such as botany, astronomy, or chemistry) there arose an increase in research aiming to help new industries. Doug Downs (2013) helps provide some context on the history of composition explaining that higher education was undergoing a transformation in which traditional classical training was being eventually replaced by knowledge that was more focused on research and which spread across different disciplines. This obvious shift in direction led to a diversification in the first-year student population and

eventually altered what had once been the monoculture that was then typical of college curricula. This shift in disciplines led to “the transformation of higher education from upper class training in classical knowledge to research-based knowledge across a range of disciplines [which] drew a wider range of students...also-challenged the monoculture upon which college curricula had been based” (Downs, 2013, p. 52). A composition student was also with some “sentimentality” thought of as “a young beginner” (Miller, 1991, p. 87). As such there was then a need to “scrub” this new student population that was increasingly from the lower economic classes, and so FYC came to be seen as a means to address the lack of appropriate academic knowledge by this new student population. Students required to take this entrance exam were very much perceived as deficient and were expected to be fixed in order to be more suited for these academic contexts. In a more current day perception of FYC, Brereton argues that composition courses should not be seen as merely a component of students’ college curricula, but as a tool that helps provide them with “practical efficiency” and as a means that helps them find “the power and skill to communicate properly what is known and thought” (1995, p. 134). This more recent view however portrays a more ideal stance towards the overarching purposes of FYC courses when they were first envisioned in the late 1800s.

2.2.2 Controversies Within the Historical Priorities of FYC

John C. Brereton (1995) reminds us that as a result of Harvard’s initiation of this new composition program, other institutions across the nation endeavored to create similar programs, albeit with fewer resources. In the early 1900s, the MLA published reports from surveys they conducted, and the results indicated that while colleges did indeed want to “improve the intellectual quality of the college curriculum” (p. 132), there was an obvious disagreement among institutions on how best to design composition courses to meet their institution’s

intellectual expectations. The elements stressed by the original Harvard entrance exam highlighted “grammar, punctuation, diction and organization ("expression"), and spelling” (Downs, p. 53, 2013). Connors (1997) argues that such a focus on grammar in particular sheds light on the “cultural baggage” that has “always revolved around the relationship between class and "good grammar" (p. 113). As such, the First Year Writing or First Year Composition course later became known as the “gatekeeper” course that would control entry to the academic community of the university based on these writing requirements (Ritter & Matsuda, 2012). Students who could not abide by these strict writing guidelines were perceived “in need not of learning but of fixing” (Downs, 2013, p. 53). It may not surprise some writing instructors and scholars that to this day some college-based institutions and departments within the USA [and internationally too] still utilize such elements of writing to keep out students whom they deem unprepared to engage with the academic community. It’s worth noting, however, that the historical rationale for offering FYC was seemingly not based on blind prejudice, but on the intent of academic institutions to better prepare their college students for rigorous writing tasks necessary for their success.

2.2.3 Current Critical Views of the FYC Requirement

Downs (2013) presents the view that FYC is “a course [designed] to ensure that college graduates have the basic writing skills that employers seek, because so many students just can't write" (p. 50). Susan Miller however, in her influential book, *Textual Carnivals* (1991), contests this need for requiring FYC courses by describing them as an opportunity to “repress and commonly assimilate the majority of American writers who obtain credentials in higher education, indoctrinating them into openly middle-class values of propriety, politeness, and cooperation” (pp. 6-7). Miller also conveys that *composition* is often viewed as being

“elementary” whereby it is also referred to as “work” that relates exclusively to “freshmen” students and does not present itself as an ongoing trajectory towards the study of writing (p. 53). The teaching of composition does not hold the same high regard as the “rest of institutionalized English studies,” and it is rarely taught at the upper levels throughout one’s college education, as was the case with rhetoric (in the previous century).

Another concern of Miller (1991) is that some administrators within FYC programs allow for the exemption of certain students from the requirements of enrolling in their FYC program. What is problematic here is that such exemptions allow composition to be defined as “a particular kind of universal test, a task to be got out of the way” (Miller, 1991, p. 86). Gilles (2002) points out an uncomfortable truth that, while FYC has typically been housed in English departments, “it has not been the most welcome of lodgers” (p. 2). Perhaps an explanation of this view of composition courses as mediocre stems from the historical view that it was never meant to be a permanent course; it was a mere placeholder until the secondary schooling system managed to properly teach students the expectations of academic writing (Connors, 1995, as cited in Gilles 2002).

2.2.4 Ethical Questions Regarding the Labor Force for Composition Teaching

Composition studies as a field arguably gained its prominence in the 1970s (see Ritter & Matsuda, 2012), as more course sections were offered and required of incoming students. That raised some ethical concerns, however, especially with regards to the source of the labor force for teaching all these sections. Today, this labor is provided by Teaching Assistants and often untenured faculty with fewer benefits than long-term tenured faculty at many US-based academic institutions. Miller (1991) aptly explains that regardless of what the original intent of FYC is, it remains true that “it is a major national industry when measured monetarily” (p. 5).

This is certainly a “labor-intensive” mission when offering a FYC course which now has four-to-five million instructors and students each year (Miller, 1991). Crawley (1998) counts at least 160,000 sections of FYC a year are offered (which amounts to close to 4 million students) even if some students are allowed to bypass FYC by taking AP English in high school. No specific updated figures exist to indicate the current number of FYC enrollments. However, the most recent National Census of Writing which was launched in 2013 (writingcensus.swarthmore.edu) obtained responses from 900 colleges, both two year and four-year institutions, who offer FYC, and this number does not represent the entire number of colleges offering the course within the USA alone.

David Bartholomae, renowned for his work in composition studies, (1996) has some cautions regarding the work-ethics involved in hiring practices for FYC classes in numerous institutions across the US. He asserts that his views come as a result of his visiting and evaluating FYC departments nation-wide (and of course one cannot generalize). However, Bartholomae refers back to Godzich (1994, as cited in Bartholomae, 1996, p. 19) saying that the field of composition profited “when university resources were reallocated in the 1980s, getting funds and faculty lines at the expense of literature and theory.” This view, however, makes the field of composition, with its pedagogical merits, of lesser value than other specializations within the fields of English. There is a continuation of this view which provides a description of the impact of this increase of funding for FYC: more money is provided to help secure funding for graduate students (or non-tenured lecturers), at the expense of allowing for fewer full-time and tenured faculty. This expansion of composition programs has at the same time led to increased graduate programs, specifically in the fields of literature and theory. The status quo has become that faculty now typically teach graduate students, whereas the majority of undergraduates and

general education courses are taught by graduate students, (Bartholomae, 1996), whose teaching assistantship in return are heavily funded through their teaching of FYC. The focus of this dissertation is on the professional development experiences of novice TAs, who similar to the TAs mentioned by Bartholomae, form the bulk of the teaching force of FYC.

In essence, the field of composition creates a cycle of funding and hiring that can eventually lead to its professional demise, since there is less weight given to its relevance within (traditional) English Departments. The dilemma here lies in the fact that many graduate students would have not been able to pursue their graduate studies had it not been for their teaching assistantship, which required of them the time-consuming task of teaching FYC courses. And yet, it is because of the abundance of graduate or non-tenured FYC teachers, that there are few full-time positions available upon graduation, and thus once again the status of composition courses is simply perceived within the realm of general or introductory studies, without the seriousness provided to other specializations in English departments.

2.2.5 Lack of Status for FYC Instructors

Perhaps the first, most critical and noteworthy view on the status of FYC lies in the perspectives of Kitzhaber, a prominent scholar of composition and teacher. Before David Bartholomae's views as outlined earlier, Kitzhaber (1990) declared that the vast majority of writing instructors were now graduate and junior instructors who required smaller salaries than full time faculty, a situation which pleased administrators and senior professors who did not have the time to teach these ever-increasing writing sections. Moreover, the situation seemed to be convenient for graduate students themselves, as they were in need of work to provide a source of income to fund their studies. Kitzhaber goes on to say, "some of these teachers are enthusiastic, experienced, expert; more are bored or resentful, lack previous teaching experience, are ill-

informed on what they are supposed to teach . . . and are teaching with little supervision or guidance" (Kitzhaber, p.14, 1990). Composition instructors are often met with another harsh reality, that usually teaching composition is met with little status, similar to the "lack of status that the freshman course has long suffered from" (Kitzhaber, 14, 1990).

Connors (1997) also offers a cynical, yet realistic, view of the current status of instructors now teaching FYC. Whereas scholars of rhetoric prior to the 1900s were very much revered and sought for their knowledge that was part of the historical rhetorical tradition, current teachers of rhetoric increasingly have lost their status and seniority and typically serve as instructors or as graduate students with a "less than permanent status" (Connors 1997; Gilles, 2002, p.2). Connors (1997) describes this current demise of teachers of rhetoric by describing them as "increasingly marginalized, overworked, and ill-paid" (p. 172); part of Connor's assessment of this clear shift is that writing instructors or teachers of rhetoric are no longer required to hark back to thousands of years of rhetorical tradition, but to engage with pedagogical theories (or modern composition-rhetoric) that is less than a century old. While this latter view may seem to some extreme- that the teaching of recent pedagogical theories may be a waste of time- it does remain true that the teaching of composition is very much seen as a labor-intensive task with dwindling levels of academic respect. Connors (1997) clarifies that this vast shift in how rhetoric was once esteemed was as a result of the influence of the German university system; many American scholars studying in Germany, then the beacon of academic ideal in the early 1900s, brought back this academic tradition of rigorous research yielding scientific results. Connors (1997) explains the following revealing point showcasing the shift in views towards the teaching of rhetoric:

To the increasingly powerful acolytes of the German system, however, rhetoric was at best a suspect and unscientific study, one seemingly unredeemable by research, and at

worst simply unscholarly drudge work. It could not be buried, and it would not go away, but neither could it be saved as "real scholarship." And so "rhetoric" existed in universities between 1860 and 1900 as a curious relic of another time, stranger every year to the empirical and skeptical community of scholars that universities were increasingly breeding, an inexplicable survival: the vermiform appendix of the university structure. (p.180)

Connors (1998) attributes this eventual loss of status due to the then newly-founded German-based academic system that preferences literary history and philology, while devaluing composition to a “remedial status, and lowered (and “feminized”) composition to the status of an ordeal of apprenticeship” (Russell, 2006, p. 258). Donna Strickland, in her work on critical genealogies of *composition studies*, also reminds us of the historical reasoning behind the feminized status of composition studies, where for centuries “women teachers have been associated with routine work, an association that continued to be played out as women began to teach required writing in colleges” (Strickland, 2011, p. 41). It now remains true that the field of composition studies still continues to lack status as it has become even more entrenched as a labor-intensive field.

2.2.6 Historical and Continuing Current Biases Towards FYC

Brereton (1993) conveys that as Harvard’s FYC courses gained prominence and spread to other institutions (1890s onwards), there had always been some opposition from professors of literature who at the time preferred to focus their teaching on literary genres or their own academic research as opposed to focusing courses on *themes* (as proposed by FYC) which was heavily time consuming. Not only that, rejection of FYC courses stemmed from a concern that teaching purely composition meant not having a core “academic subject matter” (p. 236) and

thus not worth all the effort and time spent on correcting students' theme-related work. As a response to such concerns, English composition courses with a more *literature* basis were then seen as more appropriate academic endeavors by professors. The first type of such a course was offered at Yale University in 1870 (Brereton, 1995).

The common perception has been that FYC courses are sub collegiate, and their practical "how-to" nature takes away from their intellectual rigor; typically, "the best minds in the profession have rarely concerned themselves [with it]" (Miller, 1991, p.11). Miller continues to describe how composition is perceived by referring to its lower status in the "wholly symbiotic system" in the field of English (p. 53). Thus, it would seem that the lack of status of Composition Studies worked to the benefit of literary studies. Gerald Graff, noted for his research on the (problematic) conventions of academic writing, comments that without composition studies "the teaching of literature could never have achieved its central status" (Graff, 1987, p. 2). Connors (1997) points out that because most English Departments opt to assign composition courses to lecturers (or graduate students), courses grounded more in literature are taught by professors. To put it bluntly, Connors hypothesizes that departmental administrators "know their faculties would rebel if asked to teach writing, because literature is less work. Because it is not required, attracts upper-class students, and has infinitely variable content, it is often more enjoyable to teach" (1997, p. 209). This stance cannot be assumed to apply to all English Departments across the US; however, Miller (1993) cites similar views on the division of labor between the fields of Literature and Composition explaining that it would seem that for some time now, when literature and composition are juxtaposed, the former is seen as "high" or "advanced", whereas the latter is seen as "low" or "elementary" (Miller, 1993, p. 53). It is within this often-negative ideological context that the FYWP at PU, the focus of this study, is committed to providing

extensive professional development in its TA orientation and required ENGL 500 Pedagogy course.

2.2.7 The Politics of Situating FYC

The 2013 National Census of Writing (writingcensus.swarthmore.edu) which represents the responses of 900 colleges, indicates that First Year Writing Programs (FYW) usually exist within the English Department, which represented 71% of the institutions surveyed in the National Census on Writing. Other colleges had separate departments (independent of the English Department, for example) that held the responsibility of running the FYW or FYC program. The University of Central Florida's First-year Writing Program housed in the Writing and Rhetoric Department serves as one example. Another example is Stanford University's Program in Writing and Rhetoric which is an independent program outside a typical department-based structure. Other institutions who similarly have their own unique writing programs include DePaul University, Duke University, University of San Francisco, and the University of Toronto to name but a few (wpacouncil.org).

Sharon Crowley (1998), similar to Miller's view earlier, points towards a natural progression of a struggle for existence whereby several composition departments have recently split from English Departments. The issue, Crowley explains, is that it is quite unfeasible to create this so-called universal classroom without having a link to a specific discipline, and as such students (and their teachers) find it hard to find writing situations that are uniquely engaging and relevant to a specific interest (Crowley, 1998). Perhaps some courses, such as service-learning FYC courses have begun to provide this much needed incentive for students to write materials that are of tangible significance in the real world, and not merely created for the purpose of generic writing evaluation. More broadly, when compared to the different fields,

composition holds the “bottom” status in the hierarchy, whereas the natural sciences hold the “top” position (Crowley, 1998, p. 222).

2.2.8 University-Wide Expectations of FYC Courses and Future Directions

Many composition scholars hold the more pragmatic view that composition courses should first, and foremost help students write effectively as opposed to achieving an unattainable perfect standard. Nevertheless, it is common for faculty from other departments to typically point towards “good grammar” as being their expectation of good writing (Gilles, 2002). It may also be perceived that students should take FYC classes so that students eventually write texts “that will make the onerous task of grading a little easier- that (FYC instructors) will help students how to write clear, brief, extensive prose” (Harris, 2012, p. 63). Yet upon further investigation, Gilles (2002) realized that “grammar” is often a misnomer for writing that is “thoughtful, purposeful and richly developed” (2002, p. 4). Gilles asserts, arguably correctly, that FYC programs need to advocate for their philosophy of providing students with opportunities to “*practice* (emphasis added) the craft of writing” (2002, p. 5), and that the goals of FYC programs are not grammatical, but ones that prepare students to learn how to use effective tools and strategies to help them develop their writing throughout their academic career and beyond. For the field to be taken more seriously, more advanced composition courses need to be made readily available to all English majors (Gilles, 2002). This former perspective, that FYC can help students beyond their academic career, is one that is readily advocated by the FYWP that is the focus of this research. Gilles maintains a realistic stance explaining that FYC programs surely need to move beyond other departments’ expectations of being solely responsible for the fixing of students’ writing, but to offer something more valuable that goes beyond students’ four to five years in college. This latter view is representative of the Writing Program Administration’s

(WPA's) recently updated Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition, whereby the statement specifies that "the process of learning to write in any medium is complex: it is both individual and social and demands continued practice and informed guidance" (WPA Outcomes, 2014, p.1). It cannot be ever considered a one-size-fits all approach to teaching or writing.

2.3 A Review of Research and Institutional Shifts in FYC for Multilingual Students

It is important for composition studies, regardless of specialization, to reexamine how and to what extent the monolingual assumption pervades the field and its intellectual practices, and to consider ways of moving beyond these unexamined assumptions.

(Matsuda, 2012, p. 49)

Paul K. Matsuda's call to action here highlights how composition programs in academic institutions in the USA mostly operate with the assumption that monolingualism, or being a native speaker of English, is often perceived as the norm. While often there is a celebration of student diversity at many institutions, this type of celebration tends to focus on issues of race, gender, and class. There is little mention of *linguistic* diversity, and if any, it is represented as part of the global brand of a university. To better grasp Matsuda's critique, it is first necessary to offer an overview of the increasing internationalization of higher education. This internationalization of higher education within the US forms a key point of focus of this study as I examine the impact of the increase in international/multilingual students on the FYWP's TA professional development program at Pacific University.

2.3.1 On the Internationalization of Higher Education within the USA

Nationwide, the internationalization of higher education presents both opportunities and challenges for U.S. universities. At the time of this study, the Institute of International Education

produced an “Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange” in 2015 and disclosed that international student enrollment at U.S. based higher education institutions had peaked at a national high of 974,926 students during the 2014-2015 academic year (Open Doors 2015 Report, 2015). These figures reveal the highest increase in international student enrollment in 35 years. It is worth noting that these figures do *not* represent the local multilingual student population, and thus the number of students who identify English as their second language may well be above the figures indicated on official University records.

2.3.2 On Terminology: Why “international” students cannot be a generalizable term

First, it is worth discussing the broad range of terms available to describe multilingual students and the restrictions of such labels. The term *international students*, while applicable to students easily identified by visa records, may not be suitable to all students, since students enrolling in FYC classes may include domestic students whose L1 is not English, and are more commonly referred to as Generation 1.5; these are students who were educated in the U.S. and are the children of first-generation immigrants (Harklau et al., 1999, as cited in Ferris & Hedgecock 2013). Ferris & Hedgecock (2013) note that while there is some debate over the exact time frame in which Generation 1.5 students arrive in the U.S., for example at age 5 versus 15, a better distinction lies in the “psychological and educational experiences [rather] than a strictly demographic one” (2013, p. 36). Such students have life experiences that go beyond simply one country, culture or language, and cultural experiences and accordingly may have a sense of being in-between different countries, cultures, or languages (Roberge 2009, as cited in Ferris & Hedgecock 2013).

Moreover, to complicate the label, international students can come from countries where their L1 is English, and thereby would not likely need any additional resources when enrolling in

FYC classes. Examples of such countries may include the U.K., India, New Zealand, Australia etc. Another concern is that the term *international student* contributes to the elitist field of international (intercultural) education that tends to isolate itself from issues of race or ethnicity (Noronha, 1992, as cited in Spack, 1997). The understanding here being that academic institutions tend to celebrate the “global” image their university brings, rather than focusing on the linguistic and ethnic diversity represented by international and/or local multilingual students.

To further complicate the problematic nature of labels, the term non-native English speaking student (NNESS) is no longer the appropriate word choice, since it implies that nativeness is the norm, against which language acquisition is compared (Canagarajah, 1999; Pennycook, 1994). The term *English language learner* (ELL) or *English as a second language* (ESL) student may seem at first glance like a good fit for my research purposes, especially since these terms are readily used and accepted in the field. However, once again, these two terms indicate that L1 English speakers are the standard by which these other students must be compared (Spack, 1997). Also, for institutions, these terms signify more of a deficit model, where students are always in need of extra support and pose a challenge to teachers and must be marked in some way.

In a chapter entitled “Discourses of Internationalization and Diversity in US Universities and Writing Programs,” Christine Tardy proposes a different terminology: that of “transnational” students, where she defines this term as students “who hold close ties to two or more countries. These students may include immigrants or children of immigrants, refugees, and expatriates, and their numbers are largely unaccounted for because they are domestic students” (2014, p. 244). While student visa figures help institutions identify how many international students are enrolled in their programs, the same measure cannot be used to quantify the number of domestic students

at a specific university. This encompassing definition of “transnational,” as provided by Tardy, helps instructors realize that it is rather impossible now to place students within a specified definition. Students move beyond labels and shift and transfer into self-selected labels which very often are in a state of flux and transition.

2.3.3 An Alternative Terminology: Multilingual Learner/Student/Writer/Speaker

A new term now comes to the forefront: that of the *multilingual student*. The term *multilingual learner* (MLL) has notably recently taken on a more positive connotation and has gained prominence in recent research (see Tardy, 2011; Ferris et. al., 2011; Matsuda et al., 2013). This more positive shift in terminology stems more from the field of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages and has slowly made its way into Composition Studies. *Multilingual* indicates that the student uses multiple languages and does not indicate that their language use in one language is more proficient than the other. According to Matsuda et al. (2013), *multilingual* students also comprise international students studying in the USA holding a student visa, as well as domestic students whose first language is not English. The term also holds positive associations with multiculturalism and how these learners come into the classroom with resources. A key premise of the MLL framework is that it highlights the diversity of linguistic practices and experiences of the learner rather than the levels of language proficiency. The FYWP which is the institutional context of this dissertation also views multilingual students from a similar positive perspective. MLL scholarship and pedagogy recognizes that these multilingual learners come into the classroom with rich linguistic and cultural resources. There are also instances of local multilingual students who are enrolled in FYC programs and who would rather not disclose their multilingual or “ESL” status after years of trying to avoid such labels in the American school system. As Jay Jordan, multilingual writing and rhetoric scholar,

has remarked in relation to this same issue on a national scale, “this statistical uncertainty translates into a practical uncertainty about who our multilingual students are, where they are, and how they may best be educated in US contexts” (2012, p. 4). An important caveat is to remember that the term *multilingual learner* also includes students who are equally competent in two languages, one of which may be English. These students do not typically need any extra resources to meet their language needs in a composition class. It is therefore difficult to come up with an appropriate term than can encompass the newly increasing student population. However, the term *multilingual learner* or *MLL* will be used as the most appropriate label for this specific, yet also wide ranging, student population for the purposes of this research.

2.3.4 TESOL and FYC: A History of Collaboration and Separation

An overview of the history of collaboration (or rather lack of) between the fields of TESOL and FYC proves enlightening. Matsuda (2006) explains that it was only in the mid-1940s that the increase of international students studying in the USA became apparent to composition instructors and faculty working with first-year students. During that time, the Institute of International Education estimated the total number of international students to have reached 29,813 which was a sudden increase from the previous 6,570 International students. Whereas prior to the 1940s the number of international students had gone relatively unnoticed, WPAs and composition teachers then began to create specially designed sections for freshman English composition for ESL students. The majority of these sections held the same accreditation status as regular English composition sections - though this was not necessarily the case in all institutions (Matsuda, 2006). Notably here, MLL students were placed in separate composition sections from the rest of their peers.

The increase in the international student demographic, as well as the changes initiated by English departments may give the impression that a collaboration of sorts would have occurred between the fields of composition and ESL writing. However, Matsuda (2006) notes that eventually concerns related to “L2 writing began to shift gradually from composition studies to second-language studies” (p. 23) which began gaining prominence as a professionalized field. There was now an increasing view that L2 students should be taught exclusively by trained specialists. Matsuda (2006) discloses that previously in the 1950s, there was a noticeable increase in sessions related to ESL at the main composition convention, the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC). Yet many fewer MLL-related sessions were apparent by 1966 which happened to coincide with the creation of the Teachers of English to Speakers of other Languages (TESOL) convention in 1964. Ironically, it is this specialization of the field of second language writing (SLW) and the increasing prominence of SLW specialists that led to a clear disciplinary isolation between the fields of SLW and composition. Any issues related to L2 learners began to be systematically transferred onto L2 writing specialists. It is unfortunate that while both the fields of TESOL and composition studies were serving the same student population, there seemed to be little form of collaboration between these two fields.

2.3.5 FYC and TESOL: A Disciplinary Division of Labor?

In more recent history, Matsuda (1999) rightly points out, that there has long been a “disciplinary division of labor” between the fields of composition studies and that of SLW, which causes the false assumption that students can be neatly categorized into first and second language users. Moreover, it is also falsely believed that second language learners, or as used frequently in this study MLLs, can become the sole concern of ESL experts (Matsuda, 1999, p. 699). Another key issue that merits reexamination is that given the changes in student

demographics, scholars of composition should be called upon to reconsider any monolingual assumptions: that being a native speaker in English is seen as the norm (Matsuda, 2006) when this is no longer the case. Matsuda (2012) even encourages composition instructors to move beyond the traditional framework of working with international students to solely help them learn traditional forms of English writing as used in North America (2012), but to bring into the classroom, for all students, different varieties of English usage.

In order for the field of composition to appropriately internationalize itself “effectively and ethically,” composition experts “need to learn more about the sociolinguistic and institutional contexts of other countries,” and a more pressing goal lies ahead in having U.S. based institutions “come to terms with the issues of globalization and multilingualism” within their own local institutions (Matsuda, 2012, p. 51). These goals may be seen as rather lofty and perhaps impractical by some professionals; nevertheless, there remains merit in the belief that composition instructors realize that FYC sections, given current U.S. undergraduate student demographics, will likely have a number of students who consider English to be their second language, or who are bilingual or even trilingual with English as one of their languages.

Ferris (2009) points towards this sense of polarity between the fields of TESOL and FYC as also referred to by Matsuda (1999, 1998). According to Ferris (2009), it is uncommon for L2 professionals to specialize in writing (though some L2 professionals may contest this claim), and it is also rather unusual for composition teachers to have specialized training for working with multilingual students. This study, however, examines a FYC program that aimed to introduce SLW-based research into TAs’ main pedagogy course and professional development orientation. It is worth noting that Ferris’s views were published in 2009; recently though, more L2 writing and composition professionals, including Ferris, Hedgecock, Tardy, and Matsuda, are

acknowledging the importance of gaining professional expertise in both the fields of TESOL and FYC. Moreover, there is a call to cease categorizing these fields as opposing areas of professionalization. The practical reality however remains that any L2 writing courses offered are typically only required of graduate students who are part of a TESOL program. Any other graduate students enrolled in other departments (but also teach FYC) may be able to enroll in a TESOL-based graduate course as an elective; nevertheless, “rare indeed are graduate programs in rhetoric/composition that require coursework that prepares future writing teachers to learn more about second language issues” (Ferris, 2009. p.68). Admittedly this possibility in itself can be a logistical hurdle due to scheduling and rhetoric/composition programs' requirements for their graduate students.

2.3.6 Recent Institutional Shifts Towards an Interdisciplinary Approach

Although the disciplinary isolation between the fields of SLW and FYC has been documented (see Matsuda 1998; 1999), there have been recent signs of improvement and trends towards collaborative efforts between the fields given the increasing multilingual student population within FYC courses. As early as 1990, Barbara Kroll attested that “for those engaged in teaching second language writers, what is needed is both of a firm grounding in the theoretical issues of first and second language writing and an understanding of a broad range of pedagogical issues that shape classroom writing instruction” (p.2). While Kroll’s then-view refers solely to SLW professionals, in more recent years there is clearly a call for composition professionals to also learn more about pedagogical practices based in SLW.

As a testament to efforts towards positive shifts in pedagogical practices when working with MLL students, the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) Statement on Second Language Writers and Writing, reaffirmed in 2014, calls for writing

programs to recognize the diversity in the growing multilingual student populations on campuses and to offer “instructional and administrative practices that are sensitive to [multilingual students’] linguistic and cultural needs.” Another key initiative proposed by the CCCC Statement highlights the necessity of offering “teacher preparation in second language writing theory, research, and instruction in the forms of graduate courses [and] faculty workshops.” The following section of the CCCC Statement provides explicit recommendations for teacher preparation:

Any writing course, including basic writing, first-year composition, advanced writing, and professional writing, as well as any writing-intensive course that enrolls any second language writers should be taught by an instructor who is able to identify and is prepared to address the linguistic and cultural needs of second language writers. This preparation may be offered through preparing future faculty programs, first-year composition programming for instructors, or faculty development programming offered through Writing Across the Curriculum programs, writing centers, ESL support services, or other campus initiatives. (CCCC, 2014)

While such suggested practices and forms of professional development may still be in the initial phases for many institutions across the USA, organizations such as the Conference on Writing Program Administration (CWPA) and CCCC, both key organizations in the field of composition, have in the past few years increased their representation of issues related to working with MLL students and the support needed for both students and their instructors. In addition to the CCCC’s Statement on Second Language Writing and Second Language Writers, CCCC now has as an official Committee on Second Language Writing at CCCC that is charged with several tasks such as serving as the liaison between CCCC and TESOL, the main ESL

organization, as well as “Working with other groups within CCCC that are concerned with related issues of second language writers, transnationalism, translanguaging, and the globalization of writing studies in order to develop theoretical, pedagogical, and research frameworks and connections for interested CCCC members, international disciplinary partner organizations (like TESOL, WPA, CEE, NCTE), and the field” (ncte.org). In addition, CCCC’s Committee on Second Language Writing sponsors one workshop yearly at the CCCC convention that tackles pedagogical issues that are pertinent to those teaching FYC amidst an increasing MLL student population. Another example of recent disciplinary representation of SLW is the Symposium on Second Language Writing (SSLW), established in 1998, which is now an annual event with an increasing presence of composition specialists engaging in conversations related to working with L2 writers. In one example for a call for conference proposals, the SSLW announced the theme of “Expertise in Second Language Writing” explaining that a sense of expertise can no longer be considered binary:

Expertise in second language writing is sometimes conceptualized as a binary—either you are an expert or you are not. In reality, however, there are different types and degrees of expertise that are needed depending on the context and roles—writing center tutors, teachers, teacher educators, program administrators, researchers, research mentors, editors, reviewers. As the field of second language writing matures and continues to grow as a community of experts, it is important to move toward a shared understanding of what knowledge and skills are needed for various roles we play in various contexts, and to develop a mechanism for developing and recognizing those expertise (sslw.asu.edu)

This excerpt from the SSLW highlights the importance of recognizing different forms of expertise which can lead to offering in-class practical applications for teachers as they work more frequently with a linguistically diverse student population. Across institutions, and within locally-based and international conventions, it would seem that there is now increased collaboration between the fields of composition and TESOL aimed towards improving theoretical understandings and pedagogies for successfully working with international/multilingual students. Academic journals have also increased their representation of research topics related to SLW pedagogy. In addition, nationally there has been an increase in FYC sections that are offered exclusively for self-selecting multilingual students. Some of these universities include the University of Washington, Purdue University, Arizona State University, Boise State University and Pennsylvania State University to include but a few. These cross-disciplinary efforts guided by a more collaborative approach present a case for eliminating the perceived disciplinary isolation between the fields of TESOL and FYC (Matsuda et al., 2013), and highlights the necessity of implementing change locally within institutions.

2.3 A Review of Research on Teacher Identity

This next section offers a brief overview of research on teacher identity. I use the lens offered by teacher identity scholarship to inform my understanding of the experiences of novice TAs participating in this study, primarily through analyzing their narratives in later chapters of this dissertation. More specifically, in this study, I aim to understand the development of novice TAs *professional* identities and sense of increased professional competence within the community of practice of a FYC program. In an investigation of teachers' professional identities, Beijaard, Meijer, and Verloop (2004, as cited in Beauchamps & Thomas, 2009) determined several factors related to identity. Firstly, identity formation is a dynamic ongoing process, is in a

continuous multi-faceted state of change, and is by no means static. Identity also involves the personal attributes of the individual but also the context (which in the context of this study is the FYWP where TAs learn professional characteristics adopted by their department as well as their peers). Beijaard et al. (2004, as cited in Beauchamps & Thomas, 2009) also explain that professional identity is based on the concept of agency, or what is known as a conscious decision to work on professional development and learning based on the teacher's professional goals.

2.3.1 Overview of Teacher Identity Research

Identities are constantly “co-constructed in situ, using many resources including personal biography, interactional skills, knowledge and attitudes, and social capital” (Miller, 2009, p. 175). Varghese, Morgan, Johnston and Johnson (2005) also explain that identity is “not a fixed, stable, unitary, and internally coherent phenomenon but is multiple, shifting...[and it is] transformational and transformative” (pp.22-23). Motha (2006) also reiterates a similar view whereby teachers’ identities are often “multiple and fluid and fluctuate according to context” (p. 499), as well as being multilayered with several different aspects such as race and language as was the case in her study. Such definitions serve as a helpful reminder that identity is always in a state of reformation and depends on several variables that are also in constant motion. Block (2010) offers the interpretation that according to many current applied linguists, identity is understood in reference to narratives that are constructed based on socio-cultural issues that are formed across different points in time and across different geographical locations.

2.3.2 Shifts in Perceptions of Identity Formation

Higgins and Sandhu (2015) point out that recently, specifically in the social sciences, there has been a clear change in how identity formation is perceived: whereas previously it was

believed to be more of an “end product of larger forces” (p. 50), identity is now seen as more the result of an individual making sense of his or her own identity construction and as more of an individualistic process. Importantly, Block (2010) highlights the issue that identity formation is not necessarily a smooth-sailing process, as it can be full of conflict, where an individual finds himself or herself moving across borders “which are simultaneously geographical historical, cultural and psychological.” There is also the added concern that in such instances of reflection, an individual may be at odds with how they perceive themselves to be or where they see themselves belonging (Block, 2006, as cited in Block, 2010, p. 338). Block explains that now identity is no longer seen as “two-dimensional” but as “reflexive and multidimensional” (p. 339); thus it is hard to imagine that only one aspect of one’s identity can be acted out at a single point in time; for example, it would not be possible to focus simply on one aspect of identity such as gender, while avoiding other aspects such as class, ethnicity, or race or age. Pennycook (2001) reminds us that our sense of identity is a constant form of negotiation with how we see ourselves in relation to the world. Johnson (2003) offers an engaging definition explaining that identity is “relational, constructed and altered by how (we) see others and how they see me in our shared experiences and negotiated interactions” (p. 788), showcasing that identity formation is never formed in isolation but is a part of the greater interpretation of the world surrounding us.

2.3.3 Teacher’s Personal and Professional Identities

Varghese et al. (2005) rightfully state that identity should no longer be seen as predetermined; rather, individuals should be perceived as “intentional beings” (p. 23). Moreover, Duff and Ochida (1997, p. 452) explain that teachers’ most dominant identities and ideologies depend very much on “institutional and interpersonal contexts” where teachers spend their time; other factors that help frame identities and ideologies include teachers’ purposes for actually

being in these specific contexts, in addition to their personal biographies--which cannot be excluded. One's identity cannot exist in a vacuum but is linked to social, cultural, as well as political contexts (Duff & Ochida, 1997).

Jennifer Miller (2009) also reminds us that recent research on teacher identity exemplifies how language teaching cannot be split from “social language use in classrooms, and the centrality of situated meanings within repertoires of social practices, involving specific social and institutional contexts and memberships” (p. 173). Within the context of this study, such “institutional contexts and memberships” include the first-year TA orientation and the required pedagogy course, which will be referred to as ENGL 500 throughout this study. Teacher identity was previously seen more in terms of psychology, yet our understandings of identity based on more recent research has seen a shift towards that of “contextualized social processes” (Miller, 2009, p. 173). Such “social processes” are examined in this study through investigating the main forms of professional development within the FYWP. Varghese et al. (2005) point out that more recently, utilizing views around teacher identity help us understand the external conditions that help frame what occurs within the class and help frame the personal stories told by teachers. Morgan (2004) also helps explain that it is often systems of power, such as the institutional context, that work on stipulating “social values to all forms of human activity” (p. 99). In the case of this study, the relevant contexts comprise the institutional context of the university, more specifically that of its First Year Writing Program.

2.3.4 Discourses in Identity Formation

At this point, we must also bring forward the concept of discourse. *Discourse*, in many ways like *culture*, is a term very often used in reference to topics of education and social issues, and yet it remains a term that is often left undefined (Mills 2004, as cited in Clarke 2008). The

term discourse is used to refer to “extended stretches of language beyond the sentence level, as well as to linguistically embodied systems of meaning, knowledge and belief, akin to notions referenced by the term ideology” (Clarke, 2008, p. 15). In *Social Linguistics and Literacies Ideology in Discourses*, Gee (2012) provides a refreshing description of *identity* by explaining that if we were to have an “identity kit” (p. 152), this kit would include the following: attire, language choices we make that include written and spoken forms, the beliefs and attitudes that we hold, what we believe our allegiances to be, as well as how we choose to interact with others around us (p. 152). Gee goes on to provide this illuminating and all-encompassing definition of *discourse*:

Discourses are ways of behaving, interacting, valuing, thinking, believing, speaking, and often reading and writing, that are accepted as instantiations of particular identities (or “kinds of people”; see Hacking 1986, 1994) by specific groups...Discourses are ways of being “people like us”. They are “ways of being in the world”. They are “forms of life”. They are socially situated identities. They are, thus, always and everywhere social products of social histories. (p. 3)

The main focus of this research will be the language used by TA participants in interviews as well as that used by WPAs in interviews and TA professional development sessions.

2.4. Situated-Learning & Communities of Practice

Lave and Wenger’s theory of “situated learning” has been particularly influential in studies of teacher identity. As an example of this direction, Varghese et al. (2005) explain how in their study, they worked with a group of both preservice and in-service bilingual teachers in the USA who were participating in a professional development program. They observed how these teachers, rather than merely implementing in their classrooms the training they had received,

were also undergoing a more challenging process where they “actively sought and negotiated an identity as bilingual teachers and often developed conflicted and marginalized professional identities” (p. 29). In explaining the relationship between learning and identity, Lave (1992) explains that “learning is, in this purview, more basically a process of coming to be--of forging identities in activities in the world” (as cited in Varghese et al. 2005).

As Varghese et al. (2005) note that the concept of “situated learning” can be used as a framework to better help understand how teachers’ learning can be perceived as a process of identification whereby a link is found between “learning and identity” (p. 29). In this instance we are reminded of Lave and Wenger's (1991) view that learning is seen as part of an “evolving form of membership” (p.98, as cited in Varghese et al., 2005) and that participants are participating and becoming active members of a specific community of practice. In such an instance, it is expected to find that each individual has several “identities and levels of participation” (p. 29), where learning is a result of co-participating; rather than the more traditional view of seeing learning as a unique cognitive process, in this model, learning is seen as a result of different types of social engagement. This community of learning forms “an activity system about which participants share understandings concerning what they are doing and what that means in their lives and their communities” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 53).

Motha showcases a similar approach in her 2006 study, where she explains that our understanding of identity formation is much more richly formed in the presence of *community* since this can help us move from the “isolation (of individual identity) to the richness and complexity of how identities construct each other” (p.111) as is made available by communities of practice. This community of practice can also be explained as “an aggregate of people who

come together around mutual engagement in an endeavor” (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet 1992, p. 464, as cited in D. Block, 2010, p. 337).

2.5 The Research Gap

Despite a history of disciplinary isolation between the fields of TESOL and First Year Composition (FYC), responding to the diverse needs of multilingual students requires cross-disciplinary collaboration (Ferris et al. 2011; Matsuda, 2011, 2014) and the implementation of change locally within institutions (Tardy, 2011). Much of FYC research has looked into students' experiences within the writing classroom (Reiff & Bawarshi, 2010; Sommers & Saltz, 2004). However, there is a dearth of research that focuses on FYC instructors' experiences, especially those working with resident and international multilingual students. Most recently Tardy (2011) and Ferris et al. (2011) have used survey data to investigate FYC teachers' experiences working with diverse student populations, highlighting the necessity for a more intensive understanding of FYC teachers' experiences. Thus, this ethnographic case study is designed to provide a deeper understanding of novice in-service non-TESOL specialized FYC instructors' (participants) experiences through narrative inquiry. The study takes place within a FYC program at a US-based R1 University that overhauled its teacher training by normalizing the presence of linguistically and culturally diverse students, and by addressing mainstream FYC instructors' needs when working with diverse populations. This program-instigated positive shift in attitudes towards multilingual students presented a newly developing socio-political context and community of practice for the novice in-service participants of this study.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Much of composition research has looked into students' experiences within the composition classroom (Reiff & Bawarshi, 2010; Sommers & Saltz, 2004); however, there is a dearth of research that probes into FYC teacher experiences, especially when working with an increasingly multilingual student population. This study contributes to this need for hearing teachers' voices by utilizing an ethnographic case-study approach (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Stake, 1995) that employs qualitative research methods that are traditionally based in the fields of Applied Linguistics and TESOL (see Alsup 2006; Bell, 2002; Norton, 2000). My research also extends an interdisciplinary bridge between the fields of SLW and English Composition Studies while employing teachers' narratives; In this study, narratives help inform our understanding of novice teachers' professional needs, their uptake (or lack thereof) of pedagogies offered during their professional development (specifically those related to working with MLLs), and their developing professional identities within their institutional contexts or communities of practice. In this chapter, I provide an overview of my research questions, my approach when selecting particular qualitative research methods for data collection, as well as an explanation of my methods of data analysis.

3.1 Research Questions

This study will address the following overarching research focus:

Through this research I seek to explore the impacts of positive institutional policies and discourses that depict multilingual students in a favorable light on novice Teaching Assistants, within the context of a First Year Writing Program (FYWP). I aim to examine the effects of

providing a range of professional development resources to non-TESOL trained TAs working specifically with an increasingly multilingual student population.

These additional sub-questions will help aid my research focus:

1. What connections do TAs make between the resources and materials provided by the FYWP and their sense of professional development?
2. How do TAs position themselves in relation to the suggested FYWP policies that pertain to working with multilingual learners?
3. To what extent do TAs demonstrate uptake and/or resist these policies? How do these policies impact their perception of professional competence and identity?

3.2 Qualitative Research Methods:

Qualitative research calls for detailed attention to the "interpretive nature of inquiry" (Creswell, 2007, p. 37) in addition to understanding that a study needs to consider the social, cultural, and political contexts of the participants, the researchers, and the readers. Qualitative research methods in general, and ethnographic methods especially have provided an increasing amount of research that provides a better understanding of the nature of language teaching and teachers' beliefs (Alsup 2006; Lee 2012, Morgan 2004). This has been the case particularly since the social and political sites of language teaching have gained greater acknowledgment in their impact on teaching practice (Varghese, 2007). For this reason, I selected ethnographic methods to help provide a deeper perspective of the experiences of novice TAs working within the institutional context or community of practice of a First Year Writing Program (FYWP). Block (2010) points out that researchers seeking to understand identities need to be positioned within the sociocultural (or socio-political) context of the participants' communities of practice. In my

research, this community of practice would be the FYWP at Pacific University (PU). Some of the spaces where communities are found, are the main TA orientation and ENGL 500, which is the main required pedagogy course. Given these spaces, ethnographic and narrative inquiry are appropriate methods as they allow, me, the researcher, to observe these contexts and learn through the participants' narratives about interactions and events occurring within these spaces and participants' perspectives on events. The research participants are novice TAs as well as Writing Program Administrators (WPAs) within the FYWP. The insiders' points of view, rather than that of the researcher, are predominant in ethnographic research. As stated by Creswell (2007), "the final written report or presentation [of research] includes the voices of participants, the reflexivity of the researcher, and a complex description and interpretation of the problem, and it extends the literature or signals a call for action" (p. 37). In this study, I also foreground the nature of the research site, that of a FYW teacher development program, as a key component that can help in shaping interpretations of data.

3.2.1 Ethnographic Case Study

My research uses methods that borrow from the ethnographic tradition which allow me to examine the impact of local contexts of practice as well as incorporate multiple points of view (Duff & Uchida, 1997) to learn about the broader community of practice in which the novice TAs were participants during their first year of teaching. Following Lave and Wenger's (1991) Community of Practice (CoP) framework, my study presents an understanding of the professional contexts or the community of practice, in which TAs navigate their first year of teaching and uptake specific teaching strategies recommended by the FYWP. A CoP is defined as "an aggregate of people who come together around mutual engagement in an endeavor"

(Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 1992, p. 464) - it is defined by its members and the common practices members of this community engage with.

Case studies specifically offer insight into institutional settings or educational contexts; in this study I also interview WPAs to gain a better understanding of the institutional context. The benefit of using an ethnographic case study approach in my research lies in its ability to describe the nuances of a particular setting like the FYWP TA orientation as well as to illustrate certain processes like learning new teaching practices.

For this ethnographic case study, I conducted research during a single academic year (with a follow-up interview during the second year) focusing on a single program with my lens on four novice TAs with input from four Writing Program Administrators. I did not immerse myself in the TA community during the course of the study, but I maintained an emic perspective. It is the "particularity and complexity of a single case, coming to understand its activity within important circumstances" (Stake, 1995 p. xi) that makes case studies most informative. Hearing the voices of novice instructors is crucial as they are important stakeholders in how departmental policies should be implemented for the betterment of teacher education, and consequently to the benefit of First Year Composition (FYC) students regardless of their language backgrounds. Varghese (2007, p. 292) also reminds us that that methods like *narrative inquiry* and *case studies* play a crucial role in specifying the importance of the "local perspective." Narrative and stories can thus help researchers get a better grasp of the nature of teaching and teachers' identities.

3.2.2 Narrative Inquiry

Narrative is a mode of inquiry within qualitative research defined as "stories lived and told" (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 20), where participants proceed to narrate and describe a

specific event or experience extensively. Varghese et al. (2005) advocate the use of narrative modes of inquiry to understand the construction of teachers' multiple identities. Varghese (2006) defines teacher professional identities in terms of "the influences on teachers, how individuals see themselves, and how they enact their profession in their settings" (p. 212, as cited in Miller, 2009), and it is through narratives produced during interviews that researchers can probe the nuances of these professional contexts. For the purposes of my study, I chose interviewing which can facilitate participants' story-telling process and allow participants to use their own voice and perspectives through narratives (Mishler, 1986). Analyzing narratives reveals teachers' tacit beliefs and the nuances of their daily contexts and practices and can help implement sustainable policy changes (Ramanathan & Morgan, 2007). Teacher narratives also provide space for writing programs to incorporate rarely-cited beliefs and practical experiences of instructors into programmatic changes necessary for addressing the needs of instructors and students within this new diverse composition classroom. To contextualize participants' experiences, this study utilizes other data sources such as a focus group meeting with novice TAs participants, observations of the re-envisioned FYC graduate instructor orientation and the required teaching pedagogy course, as well as interviews with administrators responsible for FYC teacher professional development.

3.3 The Research Site and the First Year Composition Course

According to Corbin and Strauss (2008) the research context or site does not control how experiences or actions will occur; it does, however, help in determining the conditions through which specific challenges or situations occur and to which research participants respond through specific actions.

3.3.1 First Year Writing Program (FYWP)

My research site is a First Year Writing program (FYWP) at an R1 university, named Pacific University (PU). In Fall 2013, the year this research was conducted, the university had the largest freshmen enrollment in the university's history, reaching 6,255 students - an increase of 16% from the previous year. International students comprised 15.6% of the freshman class (newly enrolled undergraduates) with students coming primarily from China, followed by South Korea and Taiwan. These local demographics are representative of national trends, where international student enrollment in U.S institutions in the year 2012/2013 had increased by 40% since 2002/2003. At time of conducting interviews for my study (2013-14), the total number of international students enrolled in US institutions of higher education had reached a record high of 819,644, an increase of 7.2 % from the previous year. Based on the countries sending the highest number of international students for study in the US, the majority of these international students do not speak English as their native language. (Institute of International Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2014). For the purposes of my research, I define international students as students who enroll in US institutions after acquiring a US visa, as this population is easily identifiable by university demographic records. It is important to note that not all international students consider English as their second language (L2); students coming from nations such as Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, or South Africa typically speak English natively. Other nations such as India and several African Countries also have English as an official language and students from these countries see themselves as native speakers of English (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2013).

There are also an increasing number of domestic multilingual students enrolled in US colleges and universities; this particular student population cannot be clearly identified upon

admission as they may have American citizenship or permanent residency and attended high school in the US. Jordan (2012) alerts us that “this statistical uncertainty translates into a practical uncertainty about who L2 students are, where they are, and how they may best be educated in US contexts” (p.4). Ferris and Hedgcock (2013) similarly note that assumptions on domestic L2 learners' needs cannot be relied upon due to the increasing number of “long-term or even lifelong, residents” (p. 84) of the US who come from various linguistic, educational, sociocultural, and socioeconomic experiences as well as different levels of literacy in their first and second languages. This unidentified student population often chooses to enroll in mainstream composition classes and as such it cannot be assumed that domestic multilingual students will enroll in composition classes designed specifically for L2 learners. Novice TAs participating in my study all confirmed that this diversity was reflected in their classrooms based on their understanding of some of their students’ multiple language backgrounds. The FYWP researched in this study, offers all newly-appointed TAs a week-long TA orientation, and requires that they all enroll in ENGL 500 a required graduate pedagogy course.

At the time of this study, The FYWP offered approximately 240 sections of 100-level FYC sections per academic year, in addition to offering a number of intermediate composition classes at the 200-level. All 100-level courses are based on a portfolio system, where students redraft a specified number of papers in addition to composing a cover letter to address the learned course objectives. The main hierarchical structure of the FYWP includes the Program Director as well as a total of nine Assistant Directors. The Assistant Directors for ENGL 102 (service-learning FYC course) and ENGL 103 (FYC course with literature-based texts) are full time faculty with the title “faculty mentors” (see Appendix C for FYWP course offerings). The remaining seven Assistant Directors, who also teach composition at the FYWP and are graduate

students, first apply for the positions and are then interviewed and assigned their administrative role for two-year terms. Assistant Directors have all previously taken the main TA orientation, enrolled in ENGL 500 (the pedagogy course), and have taught ENGL 101 in their first year. During their administrative years, graduate Assistant Directors are given some course release time since they have multiple roles such as planning the TA orientation with the program director and leading parts of the TA orientation, planning quarter-long workshops, conducting classroom observations for newly-appointed TAs, and serving as general TA support during the academic year by offering office hours. For the purposes of this study, I interviewed graduate Assistant Directors for ENGL 101 (the main and most popular course offered by the FYWP comprising approximately 60% of all FYC sections), as well as the former FYWP Program Director to gain some historical perspectives on the program.

3.3.2 First Year Composition Class (ENGL 101)

Graduate students at PU who apply for the first-year writing program's (FYWP) teaching assistantship go through a competitive application process that requires promising academic potential, a personal statement, and a writing sample. Not all graduate students are awarded this assistantship (awarded by the English Department) during their first year of graduate work but may reapply in subsequent years. Those who are awarded the teaching assistantship are then expected to teach ENGL 101, the first-year composition (FYC) or First Year Writing (FYW) course - which are terms that will be used interchangeably in this study. In Autumn Quarter 2013, when I began collecting data for this study, close to 24 graduate students had been awarded this Teaching Assistantship. As graduate students move on in their graduate program, they may teach ENGL 101 again or other composition classes, including one which has a service-learning component, one which uses texts based in literature, and another version of first-

year composition which operates on a “stretch” model over two quarters designed for first-generation, low income, and at times student athletes. Each of these courses enable students to fulfill their “C” (composition) distribution requirement. The FYWP also offers a number of intermediate composition classes at the 200-level.

ENGL 101 is the most highly enrolled class offered by the FYW program (see Appendix B for course outcomes). In it, "students work closely with their peers and instructor to develop a portfolio of writing, that reflects an ability to write papers with complex claims that matter in academic contexts. The readings in this class focus on academic discourse from a variety of disciplines" (FYWP webpage). During the academic year of 2013/2014, the FYWP offered 109 sections of ENGL 101. In addition, during the same academic year, 8 sections of ENGL 101 for multilingual students were offered and were taught by TESOL-trained TAs. Students who self-select for enrollment are required to email TAs for add codes, and TAs report that these multilingual sections always fill up instantly with numerous students on the waiting list. These multilingual learner (MLL) ENGL 101 sections were first offered in Autumn Quarter of 2010. Numerous universities across the US offer similar FYC courses designed specifically to cater to the needs of MLLs (for example, Arizona State University, Purdue University, University of Minnesota, University of North Dakota, Pennsylvania State University, University of Utah). Some of these programs however require MLLs to enroll in these classes based on their TOEFL test scores or other institutionally based tests.

All sections of English 101 are taught by Teaching Assistants (TAs) in the English Department, and a few TAs from the Comparative Literature Department. TAs within the English Department are affiliated with one of three tracks: Literature and Culture, Language and Rhetoric, or Creative Writing. Regardless of specialty, all TAs teaching ENGL 101 for the first

time are required to participate in a week-long orientation and enroll in the Autumn Quarter required graduate pedagogy class, ENGL 500. All novice TAs participating in this study were teaching ENGL 101 during their first year of teaching.

3.4 Participants

After obtaining the Human Subjects Division approval for this dissertation research, I received permission from the program directors to pitch my study to the new first-year composition (ENGL 101) TAs participating in the required September orientation. I was advised by the program director to present my research and call for participants on the third day of the orientation, as typically on the first day TAs are inundated with new information and may not feel confident enough to take on more responsibilities by participating in my study. On the third day of the TA orientation I was provided with a ten-minute slot to explain the need to learn more about novice TAs' sense of professional identity development and how TAs utilize resources provided by FYW programs during times of increasingly diverse student enrollments. I explained to the TAs that participating in my study would involve a series of interviews and materials from their final teaching portfolio from ENGL 500. I then provided a handout for interested future participants where they provided their names and contact information. Out of a total of 24 TAs attending the TA orientation, I received a total of 18 responses. I then emailed the 18 respondents and asked the following questions:

1. Have you taught before? If yes, for how long have you been teaching?
2. Have you tutored before? If yes, for how long have you been tutoring?
3. If you have taught or tutored before, what content did you teach or tutor, and what was the context? (high school, college, etc.)?

4. Have you received teacher training before? If yes, please just briefly mention the context and/or program.
5. What's your first language? What languages do you speak?

To gain an insider's perspective of the administrative and institutional aspects of the FYWP within the Department of English, I also interviewed four writing program administrators (see Chapter 4). Based on participants' initial interview responses and first set of interviews, the following background information is provided:

3.4.1 Participants Group A: Novice TAs

To select my final participants for this ethnographic case study I utilized purposeful sampling, which Patton (1990) describes as "selecting information-rich cases for study in depth... [which] are those from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the research" (p. 169). For my first and main group of participants, my goal was to focus on the experiences of novice TAs, which I defined as not having any prior experience teaching throughout an entire academic quarter. Given the purpose of my study, I specifically needed to work with participants who had not received any teacher training before, and who had received an education that was predominantly within the US. Therefore, I needed to exclude from my study TAs with one or more years of teaching experience. Additionally, since I wanted to focus on TAs who had had no specific experience or training in working with MLL students, I needed to exclude TAs who saw themselves as international students, as well as TAs who had received some form of TESOL training. From the original 18 respondents, I finally selected four participants. The participants were all recipients of the Department of English's teaching assistantship; however, they were affiliated with different departmental tracks, that is, either Language/Rhetoric, Literature/Culture, or Creative Writing. All participants had finished

their undergraduate studies within the last one-to-four years. To protect participants' identities, I use pseudonyms.

	Jasmine	Alejandra	David	Noah
Gender	Female	Female	Male	Male
Age	23	23	23	25
Teaching Experience	None	5 weeks (as assistant teacher in a high school program)	None	None
Tutoring Experience	4 years	None	2 years intermittently	None
Teacher Training	None	None	None	None
First Language	English	English/Spanish	English	English
Secondary Language(s)	French		French	
Current Academic Program	Creative Writing	Creative Writing	Literature	Language and Rhetoric
Year in the academic program	First	First	First	First

3.4.2 Participants Group B: FYWP Administrators

My second group of participants was composed of WPAs who were involved in the TA orientation during Autumn Quarter 2013. These administrators were also responsible for all teacher development tasks throughout the academic year. I approached each of these participants first through email explaining my study, and upon their agreement I met each of them individually for one interview. These participants were integral to help me gain an understanding of the rationales behind the newly developed teacher training within the FYW program, and their beliefs and experiences regarding teacher development formed an important part of the community of practice for novice TAs. These interviews also better helped me contextualize the

institutional community of practice within a FYWP. To protect participants' identities, I chose a pseudonym for each participant.

	Sami	Emily	Sarah	Jamie
Gender	Male	Female	Female	Female
Age	51	27	29	31
Administrative Position	FYW program Director and composition pedagogy class instructor	Assistant Director for ENGL 101	Assistant Director for ENGL 101	Assistant Director for ENGL 101
Years of Administrative Experience in FYW program	9 years	1 year	2 years	3 years

3.5 Researcher's Positionality

Ethnographers need to be clear about their positionality and as Motha (2009) describes it, the “political nature of all research” (p. 109). It is futile for ethnographic researchers, for example, to claim absolute neutrality and objectivity in their research. It is best for researchers to be as clear as possible about the impact of their actions and own identities or what Heigham and Croker (2009) refer to as their “intellectual baggage” (p. 11). It must be acknowledged that a researcher’s experiences, gender, age, cultural and ethnic background, as well as her religion and politics can influence how she interprets data and constructs the participant’s reality (Heigham & Croker, 2009). Norton and Early (2011) propose a research-based orientation, where there is more room for the construction of the researchers’ identity, and more opportunity for reflecting on how this identity can influence research findings. For these reasons, qualitative researchers should reflect on their unique identities, and make this reflection an obvious part of their final

research. In the case of my study my own TESOL background and my professional and personal experience present integral parts of my identity.

A number of researchers actually see this researcher *subjectivity* present in qualitative research as a defining feature to be celebrated. It is seen as the “basis of researchers making a distinct contribution, one that results from the unique configuration of their personal qualities joined to the data they have collected” (Peshkin, 1998, p. 18, as cited in Heigham & Croker, 2009, p. 11). Holliday (2010) however mentions that recently there has been increasing care in the field to be “less naïve” about the influences of researchers’ beliefs (p. 99). Within ethnographic studies, a researcher's positionality needs to be brought forward and its implications discussed throughout the research. While this influence of the researcher can be labeled as a drawback when conducting qualitative research, it should be seen as an advantage and a defining rich element of qualitative research that we need not hide (Motha, 2009). It is worth referring to Canagarajah’s (1996) critique of researchers’ inclination to disguise their presence and their influence on research findings by arguing that:

For all practical purposes, the researcher is absent from the report, looking behind the text as an omniscient, transcendental, all knowing figure. This convention hides the manner in which the subjectivity of the researchers- with their complex values, ideologies and experiences- shapes the research activity and findings. (p. 327)

In terms of positionality, I held several roles during the research process. At the time of the study, I myself was an experienced TA in the FYWP and had been teaching in the FYWP program since 2010. I was also at the time of the study an Assistant Director for the “stretch” composition program, so although I had administrative responsibilities for some Teaching Assistants, I did not work in a formal capacity with the participants in my study. In addition, I

had the role of the Multilingual Learners Consultant for the FYWP, which gave me the opportunity to develop teaching materials, develop program policies, and work with instructors on issues related to working with multilingual student populations. However, during this study, newly-appointed TAs were working with another AD for any issues related to working with multilingual students. During the more conversational moments of my interviews with my participants, I did mention that I held the role of the Multilingual Learners Consultant when prompted by a specific instance during the interview. Participants were also aware that I had previously received my Master's in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). I had also mentioned being bilingual in English and Arabic, which lead later to some informal discussions with my participants regarding their parents' language backgrounds. In my view, these informal discussions helped created a better sense of rapport with some of my participants.

In many ways I was a peer to my participants, but also an administrator. Given my multiple positionalities, and my own personal background, it is naive to assume that as a researcher I can isolate myself from the research process and interpretation of data; it is more constructive to acknowledge that a researcher brings her own personal perspectives, in addition to her life experiences and cultural identities, to the project. These varying researcher characteristics can limit a researcher's perspective, and yet it is this awareness and sense of reflexivity that defines a "contemporary ethnographer" (Heath & Street, 2008). I realize that I was very familiar with the research context and for that reason I was keenly aware and reflective of possible bias in my data interpretation. To help avoid such bias I followed Maxwell's (2005) suggestion to develop a "Researcher Identity Memo" (p. 28). In this memo I first looked at what prior experiences I had that were relevant to my interest in my research topic, and I then reflected on assumptions that may have developed due to these experiences. I then asked myself what

goals emerged from my prior experiences that related to my current research and whether these views were affecting my data interpretation. I asked myself these questions after each set of interviews and kept a record of my thoughts in preparation for my subsequent set of interviews. These reflective practices also aided my process of data analysis as I became aware of the possible influences of my questions on participants. This allowed me to alter my word choice during follow-up interviews and to pay more attention to value-laden words. For example, I became keen to refer to MLL students in a neutral tone when talking to my first group of participants (novice TAs) and to also avoid as much as possible the word “challenges” when referring to work they did with their MLL students. I sought to neither present MLLs in a positive or a negative light, but to reflect the diction present in the FYWP’s policies and professional development materials, and to reiterate the specific word choices used by TAs themselves when referring to their MLL students.

3.6 Data Collection

My study was conducted over the period of an academic year, starting from Fall Quarter 2013. My last set of data collection was during Fall 2014, when I conducted the last series of interviews with the TAs during their second year of teaching. The questions of these last interviews were designed to inquire how TAs made use of the original professional development resources they had received in their first year through both the FYWP’s TA orientation and the ENGL 500 pedagogy course, and how they perceived their sense of professional development over the past year. As of Fall, 2014, Noah was teaching ENGL 108, introduction to composition, in the form of a stretch model for first generation, low-income students, and student athletes. Jasmine and Alejandra were teaching in their home area of Creative Writing, whereas David was teaching ENGL 102, the service-learning version of ENGL 101.

During the week prior to the start of Fall Quarter 2013 I observed the required week-long teaching orientation for new Teaching Assistants. This teaching orientation was led by the FYWP's Director as well as three Assistant Directors who were graduate students themselves. I will refer to these individuals throughout subsequent parts of my research as Writing Program Administrators (WPAs). Most days started at 9 am and ended at 5 pm with a one-hour lunch break. For two days the lunch break also included a presentation from experienced TAs who shared their experiences in their first year of teaching FYC. The TA orientation appeared to be the first point in which TAs witnessed their newfound community of practice, and, in the case of novice teachers specifically, began to learn about preferred teaching practices, methodologies, and the logistics of teaching in the FYWP.

3.6.1 Audio Recording and Observation of the TA Orientation

During the seven-day TA orientation I remained a participant observer, which does not necessarily mean that I engaged in all events occurring during the orientation, but that I interacted, when called for, with TAs as they went about their usual activities and conversations (Heigham & Croker, 2009). Throughout the entire orientation I utilized an audio recorder that I placed at the front of the room near where the Director and ADs running the orientation stood. I sat in multiple areas of the orientation room but always towards the side or the back since I was not fully participating in all activities. During breakout sessions I followed one group of TAs led by an Assistant Director and sat with the group while still audio recording. It was in those smaller breakout sessions that TAs and the participating AD may have asked me questions about the topic at hand. At all times during the TA orientation I was taking extensive notes in my researchers' notebook in order to record my observations and thoughts, as well as to try to keep track of any utterances produced away from the audio recorder.

3.6.2 Field notes

My notes included my own self-reflections on my positionality and reactions to particular instances since I too had participated in this TA orientation four years earlier. I made use of Maxwell's (2005) Research Memo guidelines for further reflection upon any possible biases I brought into the research process.

3.6.3 Audio Recording and Observation of the Composition Pedagogy Course (ENGL 500)

When TAs are awarded a teaching assistantship by the FYWP they are required to enroll in a graduate course on composition pedagogy during their first teaching quarter, entitled ENGL 500. The course syllabus describes the course as aiming to:

Explore some of the theories and practices that guide the teaching of writing (and teaching in general) in the context of pertinent essays written by scholars in the field of composition and rhetoric. In the process of examining various theories and practices, we will work together to understand the “why” behind the “what we do” and “how we do it” when we teach writing."

(Composition Pedagogy Course Syllabus)

During that first Fall quarter, I observed ENGL 500, the required pedagogy class, three times and followed the same participant observation practices mentioned earlier. The course instructor, who was also the FYWP's Director, provided me access to the course webpage such that I had full access to readings, assignments, and handouts used in the course.

3.6.4 Interviews

By interviewing my participants across different points of their first year of teaching (and one interview during their second year), I was able to collect a rich range of narratives that reflected different moments throughout their professional development in their first year.

Narratives produced through interviews also have the advantage of lending weight to rarely accessed beliefs that may stand in opposition to the dominant scholarly discourses (Canagarajah, 1996). By collecting and analyzing teacher narratives, teachers can contribute to knowledge-making within teacher education as opposed to merely receiving theoretical knowledge of preferred teaching practices. In the scope of this study, the teacher narratives better help us understand the beliefs and practices more readily adopted by novice teachers, specifically within the context of a program that readily presents multilingual students as a positive addition to the general teaching experiences.

Since this study investigates the impact of institutional policies and discourses on participants' pedagogical preferences and sense of competence within their communities of practice, I regarded open-ended interviewing that results in TAs presenting their narratives as the most relevant approach. This approach to interviewing allows participants space for reflection and meaning-making while also providing researchers with an insider's view of the trajectory of participants' experiences (Seidman, 2006). Most notably, interviewing "affirms the importance of the individual without denigrating the possibility of community and collaboration" (Seidman, 2006). I opted for the open-ended interviewing method as opposed to a more quantitative method such as surveys where many of the participants' answers can depend on how a question is articulated without recourse to further probing. (Schuman, 1982).

Seidman (2006) explains that researchers cannot preemptively design the most effective research questions. The most relevant questions are reached through "an interviewer's sense of concentrated listening, engaged interest in what is being said, and purpose in moving forward" (p. 93) and so the most pivotal questions are a consequence of a researcher's hunch. These instincts during the interview may at first seem risky and develop over prolonged periods of time

and yet the route to effective questioning is certainly context bound and requires continuous reflection from the researcher (Seidman, 2006). Mishler (1991) explains that narratives place more focus on the nature of the stories told. For interviews conducted in this study I had an original set of questions for each session; however, for each interview I did not directly follow my list of questions since my participants were often more invested in talking about other topics that stemmed from their responses to my initial questions. Participants were especially interested in narrating the specific events of a class they taught that was particularly engaging or problematic. When participants paused for prolonged periods of time during the interview, I would follow up with questions based on their previous comments and in other instances resort back to my original suggested list of questions. At times, I would act upon those "hunches" and refer to my own teaching experience if it related to the story participants were narrating.

During the interviews, I also strived to create a sense of equality between myself, the interviewer, and my participants by opting for a more conversational tone to the interview. Clandinin and Connelly (1994) assert that conversations permit for a greater sense of equality between those engaged in the conversation in addition to flexibility for participants to come forward with topics that are most interesting to them. While conversations do require probing, conversations take place during a moment of mutual trust and portray a sense of caring between the researcher and the participants (Clandinin & Connelly, 1994).

3.6.5 Document Collection

To help with the scope of data and breadth of perspective presented in my study, I collected multiple documents that related to the TA orientation and department-based training in addition to materials used by the novice TAs in their classrooms:

- i. Documents from TA Orientation: I kept copies of all handouts provided during the orientation in addition to the TA manual provided to all TAs on the first day of the TA orientation of Fall 2013, when I started my study. I also hold a copy of the TA manual from my own orientation in 2010, which helped me detect any changes or additions that had occurred over the past few years. Within the TA manual there is a copy of the *Statement for Supporting Multilingual Students* which will readily be referred to in Chapter 4 of this study. This statement originally arose from a need to provide concrete suggestions that address Teaching Assistants' concerns regarding their responsibilities for giving students feedback on their written work. This document, developed by the FYWP in Spring 2012, utilizes feedback strategies originating from the field of Second Language Writing and exemplifies the much-needed collaboration between SLW and Composition Studies (Matsuda 2014).
- ii. Documents from the FYWP instructor webpage: This webpage includes resources such as lesson plans, sample syllabi, class handouts and suggested pedagogical practices. There is also a section dedicated to working with multilingual students.
- iii. FYC Textbook: In Fall 2014, a recently revised FYWP department-based textbook was published and required for all FYC classes. The new edition contains new readings that cater towards a diverse student population in addition to more samples from previous students' work. In certain instances, some of the participating TAs refer to a few of the readings, offered in this new textbook, that are more accessible to their MLL students.
- iv. Novice TAs' teaching portfolios: At the end of the quarter, TAs enrolled in the Composition Pedagogy class are required to compile a teaching portfolio that includes

lesson plans, assignments, as well as their teaching philosophy. The teaching portfolio provided me access to participants' teaching philosophy, which provided a rich source of data on their views on their teaching beliefs and sense of developing identity. In practical terms, the teaching philosophy documents guided my last set of interview questions as I prompted my participants in their narratives to reflect more on specific parts they had written.

3.7 Data Analysis

My approach to data analysis is inductive and depends on establishing patterns after coding transcripts rather than depending on a preset theory and testing it (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 1998). Inductive data analysis depends on themes and categories that are built “bottom-up, by organizing...data into increasingly more abstract units of information” and, as such, data coding and interpretation may need constant revisiting as researchers work towards reaching an inclusive set of themes as articulated in participants' narratives (Creswell, 2007; Heigham & Croker, 2009). My analysis of narratives does not seek to bring forward any generalizable truths that prescribe how things necessarily are or "should be" (Webster & Mertova, 2007) but maintains that teacher identities (and beliefs) are discursively constructed (Barkhuizen, 2011; Lee, 2012), and so these narratives become examples of self-representations of my participants' sense of professional development.

In order to complete data analysis, I proceeded first with transcribing data during, as well as after, collecting all required data. I transcribed data from the individual interviews, focus groups, TA orientation, and collected all my documents, field notes and my researcher-reflections amassed during the research process. For the first stage of data analysis I used In Vivo Coding (Saldaña, 2009) to keep the data true to the participants' own word choices. For

example, in the first set of interviews, as explained in the next chapter, participants frequently use the word "overwhelmed" to describe their feelings after the first day of the TA orientation. In subsequent stages of data analysis, I use the label "challenges" as a form of Descriptive Coding (Saldaña, 2009), which allows for documenting and organizing the extensive range of opinions expressed by participants during moments of difficulty in their first year of teaching. In a further stage of data analysis, I chose the sub-code of "time management" which was a more specific representation of the causes of such original "challenges." All of these aforementioned codes are currently categorized as "Initial Teacher Experience" as these codes are more reflective of earlier stages of my participants' learning-to-teach experiences. I follow Coffey and Atkinson's (1996) guidelines that depict coding as a process that combines data summation and complication; this process relevantly breaks down data to help researchers ask appropriate questions about the data collected thus far. These multiple stages of coding have guided my designing of questions for subsequent interviews with participants. Saldaña (2009, p.8) explains that "qualitative codes are the essence-capturing and essential elements of the research story," and as such coding helps with the development of categories and the path towards finding connections.

The challenge of this form of data analysis lies in the researchers' need to probe for all possible meanings in lieu of simply accepting one's personal interpretation of the data. A solution lies in developing the habit of brainstorming and even considering possible far-fetched meanings (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). To enhance the validity of data analysis, researchers may find it most useful to collaborate interactively with participants in order to help clarify the themes emerging from the data throughout the research process. This latter process is also known as "member check" (Creswell, 2007). In the last interview I conducted with my participants, I re-read some of their quotes from earlier interviews and ask my participants about a specific interpretation I had

produced through my data analysis. Such instances were specifically in cases where participants explicitly mentioned their thoughts when working with MLLs as well as instances where they mentioned tactics they had used when giving students written feedback.

To better maintain the validity and reliability of my findings, I followed a number of suggestions offered by Wells (2011) when utilizing narrative inquiry. First, Wells states the importance of keeping records of all data recordings and transcripts accessible, and to contextualize any data utilized from the recordings and used within a transcript. Silverman (2004) explains that an in-depth analysis of short excerpts of narrative text can yield more reliable results, and yet it depends on the scope of your research. Alternatively, Riessman (2008) suggests looking for connections across different parts of the entire narrative transcript (as cited in Wells, 2011). Another approach for improving the trustworthiness in narrative research is through reflexivity, which means an examination of “the ways in which an investigator’s experience and commitments shape his or her engagement in each element of the research process” (Wells, 2011, p. 119). This point has been mentioned previously in terms of researcher positionality and a researcher’s own personal (be it religious, social, political, cultural etc.) and professional identity. I attempted to utilize each of these strategies. These steps for promoting reliability in narrative research are helpful especially in terms of questioning one’s positionality and orientation as a researcher.

CHAPTER 4:

WRITING PROGRAM ADMINISTRATORS' PERSPECTIVES IN THE FIRST YEAR WRITING PROGRAM

4.1 Introduction

In order to gain a better understanding of the incremental changes in TA professional development implemented in the First Year Writing Program (FYWP) at Pacific University, specifically in relation to normalizing the presence of MLLs, it is necessary to gain an administrator's perspective. This chapter deals largely with the goals and approaches of the writing program administrators (WPAs) when revamping the professional development for incoming TAs, specifically in relation to TAs working with an increased MLL student population. This chapter also offers an overview of some of the more general pedagogy-based guiding principles that helped shape the teaching and mentoring philosophy of the FYWP. The next chapter, Chapter 5, will then highlight the voices of the novice TAs for whom the program-based support outlined here was developed.

The narratives analyzed in this section were acquired through interviews I conducted with the Program Director and two Assistant Directors (who were the current ADs at the time of data collection), as well as one former Assistant Director. The Program Director and all Assistant Directors (ADs) will collectively be referred here to as WPAs. The ADs, who were also graduate students at the FYWP, were actively involved in the TA orientation and professional

development throughout the academic year. By demonstrating four main themes through an analysis of interview data, this chapter helps elucidate how the FYWP had intentionally, through its approaches in TA professional development over a number of years, adopted a positive discourse that embraced the presence of multilingual learner (MLL) students. Within this specific institutional context, WPAs often referred to MLLs as students who possess linguistic and cultural experiences that could enrich the FYWP's teaching experience. This chapter also illustrates how the FYWP adopted a holistic professional development approach that aimed to help TAs become professionals in their teaching careers, regardless of the student populations they worked with, or future institutions they worked at.

4.1.2 Institutional Context

It is no secret that graduate students who are Teaching Assistants teaching First Year Composition (FYC) or First Year Writing (FYW) courses tend to be on the lower end of the hierarchical administrative chain of a writing program. Susan Miller (1991) highlights the “labor-intensive” nature of teaching such a course especially as graduate students grapple with their own graduate course load and are often novice teachers. For this reason, it is especially important to hear the perspectives of Assistant Directors (ADs), who are themselves graduate students, but who also serve as a bridge between the administration and their fellow graduate TA peers teaching in the FYWP. All the ADs interviewed in this study were either directly involved in the planning or the eventual implementation of the TA orientation following the release of the Statement on Supporting Multilingual Language Learners (Appendix A and section 4.2.3 of this chapter) which aimed to offer TAs within the FYWP more concrete suggested feedback practices when working with multilingual students. This chapter investigates the perspectives of WPAs, and the inner workings of planning involved in preparing novice TAs for a professional career in

teaching that also encompasses the needs of multilingual students. The voices of these WPAs reveal key insider perspectives of how knowledge is constructed and adopted within an academic institution. In the following sections, through interviews conducted with WPAs, I offer four main themes that explicate the WPAs approach towards program building and mentoring of novice TAs: *Listening* carefully to TA concerns, *Supporting* and creating a sense of safety for new teachers, creating a structure for pedagogical *Experimenting*, and *Normalizing* the presence of multilingual students. All of these themes encompass the general pedagogical ideology of the FYWP which emphasized *Teacher Development* rather than training with prescribed classroom materials, as well as the FYWP's positioning of novice teachers as scholars and researchers.

4.1.3 Broader Institutional Changes Preceding Local FYWP Changes

To provide some necessary historical context, as of 2008 a PU-based Task Force called the Provost's English Language Working Group aimed to develop "an appropriate array of support programs to help all students of whatever language background succeed in their university coursework" (as cited in Silberstein et al., 2016, p. 1). This initiative was especially timely given PU's increased commitment to its international student community. While the framework of this study does not allow for a full exploration of the changes proposed by the English Language Working Group, the final recommendation of the Working Group proposed that the PU adopt "support-based programs" for MLLs, rather than a "remedial" approach (as it had been framed previously).

While this initial Task Force was aimed at understanding which systems of support would best suit students, there remained a need to address the needs of Faculty and TAs who were working closely with this increasingly I/M (international and multilingual student population). Thus, recently two surveys were created by the College of Arts and Sciences, one

survey sought data on *Faculty's* perceptions of working with I/M students, and the second related to *TAs'* perceptions. The latter survey results are examined partially here as the TA Survey provides appropriate contextual information on the more general sentiments of unpreparedness that many TAs from different fields expressed when working with an increasingly I/M student population. This TA Survey was designed to help understand TAs' perceptions of the "needs of I/M students as well as the pedagogical needs of those who teach them" (Silberstein et al., 2016, p. 1). The survey was sent to TAs across all departments at PU, where in total 552 TAs responded to this survey, and the largest response rate came from the College of Arts and Sciences (20% of all responses). The FYWP, discussed in this dissertation, is under the College of Arts and Sciences. 60% of the total number of respondents had been teaching at PU for less than two years at the time of the survey. Generally, close to 80% of TA respondents voiced that "the presence of I/M students in their classes benefits their teaching" (Silberstein et al., p.4). Some of these views related to how I/M students provided a better range of perspectives on issues discussed in class, as well as "Greater depth in cross-cultural collaborations", and that I/M at times had better expertise in course content (Silberstein et al., 2016, p. 5).

While the previously mentioned findings prove certainly promising, the survey data also presented an array of concerns voiced by TAs across different disciplines when working specifically with I/M students. The highest point of concern expressed by TAs was that of "generating participation in class" (p. 8) as pointed out by 57% of the respondents. The second highest challenge of that of "assessing writing" (50%), followed by "explaining course content" (48%) (p. 8). Other items that were labeled under "challenges" when working with I/M students included "communicating course policies and deadlines", "assessing participation", "fostering

collaboration" and "designing assignments". Some of the notable comments expressed in the survey explain that MLL students whose L1 is not English may not be comfortable with their English usage and "struggle with how to express themselves" (Silberstein et al., 2016, p. 9). One particular TA comment presented here may resonate well with other TAs in other institutions:

It has frequently been difficult to grade international students against others because in many cases their English skills are not strong and they are only getting a small portion of what is said in class or in the readings. This is not true of all international students, but a large percentage seem to be significantly unprepared for college level work that involves listening and writing in English.

(Anonymous Survey response from TA Survey Report, Silberstein et al., 2016 p. 9)

Given the context of widespread anxiety experienced by TAs from various fields as exemplified by the TA Survey Report quote above, the FYWP had already started a series of changes within the new TA orientation and the required ENGL 500 pedagogy course as a response to concerns expressed by TAs to the WPAs. The interview-based findings from WPAs presented in this profile provide contextual data explaining a series of responses to these anxieties expressed by TAs within the FYWP, similar to some of those expressed in the TA Survey Report in general. The data presented in this chapter helps gain a clearer understanding of the reasons behind department-based policy changes through WPA perspectives, as well as the range of TA responses to these recent changes from novice TAs within the FYWP.

4.2 Themes Revealed in Interviews with WPAs

4.2.1 Listening

The FYWP had recently witnessed a clear change in the landscape of student demographics. At the time of carrying out this research, the international student population had increased by 18% over the course of just two years. More recent statistics reveal that from 2011 to 2018, the percentage increase of international student enrollment increased by over 65% (Pacific University International Student Statistics). It is worth noting that these figures include undergraduate as well as graduate students and that these numbers alone do not disclose the numbers of local multilingual students who are not identifiable by university enrollment records. This noticeable change in the student population was a key factor in developing a program practice of *listening* to TAs' concerns. The narrative data provided in this first theme, that of *listening*, offers insight on some of the initial conversations of WPAs with FYWP TAs around these changes in student demographics.

First, how did an understanding of the sentiments and anxieties of TAs regarding this shifting student population come about? Based on interviews with WPAs, it is apparent that that maintaining conversations with TAs and listening carefully and sincerely to the concerns expressed by TAs helped shape effective policy changes that directly addressed the anxieties TAs were expressing both directly (through conversations with WPAs) and indirectly (through conversations with peers). Specifically, this section explores the feedback offered by TAs when in conversation with WPAs, as well as the WPAs' perspectives regarding the planning of the FYWP's TA orientation and the close work they do with TAs throughout their first year of teaching the main ENGL 101 composition course.

The policy changes introduced by the FYWP through the Statement on Supporting Multilingual Language Learners (Appendix A), were in part possible due to the discussions with experienced and novice TAs. It was then becoming clear that the clear increase in international students across PU led to a considerable demand on the TAs' time and a heightened sense of anxiety regarding the extent of their professional responsibilities and the efficacy of their feedback practices. How did the FYWP begin to realize some of these concerns? The answer lies in conversations that occurred between TAs and the Program Director as well as their peers, the Assistant Directors.

In an interview with Sarah, who at the time of this research was one of the FYWP's Assistant Directors, she explains that TAs were worried that they would not be able to tackle all the grammar-related questions that MLLs had about their writing, since they had not received any formal training in grammar. While Sarah was keen to point out that focusing exclusively on grammar issues was never meant to be the focus of ENGL 101, she notes that this was a clear concern saying, "a lot of our TAs do have anxiety about working with multilingual students because they don't feel prepared to. They say, 'well, I'm not a grammar person. How am I supposed to help this person with their English grammar skills when I haven't been trained to?'" This instance recollected by Sarah represents one of such informal conversations that occurred between TAs and WPAs. It was as a result of these conversations Sarah notes, that the WPAs were able to realize that TAs had an unclear understanding about what the limits of their responsibilities needed to be when giving feedback to MLL students. It was necessary for the FYWP to take steps to clarify to TAs that lower order concerns of grammar correction were not the main task required of TAs when giving written feedback to students, and that these concerns could be better embedded within feedback practices when tackling Outcome 4 of the main

ENGL 101 course goals, that of revision (see Appendix B for course outcomes). This main concern expressed by TAs eventually propelled the FYWP to create the Statement on Supporting Multilingual Language Learners (Appendix A), which provided clearer guidelines that were based in pedagogical solutions for best feedback practices as recommended by research published from the field of second language writing (SLW) specifically.

Based on discussions with TAs, it was becoming noticeable that even TAs with extensive teaching experience were finding that their usual classroom practices, assigned readings, and writing assignments were no longer working well in this new and increasingly multilingual classroom. FYWP ADs are graduate students themselves who spend a year teaching at the FYWP before being eligible to apply for an Assistant Director position. As such, these sentiments of professional uncertainty were often discussed between TAs and became known to some of the ADs who were regarded as peers by the TAs. Consequently, the ADs were then able to relay the concerns expressed by their fellow TAs to the Program Director and other WPAs. I learned through my interviews with ADs that the vast majority of these revelations of anxiety towards working with an increasingly diverse student population were often a consequence of unplanned conversations, however they did eventually lead to consequential and incremental policy-based changes within the FYWP.

One of the most prominent concerns listed by TAs was that international students created issues of workload: that students would very frequently come to office hours asking for additional help on their final drafts. While TAs were keen to help their students as much as possible, TAs explained that often they were uncertain of their ability to address multilingual students' language learning needs. This concern, as highlighted earlier by Sarah, was a common one. Another AD, Jamie had voiced the concerns of TAs she was working with during a TA

workshop, where she explained that TAs were feeling conflicted and irresponsible because they knew they could choose to 'read through error' (as advised in previous TA orientations meetings), but then they worried about what would happen to these students when they enrolled in other classes across campus (as reported to the Program Director). A more detailed depiction of this anxiety is illustrated in an interview with Jamie, a former Assistant Director at the time of the study, who explains the following:

There were a lot of TAs who were quite vocal about just feeling really concerned about how to grade, how to evaluate international students' papers, basically how to "read through error". That was really a concept that we had to explain and flesh out... We had to really explain what we mean by "read through error", that was, I think, a point of stress and concern for a lot of the new TAs, just, "What does that mean? How do I do it?"

(interview with Jamie, former Assistant Director)

In this interview exchange, Jamie articulates how an initial lack of clarity in policy on the part of the FYWP resulted in TAs expressing concerns over how to best help their students. Some of the questions related to how much time TAs should spend grading multilingual or international students' papers. Assistant Director Jamie, similar to Sarah, was faced with similar questions regarding *grammar* correctness and how much attention should be paid to such issues of sentence-level correctness. After such encounters, WPAs at the FYWP began to realize that a more candid approach needed to be adopted when talking to TAs about higher order concerns (those of content and strength of argument) versus lower-order concerns (sentence-level issues) in student writing, especially that ENGL 101 was based on a portfolio system that allowed for revision at the end of the quarter.

Another revealing conversation was also experienced by the Program Director, Sami, when he was approached by a TA who had been teaching at the FYWP for a few years. The excerpt below from an interview with the former FYWP director represents a specific point of concern expressed by one particular TA, prior to specific policy changes addressed in this chapter, that was likely representative of others' concerns too:

There was one incident I remember of an experienced TA who came to me angry, and saying, "I feel like everything I've been trained to do, and everything that I sort of know how to do has been altered in front of me, and I hear all this advice like you get from emails about what to do, but it's not what I signed up for.

(Interview with Program Director)

The above quote from Sami, the Assistant Director, reflects how previously at the TA orientation, there was talk about "reading through error" as a suggested pedagogy for instructors - yet there was no specific definition of what that term meant. This observation was also noted by the ADs. These concerns then led to numerous department-based discussions between faculty and graduate Assistant Directors, some of whom had expertise in TESOL (including myself). These discussions amounted to an acknowledgment of the anxiety experienced by TAs when they felt that their department-based pedagogical training no longer addressed the needs of this increasingly diverse student population. In such moments of uncertainty, the TAs felt that there was room within the department to actually voice such concerns regarding responsible feedback practices. WPAs then realized that the pedagogical suggestions that they were offering were indeed insufficient and no longer effective when it came to practical applications to help TAs with feedback practices for their students' written work.

Another way WPAs sought to better anticipate the needs of TAs was during the planning stage of the TA orientation. During that time, the Program Director and the ADs reviewed previous evaluations provided by incoming TAs who had just completed their TA orientation. Upon reviewing the responses, Emily, also an AD, noted that it was important for the WPAs to understand what previous cohorts of TAs had been “really comfortable with and pleased with” and to gain a clear understanding of what TAs wanted more experience with. In planning for the new orientation, it was key for the ADs and the Program Director to build upon the comfort level of previous TAs in order to better meet the needs of the new incoming TAs. Rather than a top-bottom approach, the WPAs sought to work towards meeting the needs, as well as the expectations, of TAs and to help them feel welcome and understood given their mostly novice teaching backgrounds. *Listening* & acknowledging these needs and anxieties served as a starting point that would later lead to a series of incremental departmental changes.

4.2.2 Supporting and Safety

The second theme that arose from data analysis of interview transcripts with WPAs, as well as my observation of the TA orientation, was that of creating a sense of safety and support for newly appointed TAs. Many of these TAs had never formally taught a class of their own before and were being introduced to composition-based pedagogy for the first time. As I observed the TA orientation, the encouraging and optimistically-framed discourse used by Assistant Directors and the Program Director was noticeable. On the first day of the orientation especially, TAs were told by the WPAs, “If you're not ready by the end of this orientation, it's because we failed you.” When I followed up with an interview with Sami, the FYWP Program Director, he explained that this language choice was certainly a conscious decision. He clarified that WPAs knew quite well that a lot was being asked of these newly appointed TAs, regardless

of their previous teaching backgrounds. The fact remained that many of these TAs had never taught before, or if they had, it may have been based on a prescribed syllabus that required no extra decision making on the part of the TAs.

Sarah, an AD, also reiterated a similar view that encouraged an environment of support for incoming TAs. In an interview, Sarah confirmed that on the first day of the TA orientation the FYWP expressed that they had to be able to tolerate errors in teaching and that if something were to go wrong with the TAs' teaching or classes, then it was up the FYWP to help the TAs. As an observer of the new TA orientation, I was initially taken by surprise by this level of open and tolerant sense of support since it seemed somewhat unconditional. However, Sarah explained that it was key that everyone got the sense that they could learn from their mistakes since no one would have a perfect class, especially at such an early stage. As such, Sarah pointed out that it was of utmost importance that TAs not get "discouraged by those moments [of lesson plans going wrong], and rather see them as learning opportunities." This rhetoric reflected the ideology of the FYWP: viewing the TA orientation and the following ENGL 500 pedagogy course, as sites of teacher development that encouraged TAs to experiment and find their own identities as teachers when given a particular set of course outcomes that allowed for different approaches for teaching the main ENGL 101 course.

In a subsequent part of my interview with the Program Director Sami clarified the department's stance on deliberately offering such supportive language and an encouraging approach at the start of the TA orientation. He explained that he's "a big believer that people are at their best when they feel comfortable and safe and not intimidated." In this moment, the Program Director exhibited an awareness that TAs should first have a clear level of trust in their institution, and that they should feel free to be themselves. In addition, through my observations,

I noted that some terms like *community* or *collaborative* would be repeated during the TA orientation. The selective choice of these terms was to provide the impression that this was indeed a safe environment, where TAs could go ahead and take risks or experiment with ideas in their teaching. The concept of *ownership* over one's class materials was another key concept used during the orientation, where TAs could take command of their materials as they saw fit and make them their own. It is this key commitment to ownership that guided the FYWP's professional development principle - that TAs can produce their own materials while readily adapting from a pool of resources and approaches offered by the FYWP during the main TA orientation, the ENGL 500 pedagogy course, and through readily offered materials available on the main TA resource webpage.

Emily, an AD, also relayed a similar sentiment when talking about the first day of the TA orientation. Emily explained that in her view, the FYWP through its WPAs seeks to create a community that is defined by “collaboration and safety and support” and a sense of mutual work, rather than creating an independent and isolated space among TAs. In my interviews with WPAs, I consistently found this rhetoric of an inclusive, supportive and collaborative approach in descriptions of the FYWP and the orientation program. While the hierarchy within any academic institution is hard to overlook, it is important to note that the FYWP hires Assistant Directors who are themselves TAs and graduate students. This close positionality may help incoming TAs feel less of a sense of hierarchical distances from those working to help them develop professionally and thus feel less distanced from the administration.

4.2.3 Experimenting

The third theme uncovered through my analysis of interview data with WPAs, both current and previous, revealed the concept of encouraging experimentation in one's teaching.

Upon reflection, I realized that it is no small matter for the FYWP to place trust in close to thirty new TAs, many of whom have never taught before. As Sami, the Program Director points out, “Some of [the TAs] have taught before, but never this kind of curriculum. Some have taught before in programs that were highly prescribed, [and] some have never taught before.” Based on Sami’s comments, it is clear that the FYWP does work with TAs who have a range of teaching expertise and likely a broad and perhaps contrasting range of pedagogical backgrounds. Upon examining the manner in which the FYWP designed the TA orientation and the ensuing pedagogy course, ENGL 500, it appears that the FYWP program frames itself first and foremost as a teacher professional development program. Sami, the Program Director explained that if the FYWP was strictly seeking high course evaluations from the start, they would have headed in the direction of prescribing all course materials. Notably Sami did comment that by the third quarter of teaching ENGL 101, TA evaluations often averaged 4.2 out of 5, which for a required undergraduate course, is quite favorable. This allowed for goals that could not have been met by a prescriptive-teaching approach:

When an instructor learns what scaffolding means and begins to really understand how you get students to where you wanna go by building these just out of reach steps, that is a fundamental part of teaching. You cannot teach something like that, how to do that, if you give the scaffolded structure already because they have to figure out what can they teach within real time and space. What are their skills?... So if we wanna teach teachers the art of scaffolding an assignment design, which then has consequences for lesson planning and all those things, we have to have them build a sequence and experience...

(Interview with Sami, Program Director)

Here Sami is very much advocating for the concept of practicing what we preach, or rather teach. If the FYWP is asking TAs to teach a class for the first time and to utilize concepts such as “scaffolding” to help their students reach assignment goals, then the TAs themselves need to undergo a similar process; this is a process where TAs work on assignment design for the first time and are themselves helped by the WPAs through the scaffolding of different components of assignment design. Sami continued to explain that TAs are given the time to “learn the art of structuring and scaffolding and building learning steps for students.” The time the FYWP takes with this pedagogical skill-building, as opposed to providing a prescribed syllabus, is what helps “create a safe space” and allows room for experimentation with assignment design and in-class materials development. The Program Director admits that the FYWP is indeed asking a lot of the TAs and has hopeful expectations, and so creating this sense of *trust* is key to all the work they do.

Another common pedagogical tool used, which I noted during my observation of the TA orientation, was that of “Think, Pair, Share,” where TAs individually think of a certain task, then share with one peer, and finally report out to the larger group. As it turns out, based on my interviews with my main TA research participants, most TAs end up using this concept in their own teaching. Sarah also confirmed that the FYWP deliberately employed this “Think, Pair, Share” method with the TAs during their orientation so that in turn, TAs may use them in their own classes. The technique fell within a larger commitment of the program to promote reflective teaching. According to Sarah, the FYWP emphasized the concept of reflecting on one’s teaching, especially in situations where things may not go according to plan. Notably, Sarah commented that this encouraged sense of reflection was also mirrored in the ENGL 101 course outcomes, whereby students are instructed to make use of reflection (when composing their final portfolio)

for their own best learning practices. In this case, it appears that TAs are encouraged to practice what they preach to their own students in a space that does promote experimentation and risk-taking, but also honest reflection in their teaching.

Emily, also an AD, for example, explained that a key component of the TA orientation and professional development at the FYWP was that TAs should eventually feel comfortable setting up their own curriculum and creating their own assignments, as similarly described by the program director, which is unlike the prescribed curriculum method offered by other institutions. To further expand on this point Emily stated, “I think it's part of the fundamental philosophy and spirit of the whole [FYWP] to allow teachers to get to know themselves as teachers, and to be so intimate with the logic of their scaffolding and with the goals of their assignments, because they've wrestled with them from the beginning.” While TAs are provided with specific course outcomes in preparation for teaching ENGL 101, and are provided with a FYWP-published textbook, there is no indoctrination of which readings should be assigned to students or how a specific assignment should be worded. It is worth noting that TAs were offered numerous assignments from former TAs as samples published in the official TA manual and TAs were encouraged to discuss and critique such assignments, and adapt them as they saw fit. However, it remained that the Program Director and the ADs never prescribed one specific assignment, while also reminding the TAs to commit to the main “course outcomes,” which allowed TAs to experiment with designing assignments they felt comfortable with.

4.2.4 Normalizing the Needs of Multilingual Students

In my analysis of interview data with WPAs at the FYWP, it appears that the approach of the program had been to *embrace* the presence of multilingual learners, moving a step beyond merely “coming to terms” (interview with program director) with the increasing enrollment of

MLLs. This view is also echoed by Shondel Nero (2010), a TESOL specialist, who explains that in the current day, teaching FYC to students with diverse linguistic backgrounds needs to cease being perceived as an unexpected occurrence, but more as the *norm*. Within this study's institutional context and through its community-based beliefs, it appears that the FYWP had sought to *normalize* the presence of MLLs by realizing that any change in perspective was part of an incremental process and an ongoing discussion with TAs through professional development. During the TA orientation and throughout the ENGL 500 pedagogy course, both of which formed a key component of the novice TAs' newfound community of practice, MLL students were presented as an asset to the FYWP community given the students' rich linguistic and cultural experiences.

To better understand the FYWP's approach towards describing Pacific University's student population, it is worth offering a brief overview of the first few days of the TA orientation. The first encounter incoming TAs had with this institutional context of the FYWP, was the formal seven-day new TA orientation. The term *orientation* may be a misnomer as it offers TAs much more than what a typical orientation to an institution offers. A more appropriate term may be *professional development* week; many of the key pedagogical principles and methods espoused by the FYWP are offered to TAs during that first week. I had observed the TA orientation and noted that there was an overall introduction to the FYWP, its classes, and the student demographics in general, and yet there was never a sense of urgency in how the increasingly diverse student population was introduced. The impression delivered to newly appointed TAs was that multilingual students were part and parcel of PU's student community. Pedagogical tips for teaching MLL students were framed in a manner that served all students. The Statement on Supporting Multilingual Learners (Appendix A and section 4.3.2 of this

chapter) was originally developed by the FYWP for the purposes of working with MLLs. Interestingly, some of the main elements of the MLL Statement, such as the “First Pathway” and “Second Pathway” (both of which offered different approaches or timelines for syllabus planning and the number of assignment drafts) were discussed as a means for TAs to plan their courses in general, *regardless* of their student population. TAs at that point in the orientation did not yet know the actual composition of their class population since they had not yet met their students. These two different pathways were offered as a choice of approaches when TAs planned their syllabus, with the premise that once TAs had a better understanding of their students’ needs, they could then make a decision on which pathway to adopt. In addition, TAs were offered a list of resources available to MLL students, both within the FYWP and across the university (see Appendix D).

When I inquired whether the approach of *not* over-highlighting the presences of MLLs was deliberate, the Program Director responded as follows:

So, for me, my idea was that first we need to establish that this is our norm. And we're not in some kind of moment of transience ... where this wave will pass and we'll go back to the good old days. This is the norm, these are our students, they are multilingual, they're multinational, multicultural and we need to be able to see them all as our students... so I always wanted to get people to understand that this was not a crisis, this is the norm. (Interview with FYWP Director, Sami H.)

Based on my interview with the Program Director, it became clear that it was indeed a deliberate choice to use positive discourse when referring to the international and multilingual student population - that this multilingual population was part and parcel of the whole university student population, that they formed an essential part of Pacific University’s community and that

the diversity of student experiences brought into 101 classes were a welcome addition to the FYWP's teaching. In fact, Sami explained that conversations about the needs of MLL students had started with other units at Pacific University well before the sudden increase in international student enrollment in 2014. The FYWP WPAs had previously been in close contact with the Academic English Program (in what is no longer called the ESL Center), which provided required additional writing classes for MLL students who had been flagged for needing extra course support

During my observation of the week-long TA orientation, I noted that there was never an explicit session during the TA orientation dedicated to working with multilingual students, beyond a short informational session on the Writing Studio (an optional 2-credit support course that met twice a week for self-identifying MLL students enrolled in a FYWP-based writing course). There was also a reference to the ENGL 101 MLL section, where MLL students can self-select to enroll in this section that covered the same objectives as ENGL 101, but where all the students were MLLs and the TA had TESOL expertise. When I inquired about this lack of explicitness, Emily, an Assistant Director, explained in another interview that, "my feeling that there's an effort not to have there be a lot of anxiety around [having numerous multilingual students], this feeling that it's somehow exceptional because it isn't factually. And also, because it doesn't have to be from a pedagogical point of view." Emily's interpretation here also echoes Sami's earlier comments, that the international/multilingual student population at Pacific University should be seen as the norm, and not a mere moment of sudden urgency. Emily also clarified that the pedagogical approaches grounded in the field of TESOL, typically aimed at serving MLLs, could indeed be helpful pedagogical approaches for *all* students

In an interview with another Assistant Director, Sarah, she expressed a similar principle when discussing the MLL student population to incoming TAs. She perceived the diverse student demographics as the norm, and that presenting this sense of normalcy was a deliberate move on the part of the FYWP. To clarify this, she explained:

We don't want to do anything that will make TAs think that multilingual students are a separate concern, or separate from the class as a whole, or that they're extra work, things like that. Because unfortunately, that is kind of the attitude that some... That we've seen... So, we don't want it to, we didn't want it to seem like an add-on

(Interview with Sarah)

Again, it appears that there was an awareness by WPAs that there was a need to shift some common perceptions, or misconceptions, of MLLs requiring a separate or additional kind of labor when teaching. Sarah was also careful to clarify that it was necessary to present the guidelines presented in the FYWP's Statement on Supporting Multilingual Learners (Appendix A) as the current status quo, and that the policy would become a common starting point for all novice TAs, whether they had a larger number of MLLs in their classroom or not. The same, however, could not be said regarding returning TAs "who maybe have been doing things a certain way" and who did not work with this feedback policy at the start of their TA professional development.

In a separate interview with Jamie, a former Assistant Director at the time of this study, she explained that there was an intentional decision in the planning stage for the new TA orientation to mostly mention topics related to working with multilingual students through a discussion of the two optional calendar pathways which were part of the Statement on

Supporting Multilingual Learners Support (explored in more detail in section 4.3.2 of this chapter). Jamie explained that TAs, whether novice or experienced, typically assumed that the bulk of the work involved with MLLs involved issues of grammar correction, vocabulary building, and what was often referred to as lower order concerns in feedback practices. To respond to this assumption, Jamie explained that the TA orientation highlighted the need to foreground "higher order concerns" in feedback practices for all students. Queuing for errors, instilling self-editing practices, and working with multiple drafts in fewer assignments or Pathway 1 (see Appendix A & Section 4.3.2 of this chapter) was presented as the best route for TAs who had classrooms that represented students from diverse language backgrounds and who did not identify English as their first language. These multiple drafts of the same assignment could target different writing skills, and a process-based approach could also be used as a means of guiding in-class peer reviews.

Upon asking Emily, an Assistant Director, about the rationale for introducing feedback practices for working with MLLs within the broader context of feedback practice in general, she replied with the following view that stressed the need for changing TAs' common perceptions:

So I think it's valuable not only for people who have no experience working with ELLs, or with any kind of student, but also with people who have a lot of experience, because for both, it's the *change in perspective* (emphasis added)... It's almost hard to believe that, like if we say, "read through error," I think people are like, "Yeah, right." And it takes them a little while to even buy that that's really what we want them to do.

(Interview with Emily)

In this exchange, Emily explains that as teachers, TAs themselves likely have certain images of what teachers tend to look for in writing, based perhaps on their own high school experiences. What is being called for here at the FYWP, is a pushback against these commonly held beliefs on teaching writing - that the most important issue is that of grammatical correctness. By issuing the Statement on Supporting Multilingual Learners, the FYWP aimed to change the preconceived notions of many novice TAs by highlighting, through research, that higher order concerns in writing such as content and argument, supersede sentence-level issues, or lower order concerns that can often be addressed in subsequent drafts of assignments, especially within a portfolio-based system.

Another similar view was expressed by an Assistant Director, Sarah, who explained that framing resources that help MLLs as also helping all students was key to helping TAs adopt this new pedagogical approach and to encouraging them to change their perception. Sarah clarified that “everything you should do in your classroom, anything that you do in your classroom that you're doing specifically to benefit the [MLL] students will also benefit your native speakers as well.” Sarah continued to explain that because the previous advice of simply asking TAs to “read through error” was met with skepticism, the FYWP was keen to provide a statement/policy on error correction that was supported by research and which within it, contained practical pathways for setting up a curriculum that allowed for different feedback practices (based on the research cited in the policy). In a way, this policy offered both theory and practice, which arguably is a type of resource that is often lacking in practical pedagogical practices, especially when working with novice teachers. Sarah stressed that while the FYWP highlighted the importance of transparency of course objectives when teaching, the same concept of transparency was utilized

when the WPAs worked closely with TAs themselves: that all approaches you use with MLL students can benefit all students, including your “native speaker” students.

By way of clarification, Sami, the Program Director, explained that the introduction of the Statement on Supporting Multilingual Language Learners and the related Pathways allowed TAs to see that they had options regarding giving their students feedback - that the pathways document was giving them different approaches to addressing the work required of them, rather than *adding* a new layer of work. Whereas previously grammar may have been seen as a separate issue and was presented as such in an older edition of the ENGL 101 textbook, now it was presented as part of an editing and revision chapter which aligned more closely with Outcome 4, that of revision and editing, which would be of benefit to *all* students. Again, this Statement was designed so as to offer TAs a pool of resources from which they could choose the approach or pathway to feedback that made most sense to them given their feedback preferences and/or student population needs.

4.3 Pedagogy and Resource-Based Shifts for MLL Support

In order to help TAs feel better prepared when working with MLL students, a number of department-based changes needed to take place. This next section offers an overview of some of the practical changes that occurred within the FYWP, which in turn influenced TAs’ pedagogies when working with MLL students. The first of these pedagogical strategies is represented by the Statement on Supporting Multilingual Learners (also referred to in this study as The Statement), a policy provided to all incoming TAs. The second change discussed in this chapter involves examining some of the changes in the assigned FYWP textbook.

4.3.2 Developing the Statement on Supporting Multilingual Learners

As indicated in my interviews with WPAs at the FYWP, following the notable increase in international student enrollment in 2014, there was a clear department-based drive to better address the concerns of TAs who were unsure of the extent of their responsibilities when giving MLL students feedback. Consequently, there was an effort to provide recommended feedback strategies as later developed in the Statement on Supporting Multilingual Language Learners (see Appendix A). This Statement emphasized that there was a need to “help empower students—multilingual learners and native speakers alike—to become self-editors of their own work and to research their grammar errors as a means to learn through self-correction.” The creation of the Statement on Supporting Multilingual Language Learners by the FYWP was a direct result of cross-disciplinary collaboration between graduate TAs, Faculty and WPAs with various specializations such as Language & Rhetoric, TESOL and Literature and Culture in the Department of English at Pacific University. All parties involved were united in their drive to clarify instructor responsibilities while fostering multilingual student success through normalizing students’ needs. A key element in these discussions was asking what kind of feedback best served the needs of not only international L2 students, but also the often less identifiable domestic multilingual L2 students. Thus, a considerable number of suggested practices were based in SLW methodology. It was also acknowledged that all students, regardless of their language background, still required self-editing strategies that helped with higher-order concerns of content, as well as lower-order concerns typically described as “grammar” issues. As such, this Statement marks a moment within the FYWP when there was an understanding, informed by scholarly work in the field of SLW, that students can gain better agency if they indeed do learn how to become their own self-editors.

Prior to beginning the data collection process for my dissertation, I had been part of the MLL committee that had helped develop the Statement. As such, I am here able to provide some background information on how the Statement came to be developed. In our initial meeting, we, a number of WPAs within the FYWP, had established that many instructors, whether novice or experienced, would likely agree that an academic quarter or even semester was an insufficient amount of time for L2 writers to become their own “self-editors,” as also indicated by L2 research. While we all wished we had more time to work with our students, it was more manageable to have a set of suggested strategies that would help students beyond the time spent in any TA’s ENGL 101 class. Through the strategies offered in this Statement, students could be encouraged to take ownership of “tools that help with using grammar strategically, intentionally, and persuasively in various situations” while having the time to focus on higher-order concerns” or those concerns related to issues of content and the strength of the written argument. TAs would introduce students to a range of self-editing strategies and campus resources available to them, as well as offer a consistent form of error feedback to help students take charge of their learning progress. The FYWP’s belief here was that TAs would then begin to understand the extent of their teaching responsibilities and that their students’ learning was a continuous process that would continue well beyond students’ enrollment in their classes.

The following sections offer strategies presented in the Statement on Supporting Multilingual Language Learners (reproduced in full in Appendix A):

Rationale:

- L2 writers can become their own self-editors by developing important writing and reading strategies and skills.

- The support of feedback from composition instructors, writing centers and peers, and access to effective resources (such as handbooks) related to grammar, usage, and style can enhance students' ability to take ownership of their final redrafting process, and can help with future classes.

On Self Editing:

- Studies have shown that students are able to self-edit their work when instructors circle or mark a check next to “grammar” errors, which has proven to be as effective as when instructors correct.
- Cueing students to the presence of an error (without fixing the error or marking what type of error it is) and ensuring that they are aware of the available resources is sufficient for self-editing.
- If errors prove overwhelming to reading comprehension, an instructor should invite the student to have a conversation with him or her or a Multilingual Learner consultant in addition to a range of other resources. While these resources vary across institutions, they are crucial in helping TAs feel supported in their desire to better serve the needs of their students.

Practical Applications (to help TAs plan their assignment sequences):

- First Pathway: Revision Throughout—Fewer Assignments, Multiple Drafts of Each. This pathway allows students the opportunity to work with revision throughout the quarter, producing multiple drafts of each shorter and/or major assignment, with grammar feedback on later drafts. In this approach, instructors focus on higher order concerns in early drafts before prioritizing and selectively marking errors on later drafts, which

students then edit during the portfolio sequence. This can be a good option for instructors who have a high percentage of students struggling with sentence structure issues, as it provides students with a head start on revising for their portfolios.

- Second Pathway: “Higher Order” Feedback-Focused, Defer Grammar Cueing for Portfolio. This pathway allows for reading through error until the portfolio sequence of the course. In this approach, instructors focus mainly on higher order concerns throughout the first two sequences before attending to grammar concerns during the portfolio sequence. As such, this option requires that instructors provide the full two weeks allotted for the portfolio sequence. Note that even if you choose this pathway, you may work on a few shared grammar patterns among your students throughout the quarter, and help individual students target their most pressing issues early on.

Generally during the TA orientation there were references to studies that showed that MLL writers tend to make more errors in their first draft as they are grappling with new concepts and ideas (Canagarajah, 2002). This allows more lower order concerns to seep into their writing. Notably, this increase in errors at an early stage of writing is not exclusive to multilingual students. This understanding was used as a rationale for Pathway 1, above, (which required fewer assignments but more drafts of each assignment) with the rationale that while self-editing practices can be utilized to aid multilingual student success, they are also a practical approach when working with all students, regardless of what piece of writing they are working on; these recommendations presented by the Statement aimed to *normalize* the presence of linguistically and culturally diverse students by adopting teaching practices based in SLW that could also benefit the entire student population.

As apparent from the excerpts above from the Statement (see also Appendix A), these pedagogical strategies provided TAs with research-based suggested practices to help them better address the needs of students. The Statement specifically aimed to provide TAs with manageable and concrete suggestions and practical feedback strategies to help TAs understand the extent of their feedback responsibilities and have more control over the time spent giving students feedback. Within this Statement, there is also a deliberate push to advocate for the rights of students to become self-editors so that they may thrive in writing contexts beyond those of the FYWP. Chapter 5, which looks in detail at the experiences of novice TAs participating in this study, showcases through the TAs' narratives some of the positive outcomes for using this Statement on Supporting Multilingual Language Learners both for MLL students as well as local students who do not identify as MLLs.

4.3.2 Updating FYWP Textbook to be More Inclusive

The second main pedagogical change undertaken by the FYWP was introducing a new edition of the main ENGL 101 textbook. This newly re-vamped textbook which Jamie had worked closely on editing became another practical resource that helped normalize the availability of texts that better served the needs and interests of MLLs. In this new edition, published by the FYWP, Jamie explained that they were careful to “provide more readings that would be more widely accessible to the idea of a global classroom” and that they removed some of the previous readings that were rather narrow in scope and required much US-based cultural foregrounding for international students. These US-centric texts had previously often placed MLL students, specifically those who were international, at a disadvantage when compared to their peers who had spent their formative years in the US. Some of the readings in the newly updated FYWP textbook included Rossina Lippi-Green's “Teaching Children How to

Discriminate,” where the portrayal of non-native accents in Disney movies is investigated. Another recent addition was Jessica Hagedorn’s “Asian Women in film: No Joy, No Luck” as well as Manual Munoz’s New York Times piece, “Leave your Name at the Border.” These new texts offered a broader range of linguistic representation and set the tone for highlighting multilingual students’ linguistic repertoires whereby they could more actively engage in classroom discussions on these texts.

4.4 Developing as Teachers & Researchers

The last part of this chapter offers a broader perspective of what the FYWP has to offer all its TAs in terms of professional development. This professional development encompasses but is certainly not limited to working with MLL students. As I learned through multiple interviews with WPAs within the FYWP, the program has taken considerable strides to become a "teacher development" program. Sami, the Program Director at the time of this study, explained that it was necessary to “set a climate that this is a teacher development program rather than a training program.” Emily, an Assistant Director, also pointed out that based on her own involvement in the planning for the TA orientation, she understood the philosophy of the FYWP to be one that prepared TAs to become teachers in their own right rather than just simply prepare teachers to teach a particular course with prescribed course materials and assignments.

Every academic year, the Program Director, as well as three graduate ENGL 101 Assistant Directors participate in the intricate planning and logistics involved in this seven-day orientation for newly appointed TAs. Other Assistant Directors who hold other roles linked to other courses may also be involved in parts of the TA orientation planning (in previous years I did so as the MLL consultant, a role I held for two years along with other teaching responsibilities). The TA orientation is soon followed by a quarter-long pedagogy course entitled

'Approaches to Teaching Composition' (ENGL 500) which, as indicated in the course description, provides "readings in composition theory and discussion of practical classroom applications." This course aims to achieve some of the following objectives:

Explore some of the theories and practices that guide the teaching of writing (and teaching in general) in the context of pertinent essays written by scholars in the field of composition and rhetoric. In the process of examining various theories and practices, we will work together to understand the “why” behind the “what we do” and “how we do it” when we teach writing. (ENGL 500 Syllabus, Autumn 2013).

Historically speaking, this course, previously only seen as a practicum, arose from the need to reach a more nuanced balance between the pragmatic pedagogical skills needed by novice graduate instructors, and the theoretical basis necessary for such teaching practices (Guerra & Bawarshi, 2005, p. 5). In my interviews with the FYWP's WPA, I found that three main elements were focused on to help inform the perceptions of newly hired TAs: the autumn orientation, the practicum course, and the teaching of English 101 (7). The Program Director noted a conscious decision in discussing the research rationale of the FYWP's ENGL 101 course outcomes (Appendix B). Commenting on this, he explained that following these changes TAs "realized these were not just some random, arbitrary...they emerged from something. And these are all graduate students, they respond well to research." Talking openly about the administrative incentive for creating these specific course outcomes appeased TAs concerns and allowed them to be generally less resistant to the outcomes. In other words, it had significantly altered TAs' relationships with the main ENGL 101 course outcomes (based on TAs' formal feedback to the TA orientation and ongoing conversations with Assistant Directors).

The Program Director explained that historically speaking, when the ENGL 101 course outcomes (Appendix B) were first introduced to newly appointed ENGL 101 TAs, there was a clear sense of resistance as to why TAs would be required to commit to these four main course outcomes. Upon reflection on that first year, WPAs in the FYWP took the decision that they needed to share with TAs, scholars themselves, the rationale behind choosing these specific outcomes. Here, Program Director Sami explained “...If we don't situate and explain the outcomes and why they exist, they will become perceived as an institutional imposition” and TAs will see themselves as being *forced* to work with course objectives they are not privy to. For Sami, that instance was a clear moment in his career where he realized that the FYWP “owed the instructors an explanation” for why these outcomes were being implemented. This deliberate act of sharing with TAs the research rationale behind the ENGL 101 course outcomes on the first day of TA orientation acted as a starting point for the trajectory of trust that the FYWP aims to foster with TAs as they embark upon their professional pedagogy-based careers. Throughout the course of my research, I found that the development of the Statement on Supporting Multilingual Learners along with the accompanying SLW-based research reflected a similar approach to when they offered a rationale for the ENGL 101 course outcomes— that of directly engaging with the TAs as active scholars. Sami had also acknowledged the importance of being frank with TAs about the limitations of a 10-week course, and given such a tight timeframe, there were indeed institutional constraints that could become more manageable when TAs realize the background and history of the main ENGL 101 course outcomes. This showed again an instance where the FYWP sought to create a sense of trust between the TAs and the WPAs.

Given these frank research-oriented discussions with TAs regarding the rationales for specific policies, it appears that the FYWP adopts a philosophy that perceives itself as a teacher

development program that aims to prepare appointed TAs for a future career in teaching. The Program Director explains this by explaining that unlike other graduate programs in other fields, TAs graduating from the English Department at Pacific University, are likely to have a career that is grounded in teaching, and it is currently their main source of funding. He believes that for the most part, the FYWP has “a culture that really respects teaching.” One way that the program implements an approach of non-prescriptive syllabus/course methods and a philosophy of experimentation and flexibility in approaches to teaching has been by giving TAs a range of courses to teach. This vast range of experiences better helps the FYWP provide TAs with what Sami called a “fulfilling” teaching experience. For him, offering multiple opportunities for TAs to teach different classes right from the start of their appointment as TAs showcases how the FYWP places full trust in their TAs. This view matches the flow of the TA development program, whereby the first day of TA orientation articulates to incoming TAs that it is the *responsibility* of the department to help TAs feel and be ready for their first day and first quarter of teaching. This is part of how the FYWP aims to create a “comfortable and safe” environment for their TAs, as voiced by the Program Director earlier.

This trust-based approach seems to be working on several fronts within the program. Another former Assistant Director who was strongly involved in creating the FYWP’s Statement on Supporting Multilingual Language Learners commented on the positive reactions (or perhaps a lack of a negative reaction) to the policy changes related to feedback practices when teaching MLLs:

What I felt (from TAs) was relief. I felt like people... And actually, people wrote us emails saying thank you. I felt relieved. I felt like people were relieved because, again, there's leeway in what pathway you choose, and those pathways totally are wildly

disparate, right? And so, they aim to account for many different styles of teaching and feedback.

(Interview with Jamie)

In this interview, Jamie explains that the sense of uncertainty had been replaced by a sense of “relief,” that there was actually a policy that could be implemented and that it offered TAs concrete solutions within their classrooms. This approach allowed for different teaching styles, which once again, is an attitude that remains true to the FYWP’s philosophy on teaching whereby clear rationales are provided to TAs in a non-prescriptive, but more decision-based manner.

The Program Directors’ and Assistant Directors’ narratives reveal that an important aspect in programmatic innovation and collaboration requires an institutional mindset that is open to feedback from teaching assistants. It goes beyond the point of feedback, but also requires that administrators have keen listening skills - that they be aware of specific concerns expressed by novice TAs, and that they respond to such anxieties, regardless of their source. As FYC programs learn more about their student populations, listening to the needs of TAs, who are often the backbone of the teaching workforce in FYC courses, can create a nexus for incremental change in department policies. It appears that within the context of the FYWP, such genuine conversations between WPAs and TAs can allow for cross-disciplinary collaboration that results in sustainable teaching practices that benefit both our students and instructors.

CHAPTER 5: NOVICE TAS' EXPERIENCES: BEGINNING NERVOUSNESS TO EVENTUAL CONFIDENCE AND TRUST

2.1 Introduction

In this study, teacher narratives are utilized to provide a clearer understanding of participants' sense of professional identity development throughout their first year of teaching within this institutional context of a program that understands that international and multilingual students are part of a resourceful multicultural student body. Through narratives, we can access the often-untapped experiences of novice TAs, which help reveal the range of their experiences and the spectrum of their responses to and uptake of their pedagogical training. The previous chapter examined the First Year Writing Program's (FYWP) new TA orientation and the rationale behind the pedagogical training TAs received. This chapter aims to examine the experiences as "lived and told" (Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007, p. 35) by the TAs following their TA orientation, and throughout their first year of teaching. While the previous chapter showcased how the TA orientation offered resources for TAs working with multilingual learners (MLLs) from a WPA perspective, this chapter showcases non-TESOL trained TAs' experiences with and perceptions of working with MLLs. This chapter also covers a broader range of TA experiences, including preparation before starting their first class, experiences with their students inside the classroom and during office hours, as well as TAs' interactions with their peers and progressing self-perceptions of themselves as novice teachers.

I interviewed each participant five times over the span of two years (four times in their first year, and once in the middle of their second year); my focus in data collection was continuously contextualized within the institutional setting of the FYWP. Often times participants' narratives referred back to their professional development and how they made

connections back to their orientation and ENGL 500, the required pedagogy course for new TAs, when dealing with specific situations in their classrooms or reflecting on their teaching practices. As mentioned by Duff & Uchida (1997), "personal biographies" come into play in teacher identities and as we learn through each teacher's narratives, we also gain a few snippets about their interpersonal contexts too.

As aptly stated by Duff & Uchida (1997), teachers, regardless of where they may teach, will represent "a wide array of social and cultural roles and identities" (p. 451). Teachers will come with their own gendered and cultured roles, which are not to be separated from their own political beliefs. "The identities and ideologies that become foregrounded depend in large measure upon the institutional and interpersonal contexts in which individuals find themselves, the purposes for their being there, and their personal biographies" (Duff & Uchida, 1997, pp. 451-452). Teachers are embedded in their different identities, whether it be within their families, or their political, institutional or social beliefs. These multiple identities are part and parcel of who we are as humans as we are complex beings, with intersecting and mutually informing identities.

Based on narratives produced by each participant in this study, each novice TA does indeed come with a specific set of prior learning experiences, family-based beliefs and perceptions, as well as a number of socio-political values that precede their teaching assistantship at the FYWP. Notably, as some of the teacher narratives in this chapter indicate, and as referenced in the previous chapter, it appears that some of the teaching assistants' most recent teaching beliefs also stem from principles and methods presented to them during their TA orientation and during their enrollment in ENGL 500. In my selection process, I aimed to select participants who had one common factor: that of being novice teachers, with no prior TESOL

training. However, each TA had a different and unique set of prior learning, language, and local/international backgrounds. While all participants lived predominantly in the USA, Alejandra, Jasmine, and David all had either the experience of living briefly abroad, or one or both of their parents were multilingual. This was not intentional in my selection process, but more a representation of the different backgrounds of TAs hired by the FYWP. While Noah had remained in the USA his entire life, he had moved from the conservative part of the country where he had been raised, to the more liberal Pacific Northwest, which happened to better match his socio-political leanings, when he pursued his graduate studies. Each of my research participants were in some way shaped and guided by their “personal biographies” and life, as well as by their learning experiences (Duff & Uchida, 1997, p. 452). In addition to teacher identities being a culmination of previous experiences, as well as being in constant flux,

5.2 Beginnings

The first section of this chapter examines the initial stages of teaching for each of the participants, whereby they transitioned from feelings of nervousness at first, to soon after feelings of increased confidence in their competency as teachers, regardless of their student population.

5.2.1 Beginnings: From Nervousness to Confidence

Upon interviewing Jasmine, Alejandra, Noah, and David at the start of their teaching, one to two weeks after their first class, I learned about their emotions leading up to teaching their very first class. Perhaps understandably, given their novice status, they all felt some form of nervousness or a sense of being overwhelmed. Yet despite these initial concerns, they proceeded to express that they felt they had received enough preparation to start teaching. In several instances, my participants reiterated that although it was their first time to teach a full class, they

believed they had received enough guidance during their orientation from the Program Director and Assistant Directors; the participants felt that it was a matter of getting started and using the materials they had developed throughout their TA orientation.

Alejandra first expressed her sentiments during our first interview where she said that she did not feel ready for that first class, but not due to her lack of preparation or due to any lack of support received during the orientation, but due to the speed at which everything occurred.

Alejandra explained the following:

I was really overwhelmed. I felt there was no way I could possibly be ready. They gave a lot of good tips and training during orientation, but it was just so much in such a short period of time, I was running on very little sleep, two to three hours a night. Yeah, I was pretty terrified.

(Interview with Alejandra)

In this instance, Alejandra expresses that while she knows she had all the required tips and materials, time was also clearly an issue for Alejandra. However, as future interviews will indicate, she was very much able to teach her first class and felt that it had gone quite well in spite of her initial concerns. Alejandra here explains how she prepared for her first class:

I wrote out a really detailed lesson plan, pretty much wrote notes on everything I was going to say. I practiced in front of my roommate. I've never liked speaking in front of groups of people. As an undergrad I was pretty quiet. It's the complete opposite for me to sit in front of a class and talk to 22 students. I practiced a few times and tried to get comfortable with what was going to happen. Even that first day was pretty basic, just looking at the syllabus. We did a fun activity on genre.

(Interview with Alejandra)

Examining Alejandra's reactions on her first few days of teaching, her reactions may not seem surprising to a seasoned teacher since they are familiar sentiments experienced when teaching for the first time. Alejandra explains that despite all the preparation she received from the weeklong new TA orientation and all the "good tips and training," she still felt very much "overwhelmed" and acknowledged that she did indeed feel nervous. Even at this early stage of her teaching career, Alejandra shows awareness of her personal dispositions, which in her understanding contradict what her perceived image of a teacher entails, that of not being "quiet" and being ready to speak in front of an entire class. Such early emotions expressed by Alejandra's narrative are representative of the initial jitters many first-time teachers feel. What is different in her perception of herself as a teacher from that of her peers Jasmine, Noah, and David, is that she does not see her personality fitting the description of a typical teacher. While Alejandra expressed her sense of nervousness as she prepared for her first class, she followed up by saying that her first class did go well, and she describes a successful activity they did on that first day. The preparation and lesson planning she refers to, was due to the tips and suggestions she received from the TA orientation, however, she was keen to be extra prepared by writing detailed notes and doing additional practice with a peer to appease her initial concerns.

While Alejandra felt overwhelmed with the amount of new content offered to her at first, it was clear to Noah after the first few days of the orientation that he needed quickly to prioritize which materials would be most relevant and helpful at the start of the quarter for his new class. Noah made the decision not to use all the materials or every idea presented to him, but to utilize what would be most timely given his starting a completely new course. At the start of his teaching career, as is the case with the other participants, practicality took precedence over a sense of idealism. He explains that "there was so much information to absorb in the orientation

week that you just sort of unconsciously pick and choose what's gonna work for you...by the 4th or 5th day I was kind of unconsciously prioritizing what things I thought were gonna work."

Upon examining the narratives from the first set of the TA interviews, it appears that the novice TAs participating in this study were more apprehensive about teaching *prior* to actually entering their class. It was the idea of teaching a new class that created an overwhelming sense for some. However, the act of entering the class, with all their materials prepared, and actually meeting their students for this first time seemed to appease this apprehension, and their sentiments eventually turned into those of confidence and optimism.

When I interviewed David about the specifics of his first day of class, and the feelings he had upon entering class, he replied that it only took him about five minutes to settle down. He shared with me his sense of preparation by saying, "we'd done all the requisite planning. So, I felt comfortable otherwise. And I think as soon as I got over those initial jitters, I felt relieved. I also felt as if I was in the right place (pause) I was capable." Once again, it appears that this sense of preparation due to all the work required of TAs during the orientation, is what helped David feel ready and even in his own words, allowed him to feel "comfortable." Here David presents his first day of teaching from a "capable" standpoint. He attributed this sense of confidence back to the one-week TA orientation he had received, and the fact that all the necessary preparation had been done, a sentiment similar to those of Noah and Jasmine. David even depicts a sense of relief for actually beginning to start teaching his class.

David's sentiment of preparedness is interestingly reflected across other TAs' narratives such as Noah's when I asked him about his first day of teaching. During our first interview I asked Noah how he felt as he walked towards his classroom. Upon recalling this first day Noah explains, "I was surprisingly calm. The orientation was (pause) I know was an intense

orientation. I know that Monday [first day of class] I definitely felt that I was prepared.” It is worth noting here that Noah describes his feelings as being "surprisingly calm," as if the expected sentiment could have been one of panic. Like David, Noah seems confident in the fact that the work-intensive orientation had provided him with enough support to guide him through the first day and week of teaching, at least in terms of practical preparation of materials.

Given the apparent amount of intense work required during the orientation (described similarly by Alejandra), Noah, like David, expressed that overall, he felt quite well prepared when heading into this relatively new situation of teaching a class. Noah later acknowledged that the main sense of nervousness, perhaps even awkwardness, came from having a group of new students looking towards the front of the class in absolute silence; he did however feel quite prepared for the work ahead of him. David and Noah both admit to having a certain level of nervousness, on account of never having taught a class before, but they did feel well equipped for the task ahead. Alejandra also knew she had received enough preparation during her orientation, but she was well aware of her nervousness which she describes as follows:

I got there really early. I wanted to make sure I got there in time. There was a class before mine. My entire class was waiting out in the hallway. I didn't want to look at anyone. I went into the class as soon as everyone went out. I was pretty nervous. I thought all my students were there. I started a few minutes early. We were still doing intros. I made a point from then on to not start before class time. I was just so nervous I didn't want to stand there awkwardly in front of them until it was time to start class...I was still kind of jittery. I was trying to act natural. Honestly, as they were introducing themselves, I don't think I caught a word of what they were saying.

(Interview with Alejandra)

Notably, both Noah and Alejandra seemed to be acutely aware of the awkwardness of standing in front of a new group of students. Alejandra intentionally avoids eye contact and even starts the class a little early to avoid any of that awkward silence. While at the start of this first class, Alejandra exhibits a common emotion experienced by many novice teachers, that of nervousness, as the quarter progresses, her perceptions of her teaching become considerably better and more confident as she gains more experience in the classroom and becomes more familiar with her students. Noah also had a somewhat similar experience to Alejandra. It was only in that moment when Noah walked towards his class that he got that feeling of nervousness, similar to those sentiments experienced by Alejandra, and later on Jasmine. Noah noted this sense of awkward silence in the classroom on the first day of class and referred to it as even “disorienting.” Alejandra had also described that sense of silence as being rather awkward and unsettling. In a later interview Noah confirmed that his students had become “much more lively.” While this uncomfortableness with silence may seem unsurprising, it appears to be a sentiment that novice teachers are highly aware of especially at the start of their teaching career.

In my first interview with Jasmine, she portrayed a positive stance towards her first week of classes. Like the others, she referred to all the preparation she received from the first week of the TA orientation; she explained that she felt prepared due to the materials she had produced during that initial stage. Nevertheless, Jasmine still felt that sense of first-day nervousness, as she explained the following:

I was feeling, I mean very nervous because I'd never taught you know a full, certainly not 22 people; but I was feeling I think I was feeling pretty good about the first week or so and maybe more sort of overwhelmed by the holistic sort of like oh my gosh, you know, I

start and then I knew that once I sort of start teaching, as much as you wanna have time to step back and sort of examine your whole philosophy and your whole sequence is, you're just so overloaded that I think so much of your energy is focused on day to day kind of preparation. But I was feeling pretty prepared certainly feeling you know millions of times more prepared than I was 10 days previously when going into orientation, umm, I was pretty happy with like the first sequence prompts that I had created.

(Interview with Jasmine)

Jasmine's narrative here clearly once again exhibits that first week of apprehension due to the realization of being solely responsible for her class. She was also simultaneously aware that she was starting a new role as a graduate student. Although Jasmine, similar to other TAs, said she felt "overwhelmed" with the task ahead, it is notable though that she described herself as feeling "a million times more prepared" and "pretty happy" about all the preparation she had done at the orientation. She had all the materials for her first assignment sequence and was ready to use these materials for her class. In this instance, the FYWP's weeklong and labor-intensive schedule, along with large- and small-group pedagogy discussions in her newly formed teaching community, appeared to provide Jasmine with a much-needed sense of support. This sense of preparedness, albeit some nervousness, gave Jasmine a boost of confidence that was necessary for her first week of teaching. Similar to Alejandra, Jasmine's sense of confidence in herself as a teacher began to progress as the quarter stretched out.

As we examine the first week of teaching, it appears that Noah, Alejandra, David, and Jasmine were all well aware of the responsibility ahead of them. They all expressed that the expectation of meeting a new group of students for the very first time felt overwhelming at first (or in the case of David, had "initial jitters"); nevertheless, preparing their teaching materials

during the TA orientation played a key role in their overall sense of readiness as they ventured to teach their first class.

5.2.2. Beginnings: From Confidence to Mutual Trust

As someone who still recalls that first instance of formal teaching, I remember not wanting to outright reveal that I had never taught before. It was intriguing to learn that a few of the participants were open, in one way or another, to disclosing their novice teacher identities. During her first day of teaching, Jasmine had a slightly different but still open and confident approach when she introduced herself to her students; Jasmine said that it was her first time to teach composition and that she was open to constructive feedback from students. She did not indicate to her students that she had never taught before, but she revealed that she had never taught the subject matter of *composition*. Jasmine emphasized to her students “that feedback was something [she] was very much open to in terms of just not making the class better for them, but also better for [her teaching].” When I asked her why she was keen to make her students aware of her status as a novice teacher of composition, she replied saying that she trusted that her students would want her to succeed, and that this decision to be transparent stemmed from a panel she attended in the orientation which was led by peer TAs who had prior teaching experience at the FYWP. In this panel, Jasmine recalled a few TAs talking about their experiences and she recalled their attitude as follows:

[They were] very upfront about how inexperienced they were and they really seemed like it had been a positive thing and the students were very receptive to it, and not bothered by it and not resentful...that made me realize maybe it's better to just um, you know be truthful.

(Interview with Jasmine)

In this panel, a couple of the experienced TAs mentioned that openness with students was the best approach and that students often wanted to see their teachers succeed. Consequently, this comment offered a sense of encouragement to Jasmine as was apparent from her adoption of this open and confident approach, or as she labeled it, “transparency and honesty.” Interestingly, Jasmine retells the specific advice she received from the panel regarding how students were perceived by the more experienced TAs:

I mean [students] were not like accusatory monsters that want you to fail. They want to help you. And it makes it much easier, sort of like, in these moments that come up in class later down the road where you make a mistake and you do something stupid, and you can just kind of have a laugh about it. I think it creates a good atmosphere in some ways.

(Interview with Jasmine)

In the above excerpt, Jasmine takes to heart the advice provided to her by the experienced TAs who formed part of her new community of practice. She believed, through their narration of their prior experiences, that students could be a source of support and that she needed to place more trust in her students, and even be open to admitting mistakes and going with the flow since students would be on her side. This sentiment, and the way it was expressed to Jasmine by the experienced TAs, also reflected the confidence-boosting tactic adopted by WPAs in the FYWP as demonstrated in the previous chapter: that novice TAs are to be trusted and supported during their learning process. While Jasmine did not outright tell her students that she did not have specific teaching experience, she thought it a good idea to be transparent about not having taught composition before. A somewhat different, but also transparent approach was adopted by Noah when he first introduced himself to his students. He did not specifically say that he had never

taught composition before, but he was open to saying he was teaching at PU for the first time - again, an indication of this sense of transparency that was encouraged during the TA orientation.

As we examine the TAs' sentiments during the first week of teaching, it appears that emotions of initial hesitancy and concern, were soon replaced by feelings of confidence by utilizing a transparent and open approach when teaching and interacting with their students. The narratives of the novice TAs indicate that they were paying attention to the suggestions offered to them during the TA orientation and used some of these ideas as a means to further boost their confidence and sense of self-trust as they first started teaching.

When investigating the interview data further, it appears that even though the participants had a strong sense of preparedness, they were also keenly aware of how much new information had suddenly become available to them. In some instances, it was the sheer amount of information and the decision-making that ensued that made TAs feel overwhelmed; this was a feeling that was distinctive from the initial jitters that come with any new teaching experience (which can exist even for well-seasoned teachers). In reference to the orientation, for example, Noah expressed the view that although he had felt very well prepared, there had been "so much information to absorb in the orientation week that you just sort of unconsciously pick and choose what's gonna work for you." Noah's view here is representative of Estrem and Reid's (2012) study which found that novice TAs will typically hold onto the logistical suggestions and lesson-based suggestions from their initial training. Noah reiterates this point of view when he talked further about the TA orientation, saying that by the fourth or fifth day he already had a good grasp of which materials he would be covering and which he would put aside for the time being. In his own words he was "unconsciously prioritizing what things I thought were gonna work,"

and so again here Noah refers to the act of decisively filtering out which information was more useful from the orientation and which materials seemed less helpful or relevant at the time.

As is apparent thus far, a strong contributing factor of the TAs' confidence stems from feeling *well-prepared*, which is also a result of trusting in the professional development process and engaging in genuine discussions with their peers, or new community. Jasmine, like Noah, expressed that she found that the small group-workshops during the orientation were very helpful, and that she was especially able to learn from the materials of other TAs with prior teaching experience. It is worth pointing out that part of their professional development involved working in small groups with TAs who had already been teaching in the FYWP for a few years. Jasmine explained that these conversations and comparison of materials influenced some of her decisions when finally developing her own materials.

During the main seven-day orientation, TAs generally only have a few days to fully develop their materials. Noah explained however, that this fast pace was indeed productive for him. In his own words, "being forced to do the assignments every night, um, in a lot of ways there was no point in that week where you could really think about anything else. So, there was just the momentum, it helped me a lot." It seems that the expectation of developing materials for their classes and the first full assignment sequence, while seemingly a huge task, was one that helped Noah feel well-prepared for the task of teaching an entirely new class. In this instance, Noah appeared to trust the process set forth by the FYWP and he trusted the usefulness of the orientation and the expectation to produce materials during the orientation. While all the TAs participating in this study referenced the intensity of the workload required of them during that seven-day orientation, they did acknowledge that they felt prepared enough to embark upon teaching their first official course, despite the initial classroom worries.

When I asked David how his first few days had gone, he gave me the example of introducing his first assignment to his students and said he believed he “did a good job of leading up to it (the assignment) and [his] students had some really good points to make.” Already, at this early point in the quarter David was feeling confident about the teaching he had done in class so far. As was the case with Alejandra and Noah, part of this sense of confidence could be attributed to the preparation and sense of support he received from the FYWP’s WPAs through the week-long TA orientation. David described his first two weeks as going “smoothly” without needing to do adjustments to the original plan he had set up for his class during the week-long TA orientation.

However, upon reflecting on his earlier feelings right at the start of his TA orientation, David recalls that he was one of the few individuals who had openly expressed the concern that he would be “exposed as a fraud” to his students. Sharing such a sentiment at that early stage may represent David’s feeling that he was now part of a teaching community that was based on openness and frankness. This sentiment was expressed during a larger group discussion during the TA orientation, where the orientation leaders, the Program Director and Assistant Directors, encouraged all newly-appointed TAs to share their sentiments upon first arriving at the orientation and to express their feelings on teaching a full class for the first time. During that point in the orientation TAs had not yet met their students and were over a week away from teaching their first class. When I asked David how his feelings progressed during the rest of the orientation, he responded by saying:

there was always that sense that you've been thrown into the deep and when I thought of this at the beginning, everything seemed as if it was moving a bit too quickly, but it

slowed down considerably and by the end and-I felt very very *comfortable* (emphasis added).

(Interview with David)

Notably, here David expressed a view similar to Alejandra, Noah, and Jasmine regarding the speed of events and the intensity of the work required. Eventually David did get that sense of feeling “comfortable,” although David here exhibited a stronger sense of confidence in his level of comfort and preparation than some of his peers. David shows an awareness that indeed matters were moving quickly, but that he knew he was becoming well prepared and he especially commented on the benefit of the microteaching in helping him feel prepared. Microteaching refers to when TAs teach a short five-minute class in front of a small group of peers while being video-recorded. David comments that after watching his short video he thought he “looked good,” and that he even “got several compliments from people saying “oh have you never taught before? Are you sure? I want to be like you.” In this specific instance, it appears that the support and encouragement David received from his peers acts as a confidence booster and further cements his belief that he felt ready to start teaching. David continues to explain in more detail how he felt after his short microteaching session saying:

I felt really good because a lot of my peers were supportive and then we watched video, and I thought I would have sucked, then maybe I don't know (pause) I had a knack for it. So, the actual putting it into practice was a bit more reassuring in the process up to that point.

(Interview with David).

And so again in this particular instance, David seemed to feel more assured of his future role as a teacher based on this initial brief supportive experience with his peers in his newfound community.

Noah also had a memorable experience when preparing for the microteaching during the week-long TA orientation. He said he adopted a similar approach to when he previously took theatre classes in the past. Upon recalling his previous experience with theatre, he now felt that “acting classes [were] one of the best ways you can get past your fear of things,” and that taking acting classes in the past had served a far more useful purpose than taking a public speaking class for example. In this instance, Noah made use of a prior learning experience, that of theatre class, to set up his approach towards preparing for the unfamiliar microteaching experience which he described as “baptism by fire,” where no one wanted to actually do the microteaching and felt “terrified.” He expressed that in the end just going ahead with it was the best approach and allowed him to feel more “confident” in this new situation. With regards to the microteaching, David and Noah felt that they had been “thrown in the deep”; nevertheless they both felt confident enough to go ahead with this new experience of microteaching and both realized it would be an eventual benefit as they prepared for teaching, and they trusted the process set in place by the FYWP to prepare them for their first formal teaching experience at PU .

In terms of other specific components of the orientation, David, similar to Jasmine, also noted that he found the small break-out workshop groups to be “exponentially more helpful than any other part of the orientation.” David’s reasoning was that all the materials and assignments he created as a result of these small group workshops, were exactly the same materials he used in his class and part of the practical heavy-lifting he needed to do as he prepared for his new class

where he used these materials “verbatim.” Noah also spoke approvingly of the small break-out workshop groups, saying they were “probably the most helpful...it was just the act of sharing what we had with each other or that I had an unusually good group of people to work with.” Noah also expressed a similar sentiment to David regarding the workload, clarifying that the expectation of having these materials ready, and essentially having a tight timeframe to prepare his own materials, guaranteed that he would be ready with all necessary materials such as the syllabus and the first assignment sequence for his class. It appears that Noah felt well-supported during these small group discussions and that the act of sharing materials helped him feel better and more confident about the teaching materials he had prepared himself. The expectation from his new peers and Assistant Directors (who were similarly graduate students) pushed him to create his classroom materials and required lesson plans for a prompt discussion during each following day of the TA orientation. Noah explained that “the idea that I had to write a lesson plan tonight because I don't have an option not to write a lesson plan tonight” was what kept him focused and perhaps gave him a stronger sense of control over what to expect in the first few days of teaching. He was prepared because he had no option but to be prepared. Despite the tight timeline, it seems that Noah was satisfied with the momentum that the orientation offered them all.

5.2.3. Beginnings: From Mutual Trust to a Sense of Support

Jasmine from the start also exhibited feelings of confidence in the trust the FYWP placed in her, even though she was a novice teacher. This sense of confidence went beyond the initial stage of materials preparation; she explained that a sense of support was often reemphasized by the FYWP throughout the orientation. This sense of support carried through during the rest of her teaching, beyond just her first quarter. When I asked Jasmine to elaborate in more detail how she

felt towards embarking on this new journey of teaching within the context of the FYWP, she referenced the supportive comments of the program administrators and her new community of peers, which had now become her community of practice. The Assistant Directors and the Program Director himself had pointed out that things may go wrong at first when teaching a new class, and that new TAs may make “mistakes,” but that such mistakes were always fixable and not a reason for high levels of concern. Jasmine then reiterates that the FYWP administrators created this “atmosphere that everything is, you know, a learning experience and when something goes wrong there are 25 different people you can go to talk to about it, and they're completely on board with you.” Jasmine has a clear understanding that at this early point in her teaching career she is still going through a new learning experience and that it is important to reflect on ways she can improve and handle any new situations as they come up. This sense of trust is also reminiscent of the advice given to her earlier by experienced TAs, who suggested openness and honesty when meeting a new group of students, when she reflects back on how she felt towards the start of teaching, she describes her emotions as follows:

I think I was really nervous but I felt like you're kind of like yeah, jumping off a cliff but you have a bouncy castle below to catch you or something like that (laughter)...I mean I think they (the administrators) also made it clear that there are a lot of responsibilities as well; it's not just a learning experience, um, obviously we have quite [a number of responsibilities], the outcomes just themselves are quite comprehensive in terms of the number of skills and you know they're not easy skills to teach.

(Interview with Jasmine)

Similar to Noah's comparison of teaching to acting or “baptism by fire” when referencing the microteaching part of the TA orientation, Jasmine does acknowledge that she was nervous at

the start of her first class and about teaching in general. Even though she likens teaching for the first time to jumping off a high cliff, she describes the support and sense of trust she feels from the FYWP as a “bouncy castle” where she is bound to succeed and feel safe, even if there are a few difficulties. This sentiment of trust and confidence that Jasmine feels at the beginning of her teaching career is the sense of trust that the FYWP sought to instill through the mentorship they offered at the start of the quarter and during novice TAs’ first year of teaching, which was expressed as being an intentional move on the part of the WPAs in earlier interviews discussed in Chapter 4.

As apparent from the participants’ reactions to their first week of professional development (and later teaching), it appears that presenting TAs with an array of pedagogical choices and guidance from experienced TAs and Assistant Directors, while also expecting that novice TAs produce new materials in a tight time frame, can yield positive results. These positive outcomes and reactions are likely due to three main causes: first due to the more practical aspect of novice TAs actually having materials to use in their classes, and second, the accompanying sense of confidence that comes with novice TAs knowing that they are ready to embark on this new profession while being already equipped with the necessary materials. Third, TAs noted that the FYWP gave them free reign and a clear sense of trust in their ability to take full charge of their first teaching experience, even if it was somewhat rocky at the start.

At these early stages of teaching, it is the more practical day-to-day concerns of classroom logistics and materials development that are the biggest concerns for novice TAs. Similar to Estrem and Reid’s (2012) study on the professional development of novice TAs, the first round of interviews with TAs in this study indicate that at such an early stage of teaching, it is often the practical concerns of material and lesson planning that become the main focus.

Moreover, within the context of the FYWP, it appears that administratively, exhibiting a sense of trust in the capabilities of the novice TAs and using supportive framings to describe interactions with students, further aided the novice TAs' sense of confidence as they prepared for teaching their first official class and meeting their new students. While all participants did indeed have initial feelings of nervousness, these sentiments were soon replaced with confidence after they had met their students and taught their first class using the materials they had developed during the TA orientation. Moreover, the TAs also noted that the FYWP's sense of trust in them, despite their lack of teaching expertise, allowed them to feel more confident in their capabilities as teachers, where in some instances, they even shared with their students that they had not taught this specific course before. It appears that there is a cyclical connection between the FYWP's rhetoric of trust, and in return the TAs' sense of trust and confidence in themselves and an overall sense of safety in their new teaching community. They found room for experimentation in their teaching and felt well supported by the FYWP from the start.

5.3 Supporting Novice TAs working with Multilingual Students

In this study, Alejandra, Jasmine, Noah and David were all novice TAs with a range of specializations and interests within the English Department, however none of them had previously received any specialized TESOL training. One key aspect that guided the FYWP's approach to the new TA orientation, as also presented in Chapter 4, was a response to the following question: How can First Year Composition (FYC) programs, specifically those working with TAs specializing in various subfields in English studies (such as Literature, Creative Writing, Language and Rhetoric, Composition, and TESOL studies), provide more relevant professional development to help address the needs of an increasingly multilingual student population in mainstream composition courses? This goal for the FYWP was especially

pertinent when FYC TAs, like many writing instructors, were encountering a considerable demand on their time, and a heightened sense of uncertainty regarding the extent of their professional responsibilities when giving written feedback and meeting with multilingual students specifically during office hours.

Through the participants' narratives, we learn how they adopted a pedagogical approach that was encouraged by the FYWP when working with multilingual students. This section also illustrates how as novice TAs, the participants' expectations and sense of preparedness towards working with multilingual students, especially in terms of feedback practices, were impacted by the type of discourse utilized by the FYWP administrators during the TA orientation and ENGL 500.

5.3.1 Departmental Rhetoric and Pedagogical Guidelines for Working with MLLs

The FYWP's Statement on Supporting Multilingual Students (appendix A; see also Chapter 4) presents the view that multilingual students are "contributing to our campus' linguistic and cultural diversity and enriching the perspectives students bring to the work of reading and writing in our classes." Overall the FYWP's discourse presented multilingual students as a source of diverse forms of cultural and linguistic capital. In this sense, it appears that the FYWP aimed to present a sociopolitical context and community of practice that normalized the presence of multilingual students. In terms of specific feedback practices, the FYWP's Statement on Supporting MLL sought to present more specific guidelines on what the practice of "reading through errors", as supported by field of Second-Language Writing (SLW), entailed. Part of the Statement on Supporting Multilingual Language Learners (MLLs) reads as follows:

When responding to early drafts of MLL student writing, research and experience have taught us to "read through" grammar errors (in other words, to prioritize and selectively

Sami but “read through” grammar errors) in order to attend to the “higher order” content-based issues such as argument, analysis, use of evidence, and organization. These "higher order" skills, as evidenced by the first three (FYWP) Outcomes, are the most important skills taught in a writing class, and research has shown they are also the skills most likely to improve over the course of a quarter. This does not mean, however, that we should ignore "lower order" concerns such as grammar, particularly repeated errors that interfere with comprehension, and MLL students miss an opportunity to learn when we ignore their grammar mistakes. Rather, the goal should be to help empower students—MLLs and native speakers alike—to become self-editors of their own work and to research their grammar errors as a means to learn through self-correction.

(FYWP Statement on Supporting MLLs, p.1)

For further context, the creation of the Statement on Supporting Multilingual Language Learners was a direct result of cross-disciplinary collaboration between graduate TAs, faculty and WPAs with various specializations such as Language and Rhetoric, TESOL, and Literature and Culture in the Department of English at PU. As noted in Chapter 4, all parties involved were united in their drive to clarify instructor responsibilities while fostering multilingual student success through normalizing students’ needs. A key element in these discussions was asking what kind of feedback best served the needs of not only international L2 students, but also the often less identifiable domestic multilingual L2 students. Thus, a considerable number of suggested practices were based in SLW methodology. It is worth noting that all students, regardless of their language background, were still required to use self-editing and revision strategies that help with higher-order concerns of content, as well as lower-order concerns typically described as “grammar” issues.

During the series of interviews conducted for this study, it appeared through participants' narratives that the FYWP's Statement on Supporting MLLs helped guide the type of advice they received during the TA orientation on how to best offer feedback to MLL students. This Statement, as also reiterated in different ways during ENGL 500, also helped frame the extent of TA responsibilities. This in turn, offered a calming point for MLL students when they later had discussions with their TAs about their writing. Given that the FYWP's Statement suggests that TA defer cuing grammar to a later point in the quarter, it seems that students were more willing to experiment with their writing and felt a stronger sense of confidence as will be demonstrated in the following section.

5.3.2 Addressing Multilingual Students' Concerns through Suggested FYWP Policies:

Throughout the course of interviewing my participants, Jasmine, Alejandra, Noah and David, they noted that their multilingual students had the most marked improvement in their writing considering that English was not their first language, specifically in relation to the development of their ideas and overall arguments, or in other words, issues of Higher Order Concerns (HOCs). When the participants compared the amount of improvement in their multilingual students' writing in relation to students who considered English to be their L1, they believed that the multilingual students really showed clear development. Jasmine, Alejandra, Noah & David expressed concerns that ideally, they would have liked to have spent more time working on issues related to grammar or Lower Order Concerns (LOCs). Nevertheless, they also demonstrated a keen awareness that a ten-week quarter could not feasibly allow enough time to extensively work on "grammar" related topics, and that the priority must be placed on issues of HOCs of content and quality of argument, as also expressed in the FYWP Statement. This was with the understanding that each student had to submit one paper that was a more polished

version to meet the requirements of Outcome 4 of revision, proof-reading, and editing. A quote from my second interview with Noah showcases the more favorable consequences of implementing the FYWP Statement or policy and its surrounding rhetoric of normalizing the needs of multilingual students in FYC classrooms. In this interview Noah explains the following:

I got the impression that once they (multilingual students) understood that I wasn't grading for grammar, they were able to write more confidently. I'm not – it's kind-of intangible or hard to describe. I mean, maybe it's – maybe I got the sense that they were more confident just because their writing was more clear, more focused on the content, and, well, less focused on the grammar. (Interview with Noah)

Based on Noah's view, it appears that the FYWP's espoused approach of making use of multiple drafts (Pathway 1 in the Statement) can also give students the incentive to take risks with their ideas, and to understand that they are not being penalized for their initial grammatical errors, but that they are being evaluated on the strength of their ideas, actual content and argument. Alejandra, who describes herself as bilingual, also exhibited a similar perspective to Noah's when working with multilingual learners. In one particular instance, Alejandra was referring to a conversation she had had with one of her MLL students during office hours. In this instance, Alejandra pointed out that a female MLL student seemed quite unconfident about the written work she had done for class during the first few weeks of the quarter. As the quarter progressed, however, Alejandra rarely had such visits from her multilingual students. Alejandra explained the following when referring to her office hours in general:

That's actually the last time I have seen any of my international students. They don't typically come. One had come in like once before. She was really worried about this paper, and I think I think maybe, she has *relaxed* (emphasis added) a bit...I think when

she saw that I was engaging with the larger concerns. I think she was maybe scared about the grammar or something, but when she saw that I was talking about her evidence and her argument she sort of relaxed a little and I think her writing is improving.

(Interview with Alejandra)

In this exchange, Alejandra points out that her student's writing did progressively improve. However, what appears to be of importance to Alejandra here, is that her MLL student became more "relaxed" once she found out that the most important criteria at that point was issues of HOCs in writing: arguments and issues of evidence rather than strictly grammar. In particular, the language used by Alejandra in this interaction with her student appears to be borrowed from the Statement for Supporting Multilingual Learners as provided by the FYWP, in that the focus of the student's writing should be on "larger concerns" or HOCs as written in the Statement. Alejandra's student felt more confident when she realized that she would not be negatively evaluated based on her "grammar" but that the strength of her ideas and "evidence" would overall carry more weight. Alejandra makes use of this Statement or policy as a means of interacting and negotiating with her students what their top priorities should be. It also seems that Alejandra felt a sense of relief that her MLL student had become more at ease with regards to how her writing was going to be evaluated. This interaction with a student during office hours was presented by Alejandra in a favorable manner. Alejandra perceived it as a moment of success in her teaching, rather than one of stress or uncertainty. Notably, the FYWP first introduced the Statement for Supporting Multilingual Learners to provide novice and newly appointed TAs with more explicit SLW research-based guidance and directions to use with their multilingual students. For Alejandra at least, the Statement seems to have addressed the need to ease previous tensions that existed when more experienced TAs were unclear on how to best and

the extent to which they were expected to give feedback to MLL students, whether this feedback be written or in person during office hours.

David also confirmed some of the sentiments expressed thus far by Alejandra and Noah. In the context of his class, David said that he talked to his students about the feedback Statement or policy supported by the FYWP and that he said “the exact same things almost verbatim in class [as the FYWP’s suggestion]” regarding the importance of HOCs over LOCs. These LOCs could be later addressed in the final proofreading stage of Outcome 4 of the course goals. He confirmed to his students that LOCs were more common when a writer is drafting and thinking through their initial ideas and issues of content, and that these sentence-level issues are more readily noticed by writers in the final stages of revision. David reflected on the FYWP’s suggested feedback practices during our first interview and expressed that he found it “fair” and that it made the most sense to him, given that he could indeed “read through error” while deferring focus on sentence-level to later drafts written by the students. David also agreed that it was hard for students to focus on issues of HOCs & LOCs simultaneously. He explained that placing too much emphasis on LOCs from the start may hold students back from focusing on the development of their ideas, and that students may have “too much to try, and to worry about” while also trying to tackle issues of content. When commenting on how he found MLL students at times over complicate the writing task ahead of them, David explained saying:

A lot of international students...strive to write in a more (pause) in a certain register or with a certain level of (pause) they try to write in a very eloquent manner, and that they sort of over-shoot, and then they make a lot of mistakes. So that’s the only thing I really tell them is to *simplify* (emphasis added) and just do what you can, and the idea is what’s

most important.

(Interview with David)

As Alejandra previously pointed out, the level of worry or stress some multilingual students initially feel was noticeable to her from the start. David also believes that the sense of feeling overwhelmed and being unclear on the level of expectations can make multilingual students ill at ease during their writing process. David later in our second interview highlighted how the element of time and confidence can play a key role in the improvement of student writing. He spoke of one student in particular who came from China. At first this student was struggling with his writing, since as David noted there was a slight issue of plagiarism. After working with the student during conferences and discussing with him issues of content, David noted that the student's second draft of the paper had improved in many regards: linguistically, grammatically and in terms of content as well. David explained that he had been keen to refer his students to other materials they could use. In addition, he recommended the writing center to *all* his students. David was careful to point out as well that he referred all his students to different resources beyond what was offered in his class, since he knew he would not be there to help them with a future "honors thesis" for example, and that it was up to students to find ways to support their own writing as the quarter and/or years progressed. If students were indeed making use of outside resources such as the writing center, this would allow him to "focus more on ideas," content, and development of their writing. This perspective is one also presented by the FYWP: that MLL students need a toolbox they can make use of regardless of which writing assignments they may be working on or which course they are enrolled in. David also noted that in general, if he did a lesson plan on grammar, that would be when he noticed a specific type of

error surfacing across multiple student papers, and not strictly in the cases of MLL students' papers.

In another interview, after meeting with Noah at a later point in his first quarter of teaching, I specifically asked him how he would describe the progress and quality of writing produced by his MLL students. Noah explained that their writing was becoming "much better" and that he could tell that they had been visiting the "writing center because their grammar is better", and that he had not yet explicitly tackled any grammar issues in class. In his view there are some errors that "will never get fixed" for some students, such as the usage of articles. In this particular instance, Noah referred to a Chinese student, and in this case, Noah did not see this type of error (that of article usage) as an issue since "it doesn't impede meaning by any means." The usage of the verb "impede" appears to be synonym of the verb "interfere" originally used in the language of the FYWP's Statement on Supporting MLLs. It seems that Noah was adopting a similar language to the one proposed in the Statement, and such verb usage of "impede" is often used by other participants in this study. Noah continued to explain that "it seems they (students) are [on board] with the writing now that they know I am not evaluating them on grammar." Interestingly, Noah's reflection here, that students were better able to focus on and feel more confident about their writing, is similar to those reflections offered by David and Alejandra earlier. In these instances, MLL students realized that their teachers were placing more weight on the strength of their ideas, their usage of evidence, and argumentation, rather than LOCs. Noah reiterated a sentiment supporting the rationale of the Statement, explaining that "if I come down on them on grammar it will discourage them, and they will miss the point of the class." Noah then reiterates during our third interview, in his second quarter of teaching, that once MLL

students understood that he would not be focusing strictly on grammar, they began to pay more attention on issues of content. Noah offers the following advice to his peers:

I would say to someone teaching for the first time...you can correct grammar mistakes if you want to, but don't worry about it. I mean, ultimately, it's our class. We can decide if we want to grade on grammar or not. But I think by focusing on the higher order stuff especially for my international students, they were, when they were not worried about their grammar, they seemed to focus more on their content.

(Interview with Noah)

In this instance, Noah uses the words “not worried” to reflect the shift in his students’ attitudes towards their writing. This word choice is also indicative of what Alejandra and David felt after their initial and then consecutive meetings with their MLL students. Also, here Noah feels confident that this is his class, and that as an instructor he has the freedom to make decisions on how to best approach feedback, thus, showcasing this sense of trust and confidence the FYWP seeks to instill in its novice TAs.

In a separate interview with Jasmine, it was noticeable how she would often present her MLL students in a favorable light where she would highlight how much potential they had. She would talk about her students using a discourse that exhibited positive sentiments towards their already being good writers. Here is an example when she recalled her recent conferencing experience with some of her international students:

They'll come in and be like “is this good? Is this good? I feel like it's terrible” and [I] get them to see that yes, of course, there are areas that need improvement but (pause) getting them to really place a little bit of value on what they've worked on so far and the ideas are always there. There's so much potential and the stuff that they get hung up on is often

times like the easy stuff to teach and the easy stuff to fix, but you just have to get them to sort of realize that like, they're not starting from scratch.

(Interview with Jasmine)

Here Jasmine is working closely with her international students and trying to get them to see the value of their work and how much they have already achieved by this point in their academic lives- that they are *not* starting from “scratch” but already have a lot of “value” in the ideas presented in their writing. Again, this part of Jasmine’s narrative indicates how she is focusing first on issues of HOCs, as suggested by the FYWP, and that their sentence-level concerns are “easy stuff to fix despite students often placing a higher value on grammar issues. This inclination to perceive international or multilingual students with sentiments of positivity, to see that their writing is still a work in progress with clear potential for improvement, is also apparent in the narratives of other participants in this study. Jasmine also notes that because of the nature of the portfolio system, where multiple drafts of the same paper are required, she is deliberately “revision” focused from the start of the quarter through carrying out small peer review workshops in her classroom. She explained to her students that, similar to her own graduate peer-writing workshops, “it’s such a privilege” to be able to get a group of “smart” people to help look over their writing and give them feedback. In this statement, she aims to convince her students of the merits of working with one another and benefiting from each other’s expertise. Her intention here is to create a more collaborative and productive atmosphere. In this instance, Jasmine also appears to be adopting classroom methods used in her own graduate classes as means to encourage all her students, regardless of their language backgrounds.

At another point over the course of this study, I asked Alejandra how she approached “Outcome 4”, that of revision, editing, and proofreading. She explained that she did address

specific grammar errors in students' writing, but mostly by highlighting or cuing specific sentences with some lower order concerns. Again, this approach that she up took stemmed from suggestions offered by the FYWP Statement on Supporting Multilingual Students on how best to offer feedback to students. Alejandra goes on to explain that she mostly "wanted to focus on sort-of larger aspects of revision and what that meant, before teaching lessons on grammar."

What Alejandra means by "larger aspects of revision" refers to the "higher order concerns" of content and argument as highlighted by the FYWP in the Statement. Alejandra explained that she did do one lesson on passive voice and that "nobody [in class] was paying attention."

Interestingly, Alejandra is keen to reflect on her thoughts regarding teaching grammar. She explains that, "[grammar] is not very engaging, and I don't know how helpful it is in the end. I think it might stress students out more than help them." Her sentiments here are similar to Noah's earlier thoughts when he noted that focusing on grammar may not be the most productive usage of students' time. Again, here is an instance where Alejandra showcases her sense of concern over her students' stress levels. It seems that she feels attuned to their comfort levels and uses this knowledge to help her better address her students' writing needs, and to better support their sense of confidence. Moreover, given the advice provided by the FYWP, it appears that Alejandra was at ease with her decision not to add to her students' sense of anxiety by focusing on intricate grammar-related details. According to Alejandra, she was able to address their concerns by highlighting the importance of working on issues of content and ideas, and the strength of their arguments first.

As I continued my conversation with Alejandra, I had asked her how she thought the FYWP's Statement for Supporting Multilingual Students might have influenced some of her decisions in relation to how she provided feedback to her students. In this next excerpt,

Alejandra, explained how the FYWP Statement did indeed make her more at ease regarding some of the decisions she made in her classrooms. She replied saying:

I think it's nice to know that we're focusing more on, like, the broader, higher concerns. Because otherwise I might feel obligated to, like, teach more grammar and to correct it more in their papers which would take a lot more time (laughter) and not necessarily be the most helpful feedback. So, yeah, I think it really helped actually.

(Interview with Alejandra)

Alejandra explicitly points out that she agrees with the Statement and that if there was a different departmental approach, she may have felt “obligated,” a negatively connotated word, to focus more on other issues in writing that she felt were less important. In addition, during an interview at the end of Alejandra's first year of teaching, she provided a personal reason related to her language identity for why she was more inclined to agree with the FYWP policy. She explained that either way it would have still been her “instinct” to follow a similar pedagogical approach for the following reason:

Just because coming from, like, a bilingual background myself and, like, sort-of knowing what it's like to switch between languages and, like, I think my instinct would be to sort-of be, like, okay, if I can understand it, it's not, like, a big issue, but – so it's kind-of nice to know that the department agrees with me (laughter) in that regard.

(Interview with Alejandra)

At this stage, we can observe that Alejandra has a sense of comfort and confidence knowing that her own belief agrees with that policy encouraged by the FYWP. Additionally, Alejandra cites her own bilingual background which makes her more accepting of alternative language forms. For Alejandra, the FYWP-supported Statement gives her a sense of freedom and confidence on how

she approaches offering students feedback and which issues she decides to ultimately focus on in her class. In other words, it is apparent that she feels a sense of support from the FYWP regarding her preferred approaches and was more willing to uptake these pedagogical suggestions when working with MLL students.

5.3.3. From Concerns to Calm Conclusions

At the start of Jasmine's first year of teaching, I asked her about her impressions on her international and multilingual students' writing. She promptly replied saying she had this initial concern:

[MLL students were making] multiple grammatical spelling or syntax errors, like per sentence and I think that's something that I am struggling with because it's not a grammar class, and I have so much other stuff to teach them that is more important in terms of what I am responsible for teaching them and I also think it's just more important personally.

(Interview with Jasmine)

In this reflection, Jasmine expresses her concern about some of the more technical grammatical aspects of her international students' writing and thinks of how she will be able to provide the most appropriate feedback. What is notable here is that although she starts her reflection from a position of concern, she eventually talks her way into realizing that this concern should not be part of her teaching priorities, and that there are other more pressing skills she wants to teach her students, which she perceives as her main teaching responsibility. Jasmine understands that in this early stage of her teaching career, her teaching responsibilities depend more on issues of content, which was also echoed in the professional development offered by the

FYWP. However, Jasmine also explicitly notes, like Alejandra, that strictly focusing on grammar issues does not constitute part of her personal beliefs.

At a later point in the interview, Jasmine continued to explain that at the start of the quarter she required all her students to check-in with her once during the first two weeks of the quarter, even if just for a few minutes. She notes that her international and local multilingual students frequently came to her concerned about the quality of their grammar, or sentence-level issues. As she talked her students through their first assignment, she told them that this was not where she wanted them to focus all their efforts. In her own words she explained, “this is not where I want your energy to be. If it's impeding my ability to understand what you're saying in your writing then that's a different matter, but it hasn't.” Again, here Jasmine, as other participants mentioned earlier, uses language that is similar to that of the FYWP’s Statement on Supporting Multilingual Students, whereby she focuses the question of whether the content written by students “impedes comprehension” or not, as suggested in the original FYWP’s Statement (Appendix A). Jasmine emphatically points out that that she never got the sense that her students’ writing style affected her ability to understand their meaning. She then anticipates that later in the quarter she would start flagging particular mistakes based on their “severity and prevalence,” but not before weeks seven or eight which was the recommended timeline offered by the FYWP so that students could learn to focus first on issues of HOCs, such as content.

Following conversations with her multilingual students, Jasmine referred to strategies she would make use of: deferring feedback on LOCs to a later point in the quarter while placing prominence on the importance of issues of content or that of HOCs. While at the start of this first interview, Jasmine indeed expressed her concern about her students’ “grammar,” as the interview continued, she became more comfortable in her resolution to place LOCs as a secondary focus.

Jasmine right away explains to her students that “[grammar is] not the priority at this [early] point in the quarter.” Jasmine never explicitly mentions this Statement on Supporting Multilingual Learners in this first interview, however she does use language very similar to that of the Statement, such as referencing HOCs, LOCs, and mentioning that her students’ grammar does not impede her comprehension of content. In terms of emotions, Jasmine here, at a very early point in her teaching career, seems confident in her decision towards best feedback practices. This confidence may have been further cemented by the clear feedback strategies presented to her during the early stages of her TA orientation.

5.3.4 Conviction that FYWP Policies will Enhance Student Learning

Based on Jasmine’s, Alejandra’s, David’s and Noah’s perspectives, it appears that they all had a common understanding that the purpose of ENGL 101 was to help students learn a range of research-based skills which would help their students explicitly focus on HOCs. Issues of LOCs were to be deferred to a later point in the quarter, once students had gained more confidence and experience with their writing, and at a stage in the quarter when they were able to tackle Outcome 4 of the course: that of revision, editing and proofreading. Another common finding from the interview data is that all TAs participating in this study referred to the likelihood that their students were making use of the writing center and that became a crucial resource to many of their students extending beyond their experiences in ENGL 101. It appears that the FYWP’s Statement on Supporting MLLS notably influenced TAs’ decisions to focus on HOCs of content when providing students feedback. The Statement also helped participants provide their students with a toolkit that would help students on the long run address LOCs of sentence structure, by simply cuing errors in their drafts and detecting trends in their writing. These positive discourses when referring to MLLs and enabling strategies when working with

MLLs helped the participants, all novice TAs, to view themselves as professionally competent to work with diverse populations. They were able to focus on the priorities of their teaching, that of developing students' argumentative and research-based skills. Participants expressed a sense of agency, confidence, and at times freedom in their perceived professional identity which appears to be partly due to the support system and flexibility afforded to all novice TAs within the FYWP, their newfound community of practice. Moreover, throughout the academic year, participants became increasingly aware of the scope of their pedagogical responsibilities whereby they could help their students develop a figurative toolbox that would help them with any future writing scenarios, since students began to learn how to be their own self-editors. Given this approach, TAs participating in this study were consequently better able to focus on effective daily teaching practices and more open to experimenting with new ideas and having a sense of transparency with their students, since they knew there was a limit to their responsibilities; their students would certainly have future opportunities to advance their writing, especially as they had been equipped with some self-editing and revision strategies (as suggested in the Statement on Supporting Multilingual Learners) .

Thus, an analysis of TA narratives shows a more confident and flexibly-oriented approach towards working with multilingual students, as showcased through the experiences of Jasmine, Alejandra, Noah, and David. TAs were ready to uptake the strategies offered by the FYWP with regards to giving students written feedback and would even cite the FYWP's ideology to justify some of their decisions when working with MLL students. The approach espoused by the FYWP when offering professional development to new TAs, and the accompanying Statement on Supporting Multilingual students (with its multiple pathways and options), stands as a solution to the critique offered by Dana Ferris (2009); in her criticism of

many rhetoric-composition programs; Ferris explains that “rare indeed are graduate programs in rhetoric-composition that require coursework that prepares future writing teachers to learn more about second language issues” (2009, p. 68) and that if any such courses are offered, they are typically offered only by the TESOL program, and not the main rhetoric and composition program. In the case of the FYWP, while there was not one required course solely dedicated to teaching L2 writing, there was a more holistic approach where teaching methods based in L2/TESOL research were offered throughout the main TA professional development. These L2 teaching methods, as listed in the Statement on Supporting Multilingual Students, as well as discussed in the initial TA orientation and TA pedagogy course, were presented by the FYWP as methods that would benefit *all* students; working with multilingual students need not be an extra time concern for TAs (as had been expressed by previous cohorts) if they were to follow these well-researched and supported methods for giving students feedback. Given the narratives provided by the participating TAs in this study, they all felt relatively well prepared and at times even comfortable in their work with international and local multilingual students.

5.4 Continued TA Reflections

As demonstrated in the previous section, Jasmine, Alejandra, Noah & David were inclined to adopt the feedback practices espoused by the FYWP. This was especially in relation to deferring LOCs to a later revision-based stage in the quarter, and creating a focus on HOCs as they pertained to issues of content and strength of argument. While the participants appeared overall satisfied with their feedback practices, there were moments of concern regarding the future academic writing contexts some of their multilingual students may face.

As I analyzed the TA narratives, I noted two main responses towards responding to some of these concerns for their MLL students. First, the TAs in this study were quite aware that their

students may eventually work with other teachers who might have a less tolerant approach towards feedback. Within the FYWP, students wrote all assignments over a multiple draft period that culminated into a final portfolio at the end of each quarter. This realization (that other teachers would have different feedback approaches), while sobering at times, was followed by a second practical observation: while the participating TAs were keen to help their MLL students become the best writers they could become, there was a very realistic understanding that the time constraints of a ten-week quarter would not permit students to achieve such accelerated rates of improvement. Nevertheless, Jasmine, Alejandra, Noah and David all felt reassured that they had done their best effort in their teaching and that they had provided their students with the most relevant resources that helped students become their own self editors – a skill that would prove useful beyond their ENGL 101 class.

5.4.1 Future Concerns amidst Practical Realizations

In an interview with Jasmine during her first year of teaching, Jasmine shared some of her strategies for providing different types of feedback such as cueing or highlighting errors on later drafts (as suggested by the FYWP's Statement). Jasmine then noted that perhaps in the future, her MLL students might come across professors who have fewer flexible expectations for their students' writings. She pondered whether her MLL students would wish she had worked much more rigorously with them on their "grammar" or LOCs. However, within that same instance, Jasmine replied to herself saying "It's a question of balancing what my responsibilities are, what I can do, but not going overboard." Notably, in this moment, Jasmine showcases that she is well aware of the extent of her teaching responsibilities and that there is a limit to the amount of support she can offer her MLL students, specifically within that short 10-week period. Jasmine here is acutely aware of the time element in spite of this reflective statement being at an

early stage in her first quarter of teaching. This realization, and her word choice around “responsibilities,” once again reflect the FYWP’s suggested feedback practices as stated in the Statement for Supporting Multilingual Students presented during the TA orientation. It is likely that having these suggested practices in place, in terms of how and to what extent TAs need to give “grammar” feedback to their students, helped Jasmine feel more secure in her current approach towards her feedback to her students. Jasmine’s concern however, when she refers to future possible professors her students may encounter, does indeed showcase this underlying tension between students’ future possible needs and her actual current time constraints and the extent of her teaching responsibilities.

When I asked Jasmine, what her approach was towards addressing sentence-level issues or grammar, she replied saying that she would often during office hours walk her students through some practice exercises and offer some resources. She admitted though that she did not think her students made direct use of these resources. She was careful to not cue any errors until the draft before the last version was due. In some instances, the process was not as smooth as she would have liked it to be. She explained as follows:

And the last paper I cued for grammar, I just circled everything that was in error. I didn’t correct it. And it was insane how much extra time it takes up. Like, I basically read – I would just do a readthrough for content and respond, and then I would do a readthrough for grammar.... I said to them I required one presentation-ready draft. And that was something that I didn’t like spring it on them.

(Interview with Jasmine)

At this point in the quarter, Jasmine was reviewing her approach to grammar and she did express some concern over not having done enough; however, she presents some of the solutions she

suggested to her students. One of the main takeaway points she offered her students was that they would be required to present only one paper that was representative of a “presentation-ready draft” to use for presenting Outcome 4, as required by the FYWP, which focuses on revision, editing, and proofreading. Jasmine was clear with her students on this requirement at an early point in the quarter and offered them some suggestions such as going to the writing center for extra help on the sentence-level component of their writing. She mentioned that she had wanted to spend more time on grammar issues in class by having her students do in-class grammar presentations, but there had not been enough time in her teaching schedule. It is worth noting that during our fifth and last interview, Jasmine’s approach to teaching grammar had become more relaxed and she felt more confident in her approach as will be showcased in a subsequent section.

An interview with Alejandra also helped shed light on how TAs tackled the concern of improving students’ grammar or sentence-level issues. I had asked Alejandra about the final grading process and whether she noticed any difference in her approach towards grading final portfolios by MLL writers. She replied saying, “I think I was definitely more lenient with issues like grammar.” The topic of addressing “issues of grammar” had been one that was repeated throughout the course of our interviews. Alejandra would often point out that she did want to provide more time for her students to work on grammar and to test out some of the sample lesson plans discussed in ENGL 500, and that this would have been beneficial to all students (whether multilingual or not); however, there was never enough time to cover everything she wanted to do, especially with the four required course outcomes. During our third interview, after one quarter of teaching, Alejandra commented on these specific issues saying:

We didn’t have time to talk about grammar at all, and I just didn’t feel it was fair to evaluate anyone, not just my international students, pretty much anyone on their grammar

when we hadn't really covered it...I expected it to be coherent and neat, but I wasn't going to look at the details. I didn't tend to pay a ton of attention to it. Especially because I hadn't been commenting a whole lot on it the entire quarter and we just didn't have time. Like, we, in 500 talked about different, like, grammar lessons we could do, but honestly, we didn't have time.

(Interview with Alejandra)

Alejandra continues to explain that despite this time crunch, she still expected that her students' writing be coherent enough that any grammar issues were not impeding her comprehension of their work. Here Alejandra repeatedly points towards the lack of time being a key issue in her decision to not specifically address grammar in her classroom and her conscious decision to not penalize any of her students, multilingual or not, in their final portfolios in reference to their grammar. To her, it was a matter of fairness given all the other course outcomes that were required of them. Alejandra did once again reiterate the type of discourse used in the Statement for Supporting Multilingual Students, albeit in her own words by saying, their sentence-level issues "wasn't getting in the way of me understanding what was going on and what their argument was." Here Alejandra leans on the pedagogical advice she received from the TA orientation, which highlights that grammar and sentence level issues must not *impede* comprehension and that students are still accountable for one paper to be representative of Outcome 4: that of revision, editing and proofreading. The Statement for Supporting Multilingual Students does suggest finding time to address specific grammar issues later in the quarter and especially if they are more apparent as a pattern for specific students. However, the Statement overall places much more value on issues of HOCs in student writing. In this short excerpt, it seems that Alejandra displayed a confident stance towards her decision to not focus

too much on grammar and justified it from a practical perspective (that of time constraints), but also from a pedagogical perspective (that based on FYWP's recommendations).

As Alejandra became more comfortable with her teaching practices throughout her first year of teaching, she confided that she now felt a lesser amount of "guilt" about not giving too much attention to grammar in her feedback to students. She then described her reasoning and her increased sense of confidence in her decision that sometimes, focusing on grammar was not the most relevant in terms of feedback to her students. Alejandra explained the following:

[Grammar] is not a priority right now [for student's writing], it's not my priority and I'm just not going to put as much of an emphasis on that when I'm evaluating their work...I'll, like, maybe circle some issues. You know, I brought in... couple lessons in class to things that were coming up a lot that were, like, you know, maybe getting in the way of my understanding, if I was getting these long, like, passive voice sentences or, like, you know, the "who" and "that"...

(Interview with Alejandra)

Here we begin to notice that Alejandra has started to set her priorities. She states that working on issues of grammar is not her "priority." She approaches the issue of sentence-structure or grammar issues on a case-by-case basis and offers students suggestions in their papers. However, up to this point, her students' writing needs as a whole did not require her to fully address issues of grammar, and as she continued to gain more experience in her teaching, Alejandra embraced her decision with more conviction. It is also possible once again to suggest that the extent of her confidence may stem from the suggested policies of the FYWP's Statement for Supporting Multilingual Students whereby she followed its suggested feedback practices, given that the errors she described in her student writing did not impede comprehension.

At a later point during the research process, Alejandra who was then in her second year of teaching, mentioned she had a number of multilingual students in her class and that their final portfolios were some of the best work produced in her class. At that phase in her teaching career, Alejandra seemed more established in her pedagogical approaches and was considerably more confident about her pedagogical decisions, specifically those related to working with MLLs. Alejandra started to once again reflect on her views when I asked her how her most recent portfolio-grading process had been going. She mentioned her MLL students, both international and local, in a favorable light as she thought of their work in her class. When I enquired whether she had noticed any sentence-level issues in their writing, she said there had been some and that she adopted the highlighting approach as suggested by the FYWP's Statement for Supporting Multilingual Students. In one instance, a Chinese student was keen to address these specific writing errors and wanted to learn how to "fix" them. Alejandra said she thought that was within the student's right since the student was "really incorporating my feedback, which was good, but I felt like ... you don't have to do exactly what I say (laughter). You can sort-of put your own spin on it." Here Alejandra appears to trust her students' ability to improve their own writing, and she gives them the freedom to make certain choices besides those directly provided by her.

In my last interview with Noah, during his second year of teaching, he also shared Alejandra's perception that some of his international students' portfolios were "noticeably better" and showcased much better writing than what they had produced at the start of the quarter. He believed this improvement, in addition to his highlighting of specific errors, was also partly due to students frequenting the writing center, and that this was a productive approach for students in the long run since he would not be there in the future to "fix [their] senior thesis." Again, here we see an instance of TAs practically thinking of their students' future writing

situations and contemplating how they could best succeed in their future writing endeavors.

Similar to Alejandra and Jasmine, Noah also believed that focusing on grammar was not the best use of his class time. He articulated part of his perception of the purpose of ENGL 101:

This is not a grammar class. It's just not. You get grammar when you take a foreign language class to learn what the language is. This is a class about... Really, it's a class about thinking. It's about putting thoughts together logically and making an argument. I know that might sound cold, but they're getting... The best thing we can do for their grammar is to go to college in an English-speaking country. They'll internalize it, eventually. But, nobody wants to hear me talk about appositives.

(Interview with Noah)

Noah here does not explicitly refer the FYWP's Statement on Supporting MLL Students; his position appears to be more from a personal conviction and by virtue of his own language learning experiences. Noah states that detailed grammar lessons are not the most productive use of his teaching time and that by the nature of students' daily exposure to English, they would likely improve considerably in their language use. Particularly in this instance, Noah seems to be strictly referring to international students, and not local MLLs who have lived for a number of years in the USA. In addition, Noah also appears to be confident in his understanding that the main purpose of ENGL 101 is to help advance students' critical thinking and to build their argumentation skills, which is confirmed by how the four ENGL 101 course outcomes are established- only Outcome 4 refers to revising, editing, and proofreading, whereas the rest of the outcomes tackle what is better known as HOCs such as critical thinking, argument development, and an understanding of rhetorical strategies.

In this previous exchange during Noah's second year of teaching, he continues to be confident in his approach towards teaching MLL students and in his strategies when providing written feedback. Nevertheless, towards the middle of his first year of teaching, Noah did express some concern that there were moments when he was unsure whether some of his international students had a clear understanding of the ongoing class discussion. In one instance Noah expressed the following: "it's this constant anxiety of not knowing if they are communicating what they mean to you or if what you're saying is actually – the extent to which is being understood." Noah during that first year went on to say that at times he wished he had more preparation to help him work effectively with international students. Notably, Noah did not express any such concerns in this second year of teaching. This leads to the question of whether a) novice teachers become more adept at meeting their students' needs through the expertise they developed and/or b) whether it is through such expertise that they gain an understanding that time is needed for students' writing to improve by the end of the quarter.

As I met with David for our last interview, similar to other participants, he also expressed that while there may be some concerns brought forward by his peers (not participants in this study) that TAs are doing students a disservice by not fully tackling their grammar issues, he personally believed that this was an "empty statement" that had little validity to it. As he continued to provide his rationale, David quickly zoned in on the time restrictions experienced by all TAs due to the short quarter system. He explained the following:

There's an economy here, and that economy is an economy of *time* (emphasis added).

And we have a certain amount of time and a certain...there's also an economy of *attention* (emphasis added). And the student only has a certain amount of attention and time that they can give and I only have a certain amount of attention and time I can give. So, in

finding the balance between that, there's simply no way to do it at all. And like I said, for me, I don't think I'm doing a disservice to the student by foregrounding one thing that is, I believe at least to be the purpose of this class, over another, that also is something that is more specific. So, for me... The biggest thing for me is that the higher order concerns are more generalizable.

(Interview with David)

In this narrative, David reiterates what Noah said earlier: that the purpose of ENGL 101 is to help students become more adept at developing their arguments and critical thinking skills, which are described by the FYWP as HOCs. Similarly, Jasmine & Alejandra, also clarified that their main focus was to help students grasp some of these higher order concepts to better strengthen their arguments. Like all other participants, David here stresses how time constraints, or the “economy of time,” is what holds him back from realistically being able to address all of his MLL students’ sentence-level issues. What is unique about David’s response here is that he also places an emphasis on the “economy of attention”: attention that students can give to all the sentence-level (or LOCs) feedback they may receive, but also the amount of attention that he, as a novice TA, can dedicate to his students’ writings. In this excerpt, it is clear that David understands the scope of his responsibilities, and that he understands the challenge in achieving an appropriate balance that allows him to become a teacher who meets the most pressing needs of his students, which in his view, is that of HOCs, as also expressed by the FYWP.

Moreover, David, similar to Alejandra, Jasmine, and Noah, also thinks forward about the future learning contexts of his students and shows care over their future experiences. In one specific interview towards the end of his first year of teaching, David brings up the term “metacognition” which was used in his TA training and explored as a term in ENGL 500, the

graduate pedagogy course. David expressed some concern that in some contexts, the term “metacognition” may lose its meaning by only being explored on a surface level; however, he was keen to clarify that when employed well in teaching, the concept of “metacognition” certainly could have a positive impact on students’ learning whereby, “they can take the small lessons we learn in this class and turn them into big lessons throughout the rest of their education or their life.” Here David is thinking of the impact of his teaching, going beyond academic life and more into the practical daily experiences of his students. David noted that for students, keeping this metacognitive mindset was crucial, especially as “you can’t make anybody a great writer in 10 weeks. You’re not going to turn somebody into an A+ writer out of nowhere.” Again, David, similar to his peers in this study, is understanding of the time constraints of a quarter system and, like his peers, he believes in the merits of the process of writing and learning, and how improvement cannot be sudden, but must be iterative and ongoing.

When examining his feedback practices, David considered his experiences when with working with MLLs. He expressed that he agreed with the concept of “reading through error” and the specific accompanying feedback practices, as suggested by the FYWP based on SLW research. He believed that he would be doing MLL students a “disservice” if he penalized them for issues of LOCs and that “it was important to give students their due” and to grade them on the merits of their arguments which was the bigger focus of their learning goals. He then recalled an instance where one of his international students had not done well on a paper; David clarified that “it’s not that it wasn’t good because of the writer’s inability to express themselves through language. It was not good because the claims were not there.” David, similar to Alejandra, Jasmine and Noah, stresses that the focus of ENGL 101 is to help students advance their argument-writing and critical thinking, and that strictly focusing on sentence-level issues may

hold back some of their MLL students' advancement as they grapple with new ideas and thought processes. In this same interview, David reflected on some of his work with his students:

Different people acquire a different approach and that much is a given, but not letting a person improve in the areas that we're trying to make them improve on or trying to let them improve on (pause) so writing to meet these core outcomes because they're so bogged down by the inability to write in a language that it's not their own. And I guess part of it, too, is that we're not just teaching them... to write good essays in English or to write well in English, we're teaching them to write well regardless of language. So, if somebody's from China, then we're teaching them to write something well and to argue reasonably and think through these things in Mandarin or whatever as well. So, I think to me it just seems unfair.

(Interview with David)

David here is once again referring to the need to help students specifically learn Outcome 3 from the FYWP's course goals, that of producing "complex, analytic, persuasive arguments that matter in academic contexts." David here justifies the FYWP's focus on HOCs. In his own words, simply focusing on sentence-level issues as an indicator of good writing would be "unfair" and detrimental to students' progress since expecting students to place their complete attention on LOCs can in many ways limit their ability to learn more relevant core outcomes of his course. This sentiment, of assessing what may be fair or unfair to students, was also expressed by Alejandra earlier as she reflected back on her MLL students' work.

Through the teacher narratives of Alejandra, Jasmine, and Noah, it appears that they are all keenly aware of how the element of time, the process of multiple-draft writing with error cueing, in addition to the possible frequenting of the writing center, can all eventually lead to the

advancements of their MLL students' writings and the quality of their arguments. It is not an instant process and it is apparent that all participants, while wishfully contemplative of being able to do more for their students, are practically grounded in the realization that they will always have a limited period of time within a ten-week quarter. At this point in their early teaching career, they understand that they are accountable for getting students to have at least one draft in their portfolio that demonstrates students' ability to "develop flexible strategies for revising, editing, and proofreading writing" as required by the FYWP's Outcome 4. That is the extent of their teaching responsibility, as long as students are able to redraft other papers and work with their teachers' feedback to demonstrate Outcomes 1, 2, and 3, which all focus on elements of HOCs. This reassurance appears to provide Alejandra, Jasmine, and Noah with a stronger sense of confidence towards their self-perceived competence and success as novice teachers; the participants here all exhibit positive feelings, unlike the feelings of uncertainty expressed by previous cohorts, as disclosed to me during my interviews with WPAs which are discussed in Chapter 4.

5.4.2 Normalizing MLL Students' Needs

A positive consequence of the Statement for Supporting Multilingual Students, as voiced by Alejandra, was that the suggested practices based in Second Language Writing research helped with feedback practices for *all* students, regardless of their language and cultural backgrounds. In my final interview with Alejandra, I asked whether she had anticipated at the start of her teaching that she would have a high number of multilingual students in her class. She explained to me that it did not come as a surprise since they had been informed of the recent increase in the MLL student population during their TA orientation. She pointed out that it they were told that at times "a third of your class, or sometimes even more" may be international or

multilingual students. I asked Alejandra about her initial reactions upon first learning that news. Upon reflecting on the Statement for Supporting Multilingual Students and the increased numbers of enrolled multilingual students, Alejandra explained:

I think it was a bit intimidating at first (working with diverse populations), but then it became clear pretty quickly that... I don't know, a lot of the same concepts apply, like native speakers and non-native speakers have similar problems in their writing. It's making an effective argument, and using evidence, and all of these things. I think it's... It can kind of all apply

(Interview with Alejandra)

The above perspective presented by Alejandra matches the departmental shift in policies expressed by the FYWP, that multilingual students' needs are very similar to all students' needs, regardless of their language background. During my interviews, the participants explained (as also demonstrated earlier) that even though they did not focus on grammar in their classes, multilingual students generally present much improved final portfolios when compared to the quality of their writing at the beginning of the quarter. Alejandra noted in her second year of teaching that there really was only ever one instance where she could not actually comprehend what one of her international students was writing in his paper. She did point out that this one particular student in general had missed many classes and rarely appeared to engage with the classroom discussion. Alejandra explained that she "didn't feel like [his writing skills were] really reflective of international students as a whole," as this appeared to her as an anomaly from the usual attitudes adopted by multilingual students across all her classes.

During Alejandra's third quarter of teaching, she recalled talking to one student from Pakistan who was genuinely concerned about this ability to enroll in a FYC class and had asked

whether he should enroll in a later quarter. During that conversation Alejandra responded to the student saying, “I really think it’s an advantage that you come from a multilingual background, especially because of the topics we cover...you have a perspective on these issues that a lot of people in the class can’t bring to the table.” In this instance with her Pakistani student, Alejandra is careful to highlight to him the assets that he brings to the class, and she is keen on boosting his sense of confidence by adding value to his own personal experience and background. While Alejandra’s decision to support her students in such a way may have stemmed from her own personal beliefs (and possibly due to her own multilingual background), the language she uses here is very supportive. She points out directly to her MLL students that they bring their own resources to each class and that this can be a benefit to them as well as others. This positively framed discourse in reference to MLL students is similar to how the Statement for Supporting Multilingual Students also depicts MLL students, explaining that they are “contributing to our campus’ linguistic and cultural diversity and enriching the perspectives students bring to the work of reading and writing in our classes” (excerpt from Statement).

In a different instance in this study, towards the end of Jasmine’s first quarter of teaching, I had asked her what she thought of the classroom dynamics, specifically in terms of small and large classroom discussions. Jasmine talked about her class with optimism saying, that overall “it’s been positive.” She describes moments of working with multilingual students:

such joy to watch them go from, like, completely just not confident in the slightest, like, never raising their hand...never speaking up, um, to just, like, sitting in the front row, like [to now], always super-engaged and really excited about their paper.

(Interview with Jasmine)

When I enquired as to why that might be the case, that her multilingual students were now more willing to participate and clearly engaged, Jasmine responded that in some cases it was mostly due to “positive reinforcement.” Jasmine explained that in some cases their increased participation may be due to one-on-one conversations with her and giving them a bit of guidance, but also importantly “placing value, like, on their work and on the things that they’re thinking about.” This latter point appears to have had made a significant difference in her students’ level of confidence and belief in the value of their work. Jasmine reiterates how positively reinforcing what her students already know and building on that can have clearly favorable consequences in their sense of engagement in the classroom – a concept similarly reinforced during her TA professional development. Jasmine continued to reflect on her students’ improvement in their writing and class participation during this first quarter, and her narrative showcases a strong sense of optimism about their potential and feelings of pride on what they have all achieved thus far. In this exchange, Jasmine feels a sense of accomplishment through her multilingual students’ sense of increased comfort in her class.

Jasmine’s experiences when working with MLL students, relatively similar to those of Alejandra’s experiences noted earlier, demonstrate a positive sentiment and an encouraging outlook on the possibilities of designing assignments that better include the experiences and needs of multilingual students. While initially at the start of Jasmine’s teaching she had some concerns, she then presented her experience of working with MLL students as eventual wins. When I met with Jasmine for our first interview, she told me that she had around 60% of her students identified as international or multilingual. Jasmine had by far the highest number of international and MLL students in her class when compared to other participants in this study. She did admit that at first, she could not understand the speech of some of her students, which

certainly made her feel concerned at the start. In such an instance she told me that for a couple of her MLL students, she had a “really had a hard time understanding what they were saying, so that made me (pause) you know a little bit nervous. God! If I can't even understand them, how am I going to be able to help them?” This concern however dissipated as the quarter progressed and she became more familiar with her students, and their accents, and as her students become more accustomed to her class and her approach to teaching.

As I continued my interviews with Jasmine, she took note of some of the pedagogical practices she used in her classes to help improve student participation, especially for her international and local multilingual students, whom she described as being less vocal in bigger class discussions, especially at the start of the quarter. Jasmine mentioned that she tried to “*scaffold* (emphasis added) everything...when they read a text, I like to have them do, you know, have to put an online discussion comment on there so that they have something to say the next day when they come into class.” Here Jasmine is referring to the classroom management system Canvas, where classroom materials are made available in advance and where she posts discussion questions for everyone to respond to before coming to class the next day. Notably here Jasmine uses the term *scaffold*, which was a pedagogical term frequently used during the TA orientation to help TAs understand best practices regarding student assignments, once again showing how TAs made use of (or that there was uptake of) the strategies offered to them by the FYWP. Some of these approaches encouraged the usage of more written cues such as handouts as an additional source of information for her students, which provided directions to students beyond a teacher’s verbal instructions. Another approach as mentioned earlier was the use of online discussion boards to help students prepare for classroom discussions in advance, as well as in-class free writes to help generate more discussion points. This free-writing approach is

different from the more commonly used approach of brainstorming right away in small groups, where MLL students may not have enough time to fully articulate the extent of their ideas to their peers.

Jasmine had also mentioned that she made use of techniques offered during the ENGL 500 MLL student panel, where TAs experienced with working with MLL students offered a series of pedagogical tips for working with international and local multilingual students. After she had experimented with different approaches, Jasmine commented that, “I can see the difference because there are some international students who I’ve seen really improve,”, due to some of the changes she made in class. She commented, however, that some students are still not participating as well as she’d like them to and given that she can see the difference in engagement, she’s actively thinking of ways to do more “to help” other students, too. At this point in her quarter, Jasmine is sensing a noticeable improvement in her multilingual students’ work and is showing a positive disposition towards possibilities for future endeavors and pedagogical tips she can use in her classroom.

During Jasmine’s first quarter of teaching specifically, she decided to make some changes to her course readings once she realized the high number of multilingual students enrolled in her class. She assigned the reading “Mother Tongue” by Amy Tan, which was recommended to her by one of her peer TAs who shared her office space. This reading was quite relatable to a lot of her students who came from China, given the experiences of Amy Tan’s mother who was Chinese herself. Introducing this reading, according to Jasmine, led to an engaging discussion format in class. In this instance, Jasmine was quick to respond to the needs of her student demographics and catered towards their interests in different languages and cultures. This particular text also demonstrated the unfortunate racist attitudes shown towards

certain accents. Jasmine also explained that during ENGL 500, the required pedagogy course for all new TAs, they had discussed a journal article entitled “Language Difference in Writing: Towards a Translingual Approach” by Horner, Lu, Royster & Trimbur. This specific pedagogy-based discussion, according to Jasmine, “influenced” part of her decision to include an assignment for her students that encouraged them to make use of translingualism themselves and to use their own mother tongues or languages in a similar way to how Langston Hughes wrote the poem “Theme for English B.” The second part of the assignment involved students offering commentary on their language choices in their writing. This assignment could also be addressed by using different forms of dialects so that all students could feel involved in their writing, not just her multilingual students. Upon learning about this writing assignment, her students “audibly gasped” and were surprised by the flexibility this assignment offered them in terms of language choice. Jasmine explained in more detail saying:

So I said – that’s the prompt, but you have to do it in your mother tongue. So, they were like shocked. They were like, oh my g – like, do you mean I get to write, like, in Chinese? And I was like, yeah, you can, you can – I let them do, like, a visual text. One guy wrote like, designed a comic – I mean, one page, so not tons, but some of them, like, did a photo and a caption. One guy wrote a comic strip. And they were in all different languages. Some of them sort-of like poetic style, some of them are – quite a lot of them are visual...But so then in Part 2, obviously, because I can’t read Chinese and all that, they had to talk about their decisions as a writer and, like, why...[they made specific writing choices].

(Interview with Jasmine)

Jasmine here was rather confident in her choice to experiment with completely novel formats for her assignments and even encouraged her students to use their native languages, some of which she herself did not understand. She addressed this second concern by asking them for a short rhetorical commentary to justify their writing choices. It would seem that some of Jasmine's choices were informed by her keen awareness of her students' learning preferences and her willingness to provide them with materials and assignments that they could easily relate to and create a more inclusive classroom environment for her multilingual students. The approach she adopts, is well advocated by the FYWP itself, whereby in the main TA orientation, there's a clear call to encourage TAs to see multilingual students as an asset to the program and they can contribute in different ways. They each come with their own set of expertise. In this particular instance, Jasmine explains that she was hoping her students would be able to share some of their experiences from living abroad and moving to the USA, and consequently share their different cultural experiences. While Jasmine explained that her choice of assignment came to be because of her class population, it appears that the ENGL 500 discussion on translingualism resulted in a positive resolution on her part to offer a less traditional assignment option, that would open up more options for her multilingual students, and that would also be appealing to native English-speaking students. She cites one example from a native English speaker who used California surfer lingo in this particular assignment. Jasmine added that her reasoning for assigning this translingual assignment was very much because she had so many international students and she wanted to validate their previous learning and language experiences in their home countries. She explained that as someone whose "business is teaching," she finds that her role is to "advocate" for her students and she does not want them to simply harp on ideas such as "Oh, my writing is terrible and my grammar is wrong," but that they should feel they have so much to offer in this

new USA-based academic situation. Here, as in other instances, Jasmine saw herself as an advocate for her students and as someone who could provide them with a welcoming space to experiment with their multilingual identities and language choices.

In a similar manner, to help with student engagement and representation, David also worked on incorporating the preferences of his multilingual students, who were less open to participating in big class discussions. David mentioned that at the start of the course he would tell his students “participating is made up in different ways. So, if they come into my office hours, I count that too.” He would also encourage particular students who worked in small group discussions to at times report out to the bigger group, and in such a way he would also make their participation count. Here David was careful to accommodate different preferences for communication, which would allow some MLL students to feel that they could still be an active part of the classroom community, though not through the US-centric approach of oral participation.

Another instance of adopting pedagogical approaches that could better support MLL students’ needs was revealed during an interview with Alejandra. She had told me that during that quarter she had five international students enrolled in her class, and an even larger number of MLLs if she considered the MLL students in her class who were local. She explained to me that her strategies in class were typically the same as her previous quarters, and that she was trying to make a more deliberate effort at using the board more often or giving more written instructions in general to help her MLL students. Both of these techniques were recommended by the FYWP as tools for working with an increasingly multilingual student population. Alejandra also added that some of her Chinese international students were using their native language during small-class discussions and she pointed out that she was “fine” with their

approach to discussions. I asked Alejandra why that was the case, and whether this sentiment stemmed from her own personal conviction or whether it was more driven by her institutional training. She replied explaining:

I feel like the important thing is that they're understanding the concepts and learning. And when we have the full class discussion, at least a couple of them will participate in English and ...And even though I don't understand what they're saying (in small group discussions), I can tell by what's going on that they are working on my class materials... I think maybe because I'm multilingual I wanna be respectful of other students' languages and I'm like, well, if they learn better talking things out in their native language first before we have the full class discussion, that's really fine with me. I mean, the important thing I think is that they just understand the concepts. I think part of it might have come from ENGL 500 and those discussions about how to be respectful where international students are coming from, and part of it may be from my own experience.

(Interview with Alejandra)

This excerpt presents an insightful revelation by Alejandra where she explicitly refers to her own multilingual background and points out her understanding of how her multilingual students may feel more comfortable having small-group discussions in their native language. Alejandra pointed out that part of her reasoning may stem from discussions started in ENGL 500. More specifically, in this instance Alejandra is likely referring to the principles presented in the now well cited Student's Right to their Own Language statement, most recently affirmed in 2014 by the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC). One notable recommendation from the CCCC statement affirms "students' right 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. This particular statement is what Alejandra recalls from a MLL pedagogy session discussion in her main ENGL 500 class, and this CCCC statement is also representative of the FYWP's updated stance on working with multilingual students, as evident in the TA orientation. Alejandra also attests that her own language background and affiliation to her students' multilingualism made her easily accept their approach of using their first-languages during in-class small discussions, so long as this was conducive to the overall goals of the class. This narrative thus provides an example of how Alejandra's personal beliefs meshed suitably with the policies of the FYWP which clearly advocated for the benefits of working with an increasingly multilingual student population.

5.4.3 A Consensus on Purpose and Methods

Through this chapter, we better understand the initial stages of a novice teacher's teaching career and the sentiments that are unique to this stage. This is specifically in the context of a writing program that framed itself as a teacher development program, and whose purpose was to prepare graduate students for a future career in teaching that would extend beyond their years of teaching in the FYWP. The previous chapter, Chapter 4, helped us witness a series of changes initiated by the FYWP with regards to the new TA orientation and writing pedagogy course (ENGL 500) as a response to concerns expressed by previous cohorts of TAs who had experienced an abrupt shift in the student population. Through the TAs' narratives explored in this chapter, we find that their experiences corroborate many of the reflections presented in the WPAs' narratives - that novice TAs were feeling more in control of their feedback practices, their teaching methods, and less anxious about how to best work with an increasingly diverse student population. Overall, the novice TAs participating in this study felt supported by the FYWP, and were all convinced by the feedback strategies offered to them when working with

MLL students, and thus were willing to uptake many of these strategies. By re-envisioning the TA orientation and the suggested feedback practices, and repeatedly presenting MLL students in a favorable light, the FYWP succeeded in alleviating the potential anxieties that had previously been faced by novice TAs working with an increasingly linguistically diverse group of students. The TAs participating also felt a sense of confidence that they could become independent teachers with the freedom to experiment with different approaches in their teaching given the trust the FYWP had placed in them from the start. This element of trust that the FYWP established, along with the openness to the possible challenges TAs would face when teaching (but by also providing possible solutions through resources), played a key role in the participants' sense of optimism, and even sense of security as they embarked upon their newly-developing teaching career within this new community of practice.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS and RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Summary

Throughout this study, I have investigated the FYWP's shifts in policy, which were initiated by responding to TAs' professional uncertainties when working with an increasingly multilingual student population. Through the narratives of WPAs involved in these departmental changes (Chapter 4) and narratives revealing the experiences of non-TESOL trained novice TAs (Chapter 5), this study showcases the benefits gained from utilizing research and best practices based in SLW in the contexts of FYC programs. This cross-disciplinary effort pursued by the FYWP, through a collaborative approach, presents a case for eliminating the perceived disciplinary isolation between the fields of TESOL and FYC (Matsuda, 1999). This dissertation highlights the necessity of implementing change locally within institutions by genuinely addressing TAs' concerns and anxieties through innovative pedagogical approaches introduced through professional development.

6.2 Current-Day Political Ramifications

While at the start of my research there was a marked increase in international student enrollment within the US, it with worth pausing and examining the effects of more recent political changes and policies. In light of President Trump's 2016 election win, and the ensuing travel bans on a majority of Muslim-specific countries (travel.state.gov), the recent difficulties associated with travel to the US have been cited as a cause in the lower enrollment of international students in higher education institutions across the US. A recent publication by *Insider Higher Ed* highlighted that "new [enrollment figures of] international students fell by 6.6 percent at US universities in fall 2017" and it appears this decline has continued into 2018

(insidehighered.com). According to Open Doors data for the academic year 2017-18, the number of international students from China showed a 4% increase, whereas enrollment of students from South Korea, Mexico, Canada, and Iran showed a decrease in undergraduate student enrollment, with Iran showing the most noted change with an estimated 16.8 percent decrease in undergraduate student enrollment (insidehighered.com).

At this point in time there is not enough evidence to prove that the Trump administration's policies or rhetoric have had a direct effect on the reduced international student enrollment from certain countries. However, "international educators have been deeply concerned that international students could be deterred by more restrictive policies on coupled with the Trump administration's rhetoric on immigration" (insidehighered.com). As more enrollment figures become accessible, higher education institutions will be better able to assess the impacts of these administrative policies on international student enrollment. All these figures help us understand international student enrollment numbers; nevertheless, institutions remain unclear on the numbers of local multilingual students who do not identify as L1 English speakers. As such, attention to the needs of multilingual students remains a crucial goal as MLL students, whether they be international or local, form an integral part of the overall student population. As voiced through interview data from WPAs and TAs participating in this study (Chapters 4 & 5), addressing the needs multilingual students through improved teaching practices can also help *all* other students' learning needs, regardless of their language backgrounds.

6.3 Limitations of the Study

This study provides a rarely seen insider's perspective on the steps and changes involved in updating an FYC program's professional development to better meet the needs of multilingual

students, and to better professionalize novice TAs working with an increasingly diverse and multilingual student population. Nevertheless, given the scope of this study, which provides insight on one specific program, that of the FYWP at PU, it is understandable that the findings presented in this dissertation are context-specific. Duff and Ochida however (1997) remind us that ethnographic research allows for a focus on “local contexts of practice” and recognizes “the importance of incorporating multiple points of view in relation to observed phenomena” (pp. 457-458), which in the case of this study is that of the FYWP and the changes enacted in the program.

The nature of ethnographic case-studies (as utilized in this research) allows for an in-depth understanding of the experiences of novice TAs working closely with MLL students at an early point in their teaching careers, when they are still negotiating the best practices to adopt for their teaching. In the case of this study, there appeared to be a clear uptake of the resources and suggested teaching practices proposed by the FYWP, and specifically references to the feedback practices offered by the Statement on Supporting Multilingual Students. Moreover, through qualitative research methods, extensive interview data analysis, and narrative inquiry, this study provides an examination of the rationale of the FYWP’s WPAs when they worked towards overhauling the professional development program and resources offered to incoming TAs. As the next section of this conclusion will reveal, these developments in professional development are still ongoing at the FYWP and strive to include and respond to a broader range of student diversity.

6.4 Recent Developments in the FYWP

As is the nature of any ethnographic study that takes place over multiple years, changes are bound to occur. Therefore, I consulted with the current Program Director of the FYWP to

gain a more current perspective on updated pedagogical approaches related to working with MLLs. In the process of my data analysis in Chapters 4 and 5, I had noted that the ENGL 500 required pedagogy course had begun to refer to important scholarly work based on the pedagogy of translingualism. In my communication with the current Program Director, I learned about a number of updates in the FYWP's TA professional development which I briefly describe in this final section.

In the past year, the FYWP updated parts of its main textbook as well as Course Outcomes to support linguistic diversity, in part for MLLs students, but also more broadly and deliberately to encompass the needs of *all* students. This initiative was part of a “broader ideological shift toward conceiving all classroom spaces and language use as inherently diverse and operating across various asymmetrical power inequities. [These shifts] are influenced by a translingual, anti-discriminatory, and more deeply rhetorical orientation” (communication with current Program Director). In addition to developing the revised Course Outcomes based on philosophies of translingualism, there has also been a consideration of rhetorical feminist theories and ethical communicative practices. In essence, the updated FYWP's Course Outcomes take a strong stance against monolingual assumptions and seek more deliberately to move towards a “translingual orientation to language as emergent, fluid, dynamic, rooted in space and time, influenced by power, as tied to meaning making across differences, genres, etc.” (communication with current Program Director).

Moreover, the FYWP's one-week TA orientation has now an even more focused shift towards “issues of equity and inclusion and diversity” (current Program Director). TAs are encouraged to investigate how questions of “equity and power” play a crucial role regarding all aspects of teaching, starting from assignment design to the specifics of assessment. To better

negotiate these questions, the FYWP's professional development now incorporates into the TA training works such as Asao B. Inoue's research on anti-racist assessment as well as Jerry Won Lee's work that investigates translingual assessment. One example of an updated resource offered to novice TAs is the "Negotiating Diversities" workshop. Below is part of an overview of this specific workshop that is offered through ENGL 500, the required pedagogy course for all incoming TAs teaching at the FYWP.

The goal of this workshop is to develop and share teaching practices that recognize and mobilize diversity (linguistic, cultural, learning styles, ideological, forms/modes of communication) as the norm in our classrooms while also being responsive to our institutional requirements and personal philosophies. You are encouraged to consider how a range of pedagogical tools and approaches might be used to accommodate and negotiate diversity, as you choose to define it for your general practice and for this specific assignment.

(Negotiating Diversities workshop description, as offered by the current Program Director).

As can be noted from the above workshop description, the FYWP currently highlights a broader definition of diversity which includes linguistic diversity (the focus of this dissertation) as well other forms of diversity such as that of culture, learning style, ideological, and forms or modes of communication.

As a continuing trajectory of the efforts for addressing the needs of MLL students explored in this study (Chapters 4 & 5), the FYWP's current Program Director affirmed that those previous efforts have now coalesced into an ideology that helps students [and TAs teaching these goals] to prepare for writing situations that are "linguistically, culturally, and

socioeconomically diverse [in their] contexts (draft of the FYWP's Mission Statement at the time of publishing this dissertation). While the scope of this study does not permit for a full exploration of the more recent changes adopted by the FYWP at PU, the updated Mission Statement builds on previous values adopted by the FYWP which were examined in Chapter 4. In other words, the current FYWP Mission Statement goes beyond establishing linguistic diversity as the *norm*, but more specifically focuses on an encompassing view that establishes the importance of “writing curriculum, assessment practices, and language policies that acknowledge linguistic differences as the *norm of communication* (emphasis added)” (draft of the FYWP's Mission Statement). Another deliberate development recently initiated by the FYWP involved creating a grant entitled “Materializing Translingual Pedagogies in the Classroom” to encourage graduate students to develop relevant and tangible materials that can be used by other graduate students in their FYC classrooms. This grant aims to create “tangible pedagogical materials on enacting translingual pedagogy” and aims to steer away from complicated jargon and provide access to more meaningful and practical classroom materials. Examples of new resources made available by this grant include syllabi, sample assignments, lesson plans, assessment models, and suggested course readings. These more recent changes are still ongoing and merit further examination after the updated Course Outcomes and the FYWP's Mission Statement have been in effect for a longer period of time.

6.5 Where Do We Go from Here? Recommendations for FYC professional Development Programs

Though based on a single program, this study is highly suggestive that change should not merely be institutionally instigated, but peer-guided through a common cause and space. My interviews with novice TAs, following the changes in TA training, showcase the need to remove

structural barriers within institutional disciplines in order to alleviate institutional and professional anxiety that is often left unacknowledged. Working closely with graduate TAs and providing access to mentors with TESOL expertise (who are also seen as peers) can provide safe spaces for genuine discussions. Some concerns still persist: How can we *also* offer more support to experienced TAs who are currently more advanced in the FYWP program and who have taken their TA orientation and ENGL 500 course prior to the recently implemented changes? This is especially worth considering given the “labor-intensive” nature of FYC classes as aptly pointed out by Miller (1991) and the difficulty these TAs face in finding time to attend optional multilingual pedagogy workshops offered by the FWYP.

Another issue lies in questioning whether offering MLL ENGL 101 sections may have likely encouraged multilingual students to enroll in these specific sections, and thus may have lessened the enrollment of MLLs in mainstream ENGL 101 sections. For this reason, we cannot be certain whether MLL students self-selecting MLL 101 sections may have reduced the pedagogical uncertainties reported by non-TESOL trained TAs teaching mainstream ENGL 101 sections when working with multilingual students. However, given that there are a limited number of MLL 101 sections offered per academic year, we know that all mainstream ENGL 101 sections had a representative number of multilingual students given the general campus demographics. Moreover, students’ evaluations from the MLL ENGL 101 sections have been consistently positive, and the FYWP's philosophy continues to strongly support the idea of offering a directed-self placement option for MLL students who believe that such a resource could better help them given their perceived language learning needs.

There is a pressing need to provide more relevant training to mainstream (non-TESOL trained) composition TAs; listening to these teachers' voices can better inform departmental

policies within campuses witnessing the globalization of higher education. Now is the time to remind ourselves—WPAs, faculty, and graduate instructors—of the importance of cross-disciplinary collaboration and the need to push back against disciplinary divides within a department. To be more specific, the FYWP's story showcases the success that can come out of meaningful collaboration between the fields of FYC and that of TESOL. Equally importantly, this is a story of *listening* to TAs' concerns, and taking locally-based initiatives. A few questions remain. How might we best advocate for L2 writing students across disciplines? What role can we play in facilitating disciplinary writing practices that support multilingual students? How might we go about it? And how can we work with WPAs to advocate for our multilingual students?

Much of what is presented in this study is a result of specific contextual circumstances that vary from one institution to another. However, the events, perspectives, and narratives examined here provide examples for other institutions on how to initiate genuine conversations about the underlying less-explored reasons for FYC novice TAs' uncertainties when working with an increasingly multilingual student population - and now, an ever increasingly diverse and integral student population.

REFERENCE LIST

- Alsup, J. (2006). *Teacher identity discourses: Negotiating personal and professional spaces*. Mahwah, N.J: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Atkinson, D. W., & Ramanathan, V.A. (December 07, 1995). Cultures of Writing: An Ethnographic Comparison of L1 and L2 University Writing/Language Programs. *Tesol Quarterly*, 29, 3, 539-568.
- Barkhuizen, G. (September 01, 2011). Narrative Knowledging in TESOL. *Tesol Quarterly*, 45, 3, 391-414.
- Bartholomae, D. (1996). What is Composition and (if you know what it is) why do we teach it? In Bloom, L., Daiker, Donald A., & White, Edward M. (Eds.) *Composition in the twenty-first century : Crisis and change*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Bawarshi, A. S., & Reiff, M. J. (2010). *Genre: An introduction to history, theory, research, and pedagogy*. West Lafayette, Ind: Parlor Press.
- Beauchamp, Catherine, & Thomas, Lynn. (2009). Understanding Teacher Identity: An Overview of Issues in the Literature and Implications for Teacher Education. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 39(2), 175-189.
- Bell, J. S. (2002). Narrative inquiry: More than just telling stories. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(2), 207-213.
- Block, D. (2010). Researching language and identity. In B. Paltridge & A. Phakiti, A. (Eds.), *Continuum companion to research methods in applied linguistics* (pp. 337-349). London: Continuum.
- Block, D. (2010). Researching language and identity. In B. Paltridge & A. Phakiti, A.

- (Eds.), *Continuum companion to research methods in applied linguistics* (pp. 337-349). London: Continuum. Carbondale and Edwardsville, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Brereton, J. (1995). *The origins of composition studies in the American college, 1875-1925 : A documentary history* (Pittsburgh series in composition, literacy, and culture). Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Canagarajah, A. (2002). *Critical academic writing and multilingual students* (Michigan series on teaching multilingual writers). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (September 06, 1996). From Critical Research Practice to Critical Research Reporting. *Tesol Quarterly*, 30, 2, 321-30.
- CCCC Committee on Second Language Writing., 2016, <https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/committees/secondlang>. Accessed 16 Aug. 2016.
- Clandinin, D. & Connelly, F. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Clandinin, D. J. & Connelly, F. M. (1994). Personal experience methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Hand book of qualitative research* (pp. 413-427) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Rosiek, J. (2007). Borderland spaces and tensions. In D. J. Clandinin, *Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology* (pp. 35-70). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. Retrieved from http://american-philosophy.org/events/documents/SIAP_2009_Clandinin_Proof-Ch2.pdf

- Coffey, A., & Atkinson, P. (1996). *Making sense of qualitative data: Complementary research strategies*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Connors, R. (1997). *Composition-rhetoric : Backgrounds, theory, and pedagogy* (Pittsburgh series in composition, literacy, and culture). Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Corbin, J. M., Strauss, A. L., & Strauss, A. L. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Los Angeles, Calif: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications
- Crowley, S. (1998). *Composition in the university : Historical and polemical essays* (Pittsburgh series in composition, literacy, and culture). Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Denzin, N, K., & Linclon, Y.S. (Eds.). (2005). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*. (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Downs, D. (2013). What is first-year composition? In R. Malenczyk (Ed.) *A rhetoric for writing program administrators* (Writing program administration (Series)). Anderson, South Carolina: Parlor Press.
- Duff, P. A. (January 01, 2007). Second language socialization as sociocultural theory: Insights and issues. *Language Teaching*, 40(4), 309-319.
- Duff, P. A., & Uchida, Y. (January 01, 1997). The Negotiation of Teachers' Sociocultural Identities and Practices in Postsecondary EFL Classrooms. *Tesol Quarterly*, 31, 3, 451-486.

Eckert, P., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (October 01, 1992). Think Practically and Look Locally:

Language and Gender as Community-Based Practice. *Annual Review of*

Anthropology, 21, 1.

Estrem, H., & Reid, S. (2012). What New Writing Teachers Talk about When They Talk about

Teaching. *Pedagogy*, 12(3), 449-480.

Ferris, D. (2009). *Teaching college writing to diverse student populations* (Michigan series on

teaching academic English in U.S. post-secondary programs). Ann Arbor: University of

Michigan Press.

Ferris, D. (2009). *Teaching college writing to diverse student populations*. Ann Arbor:

University of Michigan Press.

Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. (2013). *Teaching L2 Composition: Purpose, Process, and Practice*.

Hoboken: Taylor and Francis.

Ferris, D., & Hedgcock, John. (2013). *Teaching L2 Composition Purpose, Process, and Practice*.

(3rd ed.). Hoboken: Taylor and Francis.

Ferris, D., Brown, J., Liu, H. S., & Stine, M. E. A. (June 01, 2011). Responding to L2 Students

in College Writing Classes: Teacher Perspectives. *Tesol Quarterly*, 45, 2, 207-234.

Ferris, Dana, Brown, Jeffrey, Liu, Hsiang Sean, & Stine, Maria Eugenia Arnaudo. (2011).

Responding to L2 Students in College Writing Classes: Teacher Perspectives. *TESOL*

Quarterly: A Journal for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages and of

Standard English as a Second Dialect, 45(2), 207-234.

Gee, J. (2012). *Social linguistics and literacies ideology in discourses* (4th ed.). Abingdon,

Oxon; New York: Routledge.

- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gilles, E. (2002). The departmental perspective. In Roen, D. (Ed.) *Strategies for teaching first-year composition*. Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Graff, Gerald. *Professing Literature : An Institutional History*. Chicago ; London: U of Chicago, 1987. Print.
- Guerra, J. & Bawarshi, A. (2005). Managing transitions: Re-Orienting perceptions in a practicum course. In S. I. Dobrin (Ed.), *Don't Call it That: The Composition Practicum* (pp. 43-66). NCTE.
- Harris, J. (1997). *A teaching subject: Composition since 1966* (Prentice Hall studies in writing and culture). Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Heath, S. B., & Street, B. V. (2008). *On ethnography: Approaches to language and literacy research*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Heigham, J., & Croker, R. A. (2009). *Qualitative research in applied linguistics: A practical introduction*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire [England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Higgins, C. & Sandhu, P. (2015) "Researching identity through narrative approaches" In M. Bigelow and J. Enser-Kananen (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Educational Linguistics* (pp. 50-61). London and New York: Routledge.
- Holliday, A. (2010). Analyzing qualitative data. In B. Paltridge & A. Phakiti (Eds.). *Continuum companion to research methods in applied linguistics* (pp. 98-110). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Independent Writing Departments and Programs Affiliate., 2018, <http://wpacouncil.org/iwdpa>
Accessed 14 March. 2018.

Inside Higher Education. New International Enrollments Decline Again., 2018,

<https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/11/13/new-international-student-enrollments-continue-decline-us-universities>. Accessed 10 Jan. 2019.

Institute of International Education. Press Release: *Open Doors International*

Students in the U.S., 2013, <http://www.iie.org/Who-We-Are/News-and-Events/Press-Center/Press-Releases/2012/2012-11-13-Open-Doors-International-Students>. Accessed 29 May. 2014.

Institute of International Education. Press Release: Open Doors International Students in

the U.S., 2015, <http://www.iie.org/Who-We-Are/News-and-Events/Press-Center/Press-Releases/2015/2015-11-16-Open-Doors-Data>. Accessed 12 December. 2015.

Johnson, K. (July 01, 2006). The sociocultural turn and its challenges for second language teacher education. *Tesol Quarterly*, 40, 1, 235-57.

Jordan, J. (2012). *Redesigning composition for multilingual realities*. Urbana, Ill.: Conference on College Composition and Communication of the National Council of Teachers of English.

King, N., & Horrocks, C. (2010). *Interviews in qualitative research*. Los Angeles: SAGE.

Kroll, B. (1990). *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (Cambridge applied linguistics series). Cambridge [England] ; New York: Cambridge University Press.

LaFrance, M., & Nicolas, M. (September 01, 2012). Institutional Ethnography as Materialist Framework for Writing Program Research and the Faculty-Staff Work Standpoints Project. *College Composition and Communication*, 64, 1, 130-150.

Lave, J. (1992, April). Learning as participation in communities of practice. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, I. (January 01, 2012). Becoming a writing teacher: Using “identity” as an analytic lens to understand EFL writing teachers’ development. *Journal of Second Language Writing*.

Malenczyk, R., Ritter, Kelly, Royer, Dan, Roger, Gilles, Ashley, Hannah, Downs, Doug, . . . Wilhoit, Stephen. (2013). *A rhetoric for writing program administrators* (Writing program administration (Series)). Anderson, South Carolina: Parlor Press.

Matsuda, P. (1999). Composition Studies and ESL Writing: A Disciplinary Division of Labor. *College Composition and Communication*, 50(4), 699-721.

Matsuda, P. (2006a). Second Language Writing in the twentieth century: A situated historical perspective In Matsuda, P., Cox, Michelle, Jordan, Jay, & Ortmeier-Hooper, Christina. (Eds.) *Second language writing in the composition classroom : A critical sourcebook*. New York, NY: Bedford/St. Martins.

Matsuda, P. (2006b). The Myth of Linguistic Homogeneity in U.S. College Composition. *College English*, 68(6), 637-651.

Matsuda, P. K. (January 01, 2014). The Lure of Translingual Writing. *Pmla*, 129, 3, 478-483.

Matsuda, P. K. (June 01, 1999). Composition Studies and ESL Writing: A Disciplinary Division of Labor. *College Composition and Communication*, 50, 4, 699-721.

- Matsuda, P., Cox, Michelle, Jordan, Jay, & Ortmeier-Hooper, Christina. (2006). *Second language writing in the composition classroom : A critical sourcebook*. New York, NY: Bedford/St. Martins.
- Matsuda, Paul Kei. (1998). Situating ESL Writing in a Cross-Disciplinary Context. *Written Communication*, 15(1), 99.
- Matsuda, Saenkhum, and Accardi. "Writing Teachers' Perceptions of the Presence and Needs of Second Language Writers: An Institutional Case Study." *Journal of Second Language Writing* (2012): Journal of Second Language Writing. Web.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications.
- Merriam, S.B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education* (2nded). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, J. (2009). Teacher Identity. In A. Burns & C. Richards (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education* (pp. 172-181). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Miller, J. (2009). Teacher Identity. In A. Burns & C. Richards (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education* (pp. 172-181). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Miller, S. (1991). *Textual Carnivals: The politics of composition*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Mishler, E. G. (1986). *Research interviewing: Context and narrative*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

- Mishler, E. G. (1991). *Research interviewing: Context and narrative*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Morgan, B. (2004). Teacher Identity as Pedagogy: Towards a Field-Internal Conceptualization in Bilingual and Second Language Education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education & Bilingualism*, 7, 172-3), p.172-188.
- Morgan, B. (2004). Teacher Identity as Pedagogy: Towards a Field-Internal Conceptualization in Bilingual and Second Language Education. *Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 7 (2&3): 172-189.
- Morgan, D. L. (1988). *Focus groups as qualitative research*. Newbury Park, Calif: Sage Publications.
- Motha, S. (2006). Racializing ESOL Teacher Identities in U.S. K-12 Public Schools. *TESOL Quarterly: A Journal for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages and of Standard English as a Second Dialect*, 40(3), 495-518.
- Motha, S. (2009). Afternoon tea at Su's: Participant voice and community in critical feminist ethnography. In S. Kouritzin, N. Piquemal, & R. Norman (eds.), *Qualitative Research: Challenging the Orthodoxies in Standard Academic Discourse(s)* (pp.103-119). New York: Routledge.
- Motha, S. (2009). Afternoon tea at Su's: Participant voice and community in critical feminist ethnography. In S. Kouritzin, N. Piquemal, & R. Norman (eds.), *Qualitative Research: Challenging the Orthodoxies in Standard Academic Discourse(s)* (pp.103-119). New York: Routledge.
- National Census of Writing. 2013., <http://writingcensus.swarthmore.edu/>. Accessed 13 Jan. 2015.

- Nero, S. (2010). Discourse tensions, Englishes, and the composition classroom. In B. Horner, M.Z. Lu, and P. Matsuda (Eds.). *Cross-Language Relations in Composition* (pp. 142-157). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Harlow, England: Longman.
- Norton, B., & Early, M. (September 01, 2011). Researcher Identity, Narrative Inquiry, and Language Teaching Research. *Tesol Quarterly*, 45, 3, 415- 439.
- Paltridge, B., & Phakiti, A. (2010). *Continuum companion to research methods in applied linguistics*. London: Continuum.
- Patton, M. Q., (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park, Calif: Sage Publications.
- Pole, C., & Morrison, M. (2003). *Ethnography for education*. Buckingham : Open University Press.
- Reid, E. S. (2013) What is Teaching Assistant Preparation? In R. Malenczyk (Ed.), *A Rhetoric for Writing Program Administrators* (pp.197-210). Anderson, SC: Parlor Press.
- Ritter, K. (2009). *Before Shaughnessy Basic Writing at Yale and Harvard, 1920-1960* (Studies in Writing and Rhetoric). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Ritter, K., & Matsuda, Paul Kei. (2012). *Exploring composition studies sites, issues, and perspectives*. Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press.
- Ruecker, T., Shapiro, S., Johnson, E., & Tardy, C. (2014). Exploring the Linguistic and Institutional Contexts of Writing Instruction in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(2), 401-412.

- Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. London: Sage.
- Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Silberstein, S., Aniwar M., Burt, R., Guirca, M., & Malcolm, K. (2016, July 11). Research Report: TA Survey on Teaching International Students. *Web*. Retrieved from <http://www.washington.edu/teaching/files/2016/06/TA-Survey-Report.pdf>
- Sommers, N., & Saltz, L. (September 01, 2004). The Novice as Expert: Writing the Freshman Year. *College Composition and Communication*, 56, 1, 124-149.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Starfield, S. (2010). Ethnographies. In B. Paltridge & Phakiti (Eds.). *Continuum companion to research methods in applied linguistics* (pp. 50-65). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. '
- Strickland, D. (2011). *The Managerial Unconscious in the History of Composition Studies*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Tardy, C. M. (2011). Enacting and transforming local language policies. *College Composition and Communication*, 62(4), 624-661.
- Tardy, C. M. (2014). Discourses of internationalization and diversity in US universities and writing programs. In *Transnational Writing Program Administration*. (pp. 243-262). Utah State University Press, An imprint of University Press of Colorado.
- The History of TESOL International Association., 2016, <http://www.tesol.org/about-tesol/association-governance/tesol's-history>. Accessed 21 Dec. 2016.
- Tichenor, M. S., & Tichenor, J. M. (December 07, 2004). Understanding Teachers' Perspectives on Professionalism. *Professional Educator*, 27, 89-95.

University Quick Facts., 2018, <https://admit.washington.edu/QuickFacts/Freshmen>. Accessed 13 Jan. 2019.

U.S. Department of State. Supreme Court Decision on Presidential Proclamation 9645., 2018, https://travel.state.gov/content/travel/en/us-visas/visa-information-resources/presidential-proclamationarchive/june_26_supreme_court_decision_on_presidential_proclamation9645.html. Accessed 27 Jan. 2019

Varghese, M. M. (2007). Language Teacher Research Methods. In *Volume Ten* (ed. K. King) of *the Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (2nd ed. General editor, N. Hornberger), pp. 287-298. Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.

Varghese, M., Morgan, B., Johnston, B., & Johnson, K. (2005). Theorizing Language Teacher Identity: Three Perspectives and Beyond. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 4(1), 21-44.

Varghese, M., Morgan, B., Johnston, J., Johnson, K. (2005). Theorizing language teacher identity: Three perspectives and beyond. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 4, 21-44.

Wardle, Elizabeth. (2009). "Mutt Genres" and the Goal of FYC: Can We Help Students Write the Genres of the University? *College Composition and Communication*, 60(4), 765-789.

Webster, L., & Mertova, P. (2007). *Using narrative inquiry as a research method: An introduction to using critical event narrative analysis in research on learning and teaching*. London: Routledge.

Wells, K. (2011). *Narrative inquiry*. New York: Oxford University Press.

WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition (v3.0). (adopted in 2014). Retrieved from
<http://wpacouncil.org/positions/outcomes.html>

APPENDIX A: STATEMENT ON SUPPORTING MULTILINGUAL LEARNERS

[FYWP] Statement on Supporting Multilingual Language Learners

Context:

Multilingual Language Learners (MLLs) are a vibrant addition to our composition classrooms, contributing to our campus' linguistic and cultural diversity and enriching the perspectives students bring to the work of reading and writing in our classes. Like all admitted [PU] students, MLL students have met and exceeded admissions requirements and are highly qualified. Like many [PU] students, some of these MLL students will also need additional support as they continue to develop their English language proficiency. While the [First Year Writing Program] is working to offer sufficient support for our instructors to ensure both they and their students have access to the resources and best practices they need to foster success in the writing classroom (to learn more about these resources and best practices, please consult the [FYWP] website), this statement is meant to clarify instructor responsibilities as well as [FYWP] expectations for assessing and giving feedback on grammar correctness in student writing.

Assessing and giving feedback on papers seems to be of particular concern for many instructors, primarily because many of us are unclear about the level of attention we should be paying to grammar errors. When responding to early drafts of MLL student writing, research and experience have taught us to “read through” grammar errors (in other words, to prioritize and selectively mark but “read through” grammar errors) in order to attend to the “higher order” content-based issues such as argument, analysis, use of evidence, and organization. These “higher order” skills, as evidenced by the first three [FYWP] Outcomes, are the most important skills taught in a writing class, and research has shown they are also the skills most likely to improve over the course of a quarter. This does not mean, however, that we should ignore “lower order” concerns such as grammar, particularly repeated errors that interfere with comprehension, and MLL students miss an opportunity to learn when we ignore their grammar mistakes. Rather, the goal should be to help empower students—MLLs and native speakers alike—to become self-editors of their own work and to research their grammar errors as a means to learn through self-correction.

Expectations:

While we cannot realistically expect MLL students to achieve native speaker accuracy in a span of eleven weeks, or even four years for that matter, we can and should expect ELL students to become their own self-editors by developing important writing and reading strategies and skills. These are skills and strategies with which students can reasonably become more proficient in eleven weeks with the support of feedback from composition instructors, writing centers and peers, and access to effective resources (such as handbooks) related to grammar, usage, and style. Indeed, students' ability to self-edit their writing is an important part of the [FYWP's] Outcome Four, which requires that a student's portfolio demonstrate the ability to revise, edit,

and proofread his or her writing. *In fulfillment of this outcome, we can and should expect students to produce at least one “presentation draft” (a paper that demonstrates students’ ability to edit their writing) in the graded portion of their portfolios.*

Practical Applications

Self-Editing

Studies have shown that students are able to self-edit their work when instructors circle or mark a check next to grammar errors. This approach has proven just as effective as when instructors correct or code (using a coding system such as VT for verb tense) the grammar issue for the student. So in most cases cueing students to the presence of an error (without fixing the error or marking what type of error it is) and ensuring that they are aware of the available resources is sufficient for self-editing. In those few cases in which errors prove overwhelming to reading comprehension, an instructor should invite the student to have a conversation with him or her or an MLL consultant as soon as possible as a means to provide greater individualized support.

[FYWP]Pathways for Providing Feedback on Grammar Correctness

The [FYWP] provides a Statement on Assessment of and Feedback on Grammar Correctness in Chapter 6 of the TA Manual. This statement suggests using one of two pathways, designed as calendar templates, to help both instructors and students—both MLL and not—balance grammar feedback with “higher order” concerns. You can turn back to Chapter 6 or visit the EWP website for more detailed information on how to implement these pathways, but the pathways themselves are as follows:

■ **First Pathway: Revision Throughout: Fewer Assignments, Multiple Drafts of Each**

This pathway allows students the opportunity to work with revision throughout the quarter, producing multiple drafts of each shorter and/or major assignment, with grammar feedback on later drafts. In this approach, instructors focus on higher order concerns in early drafts before prioritizing and selectively marking errors on later drafts, which students then edit during the portfolio sequence. This pathway means assigning fewer short assignments during the first two sequences in order to allow students to first address higher order concerns before receiving error markings on a second draft, which they can edit during the portfolio sequence. This pathway can be a good option for instructors who have a high percentage of students struggling with surface issues, as it provides students with a head start on revising for their portfolios. Because students are spending more time on their drafts, this pathway may help facilitate the connection between higher and lower concerns.

■ **Second Pathway: “Higher Order” Feedback-Focused, Defer Grammar Cueing for Portfolio**

This pathway allows for reading through error until the portfolio sequence of the course. In this approach, instructors focus mainly on higher order concerns throughout the first two sequences before attending to grammar concerns during the portfolio sequence. Please keep in mind that for some students this approach can require a lot of grammar and self-editing

instruction during the last two weeks of the course, and some students may feel overwhelmed trying to make final portfolio revisions while also identifying errors and demonstrating the ability to self-edit. As such, this option requires that instructors provide the full two weeks allotted for the portfolio sequence. Note that even if you choose this pathway, you may work on a few shared grammar patterns among your students throughout the quarter, and help individual students target their most pressing issues early on.

Notes on the Pathways:

- The pathways are intended as broad approaches for providing feedback to grammar error on student drafts and not as comprehensive approaches to teaching grammar. So, while we encourage instructors to address error, we also advocate a rhetorical approach to grammar instruction, which understands grammar as micro-level writing choices that are strategic, genre-specific, situationally dependent, and intimately tied to meaning-making and persuasion.
- In both approaches, instructors can teach rhetorical grammar workshops throughout the quarter that help students see grammar in terms of strategic choice. This can be done by analyzing how authors make powerful micro-level choices, exploring ways that lower and higher order concerns are linked, or by conducting workshops where students experiment with strategic micro-level choices in their own writing, for example. For more information on how to teach grammar rhetorically, see Part One of this chapter above.
- Both approaches also allow instructors to provide students with the chance to edit their writing along the way, albeit with different levels of emphasis. Students are cued to errors selectively from the beginning of the course, reading through some error, helping students identify patterns, and taking care to emphasize higher order concerns.

Ideally, no matter which pathway you choose, instructors should (1) prioritize the most common and severe errors, identify them in students' papers, and offer grammar resources, such as the Purdue Owl or *Writer's Help* and (2) help students gain awareness of and tools for using grammar strategically, intentionally, and persuasively in various situations.

APPENDIX B: FYWP COURSE OUTCOMES

1. To demonstrate an awareness of the strategies that writers use in different writing contexts.

- The writing employs style, tone, and conventions appropriate to the demands of a particular genre and situation.
- The writer is able to demonstrate the ability to write for different audiences and contexts, both within and outside the university classroom.
- The writing has a clear understanding of its audience, and various aspects of the writing (mode of inquiry, content, structure, appeals, tone, sentences, and word choice) address and are strategically pitched to that audience.
- The writer articulates and assesses the effects of his or her writing choices.

2. To read, analyze, and synthesize complex texts and incorporate multiple kinds of evidence purposefully in order to generate and support writing.

- The writing demonstrates an understanding of the course texts as necessary for the purpose at hand.
- Course texts are used in strategic, focused ways (for example: summarized, cited, applied, challenged, recontextualized) to support the goals of the writing.
- The writing is intertextual, meaning that a “conversation” between texts and ideas is created in support of the writer’s goals.
- The writer is able to utilize multiple kinds of evidence gathered from various sources (primary and secondary – for example, library research, interviews, questionnaires, observations, cultural artifacts) in order to support writing goals.
- The writing demonstrates responsible use of the MLA (or other appropriate) system of documenting sources.

3. To produce complex, analytic, persuasive arguments that matter in academic contexts.

- The argument is appropriately complex, based in a claim that emerges from and explores a line of inquiry.
- The stakes of the argument, why what is being argued matters, are articulated and persuasive.
- The argument involves analysis, which is the close scrutiny and examination of evidence and assumptions in support of a larger set of ideas.
- The argument is persuasive, taking into consideration counterclaims and multiple points of view as it generates its own perspective and position.
- The argument utilizes a clear organizational strategy and effective transitions that develop its line of inquiry.

4. To develop flexible strategies for revising, editing, and proofreading writing.

- The writing demonstrates substantial and successful revision.
- The writing responds to substantive issues raised by the instructor and peers.
- Errors of grammar, punctuation, and mechanics are proofread and edited so as not to interfere with reading and understanding the writing.

APPENDIX C: FYWP COURSE OFFERINGS

Each of the 100-level course offered by the [FYWP] (detailed below) enable students to fulfill their “C” (composition) distribution requirement and meet the same [FYWP] course outcomes (Appendix B). All 100-level courses are based on a portfolio system where students redraft a specified number of papers, in addition to composing a cover letter to address the learned course objective. The range of 100-level courses offered is as follows:

- a) ENGL [101] is the main and most popular course offered by the EWP (approximately 60% of all FYC sections) where "students work closely with their peers and instructors to develop a portfolio of writing that reflects an ability to write papers with complex claims that matter in academic contexts. The readings in this class focus on academic discourse from a variety of disciplines" ([FYWP] webpage). ENGL 101 is best described as a rigorous course with three sequenced, cumulative assignments and a final portfolio specifically designed to introduce first-year students to academic discourse (Guerra & Bawarshi 5); ENGL [101] represents "a general education course designed to improve students' writing skills and prepare them for college and workplace writing" (Downs 5).
- b) ENGL [101] Multilingual sections, offered 2-3 times per quarter for self-selecting students and taught by TAs with TESOL expertise (as will be elaborated in an upcoming section of this profile)
- c) ENGL [103], which uses texts and scholarship based in literature (approximately 40% of all FYC sections)
- d) ENGL [102], which has a service-learning component with organizations in the Seattle area (5 sections are offered every academic year)
- e) ENGL 109/ENGL 110 which operates on a “stretch” model over two quarters for students affiliated to the Educational Outreach Program, The Office of Minority Affairs & Diversity, or Student Athletic Academic Services.

(From 100-Level [FYWP] Course Basics)

APPENDIX D: SUPPORT RESOURCES FOR MLLS

Composition and Writing Courses and Support Resources for International & Multilingual Students and their Teachers at [PACIFIC UNIVERSITY]

English Department Composition (“C”) and Writing (“W”) Courses

Writing is central to learning, and to putting learning into action in students’ academic, career and civic lives. English Department composition courses offered through the Expository Writing Program (EWP) and Interdisciplinary Writing Program (IWP) may be used toward either UW’s “C” (composition) or “W” (additional writing) requirements. EWP and IWP offer different approaches to teaching composition, and students may take courses in both programs. Students must earn at least a 2.0 in their EWP or IWP course to fulfill the “C” (composition) requirement. Students who earn 2.0 or above in an EWP course other than 109/110 may not take further EWP courses without petitioning to do so; however, students may take up to three IWP courses.

Both EWP and IWP courses welcome multilingual students, offer small class sizes and conferences with the instructor, and provide opportunities for students to gain skill and confidence as readers and writers. Composition courses offer an effective introduction to UW resources and to American academic culture.

The Interdisciplinary Writing Program (<http://depts.washington.edu/engl/iwp>)

IWP offers expository writing courses linked with lecture courses in the Arts, Humanities, Natural and Social Sciences. Students must register concurrently (at the same time) for both the lecture course and the linked writing course, creating a 10-credit pair of linked courses. Lecture courses accompanied by writing links vary each quarter. IWP offers links to over 50 lectures each year, and more than 1500 students each year take an IWP “writing link.”

ENGL 197, 198, and 199 are linked with lecture courses at the 100-level. ENGL 297, 298, and 299 are linked with courses at the 200-level and above. While ENGL 297, 298, and 299 are called "Intermediate Writing," there is no pre-requisite; students do not need to take a 100-level writing course before enrolling in a 200-level writing link. All writing links include conferences with the instructor to discuss drafts of essays. Writing links help students improve their writing skills while exploring ideas and materials assigned in the linked lecture courses. UW research has shown that this linked course arrangement often improve students’ grades and the depth of their learning in both the writing course and the lecture course.

The Expository Writing Program (<http://depts.washington.edu/engl/ewp>)

EWP offers an array of writing courses: 109/110 (a two-quarter composition course), 111 (writing through literary texts), 121 (service-learning composition), and 131 (writing through academic and cultural texts). All 100-level writing courses in the Expository Writing Program are designed around and help students meet a shared set of outcomes. These outcomes are intended to prepare students for writing in a variety of academic contexts. More than 4,000 students each year take an EWP course.

The EWP outcomes: <http://depts.washington.edu/engl/ewp/outcomes.php>

1. To demonstrate an awareness of the strategies that writers use in different writing contexts.

2. To read, analyze, and synthesize complex texts and incorporate multiple kinds of evidence purposefully in order to generate and support writing.
3. To produce complex, analytic, persuasive arguments that matter in academic contexts.
4. To develop flexible strategies for revising, editing, and proofreading writing.

All 100 level EWP courses are graded on a portfolio system. At the end of the course, students create a portfolio of selected work from the quarter and write a cover letter explaining how this portfolio demonstrates that they have met the course outcomes. All EWP courses include at least two individual conferences with the instructor to discuss your work.

“C” and “W” courses designed specifically for multilingual students

All Expository Writing Program (EWP) and Interdisciplinary Writing Program (IWP) courses welcome multilingual learners, and both programs also offer courses for MLL students who would like to take a composition course with other MLLs, in a section taught by a teacher with expertise in both Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) and teaching composition. Students in these MLL sections use the same texts, complete the same assignment sequences, and must demonstrate the same learning outcomes as students in any IWP or EWP course. Quarterly surveys confirm that students are overwhelmingly positive about the impact of these courses on their writing process, their understanding of “the logic of Western academic writing,” their ability to understand and use resources to become effective self-editors, and their confidence not only in reading and writing, but in participating in class and in talking with teachers

“MLL 131,” “MLL 121” and “MLL 281” offer an opportunity for multilingual students who would like to complete an introductory or intermediate composition course with classmates who are also multilingual. MLL 131 (EWP’s most popular expository writing course) is offered every quarter. MLL 121 (EWP’s service-learning composition course) and MLL 281 (EWP’s intermediate composition course) are offered less frequently. These MLL sections are marked in the online time schedule “MULTILINGUAL (or MLL) STUDENTS ONLY. MLL instructors post canvas syllabus descriptions, and instructors’ email is listed in the time schedule, so students may contact them for additional information. No add codes required.

“MLL English 198H,” an IWP writing link with Psychology 101 B or D, will be offered in Spring 2015. Students must be registered in Psychology 101 B or D to enroll in the English 198H writing link. English 198 may be used toward either the “C” or the “W” requirement. Students should contact instructor Jennifer Zinchuk (jzinchuk@uw.edu) for information and add codes.

Academic Support Programs offers Academic Achievement courses for freshmen, sophomores, transfer students and/or international students who are interested in improving their academic performance and transition to life at UW. Through this one-day-a-week course (3 credits, “W” eligible), students will be presented with interesting content (e.g. sports media, graphic novels, immigration, action movies, etc.) while also learning strategies to improve their note-taking, test-taking, essay writing, reading and study skills. As part of this course, students will also be paired with a tutor mentor who will provide them with three hours of tutoring/mentoring each week. Sessions will focus on providing students with academic support,

reinforcing/teaching academic success skills, and providing overall mentorship and support. For more information, including about Academic Achievement Courses specifically for ELL students, please visit: <http://depts.washington.edu/aspuw/develop/courses/>

Additional writing support courses (not “C” or “W”)

The Academic English Program (AEP) offers a series of courses (English 102, 103, & 104) designed to support multilingual students and improve their academic English skills. English 102 helps students develop paragraph length responses to academic readings and improves organization and fluency in writing. English 103 helps develop the strategies students need to write researched, organized, and correctly documented papers using academic sources. English 104 develops listening, note-taking and classroom discussion skills. All courses count as general elective credits toward fulfilling undergraduate degree requirements. The courses are fee-based. For more information: arenehan@pce.uw.edu.

International & English Language Programs (IELP) offer a wide range of language resources for students, from three to ten week intensive sessions to oral fluency and college preparation programs and online courses in academic, business, and technical English. These are fee-based and non-credit bearing courses, but for some students they might be very useful. The IELP web site is: <http://www.ielp.uw.edu>.

English 115: "MLL Studios" are designed for multilingual speakers of English and are available to any student who is taking an Expository Writing Program (EWP) or Interdisciplinary Writing Program (IWP) composition course (English 111, 121, 131, 197, 198, 199, 297, 298 or 299) and would like additional English language support. MLL Studios are 2-credit (C/NC) courses that meet two days a week for 50 minutes. In the Studios, students build advanced vocabulary skills, focus on reading skills to help comprehend and analyze complex texts, and review and analyze grammar structures, focusing on how they apply to organization and produce different effects in academic writing. Enrollment is capped at 10 students per section. In some quarters there are also “Studio” courses for graduate students offered through the Academic English Program as sections of English 492.

Targeted Learning Communities at OWRC The Odegaard Writing and Research Center (OWRC) offers group tutoring for English Language Learners in composition and some other courses. Targeted tutoring pairs an OWRC tutor with a group of 3-5 students who are enrolled in the same course. The group may register for General Studies 391 credit (C/NC) for their work in the Targeted Learning Community. TLC is aimed at providing a low-stakes, collaborative learning environment outside the classroom to discuss writing strategies. For more information, contact owrc@uw.edu early in the quarter.

Writing Centers and Writing Support Resources

Odegaard Writing and Research Center (OWRC) The Odegaard Writing and Research Center (OWRC) offers UW students free, one-to-one, 45-minute tutoring sessions for any writing or research project, as well as for personal projects such as applications or cover letters and resumes. Our tutors and librarians are trained to collaborate at any stage of the writing and research process, from brainstorming and identifying sources to making final revisions and tying up loose ends. They are always excited to talk through American academic conventions and help

writers put their past writing experiences in conversation with new ones. For more information, or to schedule an appointment (more than 500 available per week!), please see our website (<https://depts.washington.edu/owrc>) or come visit us in person on the first floor of Odegaard Undergraduate Library!

The CLUE Writing Center: CLUE is a free late-night, multidisciplinary study center open to all UW students. We offer drop-in tutoring for math, writing, chemistry, physics, economics, statistics, computer science and engineering, biology and various foreign languages. CLUE also holds writing workshops as well as course-specific discussion sessions and exam reviews for popular first- and second-year classes, and conversational groups for international students. We're open Sunday-Thursdays from 6:30 p.m. to midnight in Mary Gates Hall as well as Monday-Thursdays from 11:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. in the HUB.
<http://depts.washington.edu/clue/index.php>.

Disciplinary Writing Centers: Disciplinary writing centers focused on writing in a particular discipline are housed in Anthropology, Communication, Education, History, Philosophy, Political Science/Jackson School/Law Societies & Justice, Psychology and Sociology. Information about writing centers may be found at
<http://guides.lib.washington.edu/content.php?pid=529582&sid=4411788>.

Career Center, 134 Mary Gates Hall, (206) 543-0535, helps students explore majors, successfully connect their academic accomplishments with a wide variety of employers, and move forward in their roles as well-educated world citizens. The Career Center provides workshops specifically designed for international students (including: Strengths Identification, Resume, Cover letter, Interviewing and LinkedIn Labs) as well as a full spectrum of services, from self-exploration and decision-making to understanding career options and how to prepare for the work world both in the U.S and abroad. Services include in person appointments, live and online workshops, information about jobs and internships and consultation on resumes, cover letters, interviewing and other topics. <http://careers.washington.edu>.

Office of Minority Affairs and Diversity Educational Opportunity Program Instructional Center: The Instructional Center, 1307 N.E. 40th Street, Room 240; 206.543.4240, provides academic support for EOP students, and for non-EOP students by application. In addition to drop-in tutoring in writing and other disciplines the Center offers writing support, study skills classes, test preparation classes, graduate exam preparation, and a computer lab for students. The Instructional Center operates year round. <http://depts.washington.edu/ic>.

Student Athletic Academic Services: SAAS provides academic and logistical support to UW student-athletes. SAAS advisers, like those at UAA Advising and Office of Minority Affairs & Diversity Counseling Services, are generalists. Their goal is to provide student-athletes the support required to succeed academically and personally at the UW. In addition to advising, SAAS offers access to tutoring and a learning specialist, a computer lab, and programs fostering career development and life skills.
http://www.gohuskies.com/ViewArticle.dbml?DB_OEM_ID=30200&ATCLID=208241349.

Additional Institutional Resources

Center for Teaching and Learning, 100 Gerberding Hall, provides a range of resources for faculty and TAs working with ELL/multilingual students. CTL consults with individual faculty and TAs who have questions about supporting ELL/multilingual students in their classes, offers workshops on the topic for groups of faculty and/or TAs, and the International TA Program helps support TAs who are not native speakers of English regarding questions they might have about teaching ELLs. CTL also offers Faculty and Professional Learning Communities each quarter and have included FPLC's focused on working with ELL/ international students. <http://www.washington.edu/teaching>, 543-6588 or thectl@uw.edu.

CLUE Conversation Groups: Starting the 2nd week of Winter quarter, every Tuesday and Thursday 7-9pm in Mary Gates Hall 284, CLUE Conversation Groups offer international students a space for lively discussions on life and cultures at the University of Washington and in Seattle. It is a place of comfort and fun if you are interested in: practicing communication skills and English speaking; discussing life and culture of America and your home culture; building a community that extends to festival celebrations/ events with friends; building up resources that support daily English practice. For winter quarter, we will cover topics such as "American Slang", "Romantic relationship", "Lunar New Year", "American pop culture", etc. You can find more details at <http://depts.washington.edu/aspuw/clue/home>.

Foundation for International Understanding Through Students (FIUTS): The Foundation for International Understanding Through Students is proud to serve the global community of the University of Washington and the Puget Sound Region. All students and scholars, international and domestic, and members of the local community are welcome to get involved with FIUTS and its programs. FIUTS coordinates UW's International Student Orientation, offers a variety of events and programs including Wednesday Lunch and World to Work, and opportunities for leadership and K-12 education outreach. (206) 543-0735, info@fiuts.org, <http://www.fiuts.org/students>

“Global Classrooms” resource page for multilingual UW students and their teachers: This site offers scholarly, training and support materials for teachers of multilingual students, as well as resources for students. Information includes writing resources, UW Health and Wellness, Housing and Food Services, FIUTS, International Student Services, Registered Student Organizations, and more. Materials are chosen to support multilingual students and advance our capacity for creating global classrooms on the UW campus. <https://catalyst.uw.edu/workspace/esoneill/21763/>.

International Student Services: The professionally trained staff at ISS (in Schmitz Hall 459 (206) 221-7857) helps students understand the benefits and restrictions of F-1 and J-1 visa status, as well as changing to those statuses. ISS advisers work with international students seeking campus employment, assist with applications for off-campus employment, and advise about travel and visa issues. The ISS site also posts news and updates, and provides a “live chat” option for students currently studying at the University of Washington. <http://iss.washington.edu/>

Undergraduate Academic Advising (UAA): There are nearly 200 advisers at the UW. You can find one – or more – and start building your education team at UAA. 30-minute advising appointments are available by calling (206) 543-2550 or stopping by the Center for

Undergraduate Advising, Diversity & Student Success in 141 Mary Gates Hall. Quick Questions can be answered in person M-F between 9:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., or sent to advice@uw.edu.
<http://www.washington.edu/uaa/advising/about/team.php>