

Second Language Writing in Intensive English Programs and First Year
Composition

by

Matthew J. Hammill

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Approved June 2014 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Paul Kei Matsuda, Chair
Shirley Rose
Mark James

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

August 2014

ABSTRACT

The study develops a better understanding of what is valued in L2 academic writing in IEP and FYC programs through a comparative case study approach, identifying the assumptions and underlying values of program directors and instructors in both types of instructional settings. The goal of the study is to understand more about second language writing pedagogy for international students in these programs, as well as to provide university administrators with a better understanding of how to improve writing instruction for multilingual students, who have become a key part of the U.S. higher education mission. Data include program-level mission statements, course descriptions and objectives, curricular materials, as well as interviews with teachers and program directors. Major findings show that there is a tension between language-focused vs. rhetoric-focused approaches to second language writing instruction in the two contexts. IEP instruction sought to build on students' language proficiency, and writing instruction was rooted in a conception of writing as language organized by structural principles, while the FYC program emphasized writing as a tool for communication and personal growth. Based on these findings, I provide recommendations for improving graduate education for all writing teachers, developing more comprehensive needs analysis procedures, and establishing administrative structures to support international multilingual students.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this to my mother and father for always being there for me, and to Mike and Jim for looking after their little brother.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would first and foremost like to thank my advisor and Chair Dr. Paul Kei Matsuda for all of his valuable help and patience. Dr. Shirley Rose and Dr. Mark James have also been instrumental in trying to bridge the fields of rhetoric and composition, Writing Program Administration, and Applied Linguistics. I would also like to thank Dr. Doris Warriner for broadening my knowledge and appreciation for Applied Linguistics. Dr. Patricia Friedrich and all of my colleagues and students at ASU West Campus also played a large role in my understanding of writing pedagogy. My classmates Youmie Kim, Eduardo Diniz de Figueiredo, and Daisy Fredricks helped me tremendously along the way. Extra special thanks to Program Manager Sheila Luna for always helping me with her expertise and patience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	Page
1 INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of Problem.....	3
Overview of Chapters	7
2 L1 AND L2 WRITING IN U.S. HIGHER EDUCATION	9
Composition Studies in U.S. Higher Education.....	10
Teaching Approaches in First Year Composition.....	15
Intensive English Programs in U.S Higher Education.....	23
L2 Writing in U.S. Higher Education.....	27
L2 Writing Teaching Approaches.....	29
L2 Writing in Composition Studies.....	34
Axiological Tensions between L1 and L2 Writing Theory.....	36
3 METHOD	40
Research Questions.....	42
The Context of the Study.....	43
Participants.....	44
FYC Writing Teacher Participants.....	44
IEP Writing Teacher Participants.....	46
Writing Program Administrator Participant.....	47
Data Collection and Analysis.....	47
Interviews.....	47

CHAPTER	Page
Documents.....	49
4 WRITING INSTRUCTION IN THE FYC AND IEP PROGRAMS	50
The FYC Program.....	50
FYC Mission.....	50
FYC English 105 Course Description.....	52
FYC English 105 Teaching Approaches.....	53
FYC English 105 Main Writing Tasks.....	57
FYC Assessment.....	59
The IEP Program.....	63
IEP Mission.....	63
IEP Level 5 Reading/Writing Course Description.....	64
IEP Level 5 Writing Teaching Approaches.....	65
IEP Level 5 Reading/Writing Main Writing Tasks.....	68
IEP Level 5 Reading/Writing Assessment.....	69
FYC and IEP Program Articulation.....	69
5 TENSIONS AND OPPORTUNITIES	73
General vs. Specific Pedagogy	74
Language Development and Learning Transfer.....	79
Writing Development.....	80
Rhetorical Modes and IEP Writing Instruction.....	86
Grammar and Error Correction.....	88
Plagiarism Policies and Practices.....	90

CHAPTER	Page
Teacher Training.....	94
Program Administration and International Student Recruitment.....	94
6 DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND FUTURE RESEARCH.....	97
Recommendations for Writing Programs.....	101
Limitations and Future Research.....	105
REFERENCES.....	109
APPENDIX	
A IRB PROTOCOL	116
B INFORMATION LETTER FOR WRITING TEACHERS	118
C INFORMATION LETTER FOR WRITING PROGRAM DIRECTORS.....	120
D INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR IEP WRITING TEACHERS.....	122
E INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR FYC TEACHERS.....	124
F INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR FYC PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR.....	126
G INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR IEP PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR.....	128

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Recruitment of international students has become a major priority for American universities. International students are recruited for their abilities and talents, but also because they can expose American students to a wider variety of perspectives and cultures. In addition, international students are increasingly seen as a revenue source for universities facing budget pressures. International students pay out-of-state tuition, and in some cases may pay more. Intensive English Programs (IEPs) are playing an important role in preparing these students for U.S. higher education. IEPs are programs that are designed for pre-matriculated international students who are non-native speakers of English. Although many IEPs accept students who do not plan on continuing on to university studies, their primary role is to provide a gateway to higher education institutions for students whose language proficiency does not yet meet college admission requirements.

IEP students who continue on to university will in most cases be required to take First Year Composition (FYC) courses; however, IEP and FYC writing and programs are not always in close alignment administratively (Williams, 1995). In addition, IEP writing instruction is rooted in the TESOL/applied linguistics discipline, while FYC writing theory has emerged from the more humanities-focused tradition of rhetoric and composition, which has been slow to incorporate second language issues into composition classrooms. These disciplinary differences affect not only program-level pedagogy, but also the position and prestige of the programs within the university. The vast majority of FYC programs are situated within academic departments, while

depending on the context IEPs may be completely independent and practically invisible, or may be part of academic departments like FYC programs.

Despite these differences, FYC and IEP programs have similar missions in that they serve to socialize students into the norms of academic discourse communities, and share similar concerns about how to execute this mission while dealing with the complex exigencies of higher education administration. One major distinction is that IEPs are not concerned only with writing instruction; their mission is to improve students overall language proficiency in reading, writing, listening, and speaking, with the ultimate goal of helping students meet the language proficiency levels required for university admission. Composition classrooms require proficiency in each of these modalities, but instruction is focused primarily on writing, as well as reading to some extent.

Composition courses are writing courses, while IEP courses are situated as language classes. L2 writers may be in a position where what they have learned in the IEP may not transfer well to FYC courses. In addition, if FYC teachers are not aware of what their students have previously learned, then learning transfer becomes even more difficult.

Previous research (e.g., Atkinson & Ramanathan, 1995; Williams, 1995) suggests that L2 and L1 writing programs tend to be separate from each other in terms of administration, pedagogical approaches, and assumptions about the nature of academic writing. FYC programs do not focus primarily on developing students' linguistic proficiency, are usually housed within English departments, and emphasize building students' rhetorical knowledge. In FYC programs, the WPA Outcomes Statement has been influential in establishing a set of outcomes that reflect research in rhetoric and composition (White, 2006; Ericsson, 2006). This statement includes an emphasis on

building rhetorical knowledge, but has been criticized for its lack of attention to language issues particularly affecting L2 writers (Matsuda & Skinnell, in press). In the case of IEPs, linguistic proficiency development is foregrounded rather than rhetorical concerns (Atkinson & Ramanathan, 1995). While most second language writing research has focused on L2 writing in higher education contexts (Ortmeier-Hooper & Enright, 2011), there is a lack of current research specifically focusing on second language writing in IEP programs. In addition, the relationship between writing instruction in IEP and FYC programs has not been sufficiently addressed.

The goal of the study is to understand more about second language writing pedagogy for international students in these programs, as well as to provide university administrators with a better understanding of how to improve writing instruction for multilingual students, who have become a key part of the U.S. higher education mission. The study develops a better understanding of what is valued in L2 academic writing in IEP and FYC programs through a comparative case study approach, identifying the assumptions and underlying values of program directors and instructors in both types of instructional settings. Data include program-level mission statements, course descriptions and objectives, curricular materials, as well as interviews with teachers and program directors.

Statement of Problem

In my own experience as an instructor of writing classes at both IEP and FYC programs, I noticed a conflict within myself about how to approach teaching in these contexts. My academic and professional background prior to teaching any FYC classes had been situated entirely in TESOL and applied linguistics. I had taught a wide variety

of English language classes both in the U.S. and overseas, and had studied a number of foreign languages myself. In fact, I have never taken a writing class in English. I wasn't required to take any writing classes as an undergraduate and had no idea what FYC programs did. As a result, my first semester as an FYC teacher felt like pure improvisation. I needed to know more about composition theory and practice. I was unsure of the intended goals of FYC writing instruction, and lacked the disciplinary knowledge to fully understand the constructs described in the *WPA Outcomes Statement*. As a result, I tended to draw on my previous experience as a teacher of multilingual students, in which I focused more on structure and language usage.

As I gained more experience as an FYC teacher, read journals in composition studies, and attended conferences devoted to composition and writing program administration, I started to develop an appreciation for what I saw as the more socially-situated, discourse-level rhetorical focus of composition scholars. I became concerned with what I saw as the lack of focus on rhetorical aspects of writing in IEP writing instruction. However, I also began to see scholars in rhetoric and composition routinely fall into the type of thinking described by Matsuda (2006) as stemming from the "myth of linguistic homogeneity," in which the prototypical FYC student is assumed to be a native speaker of English. L2 writers will not get the language support they need if composition classrooms do not provide additional language support. Language acquisition is a life-long process, and it is not realistic to assume that IEPs can "fix" students' English in a year or two.

I was concerned that students in both L1 and L2 writing programs were suffering from the effects what Matsuda (1999) referred to as "the disciplinary division of labor,"

through which L1 and L2 writing concerns became separate due to the effects of TESOL/applied linguistics and composition studies' different trajectories as academic disciplines. Students who transition from IEP writing classes into FYC writing classes are themselves crossing this disciplinary divide. Since L2 writing programs are often in marginalized positions on campus (Williams, 1995), there is little opportunity and few resources to encourage collaboration and understanding about improving the transition of IEP students into FYC and the larger academic community. In addition, because many composition classes are taught by graduate teaching assistants from fields such as literature and linguistics, in practice many FYC teachers do not have a background in composition studies, and are themselves unaware of the history and development of composition studies itself. At the same time, graduate programs in TESOL have only recently begun to offer courses devoted specifically writing instruction in higher education settings. As a result, because of the lack of professional training in ESL writing in academic settings, many IEP teachers have to in effect teach themselves to teach writing.

I realized that the divisions and tensions I was noticing reflected somewhat different underlying values; for example, "genre" in composition is generally more focused on social action and the discursive formulation of genres, while in applied linguistics the focus has been traditionally on language and texts (Costino & Hyon, 2007). What I saw as "values" in this sense are the underlying emphases, and resulting pedagogical ramifications, at play in these differing notions of genre. It seems to "make sense" that L2 students need more of a language focus in terms of acquiring academic language, but in my own FYC teaching I realized that native English speaking students

benefitted from a focus on language as well. I began to see that these nuances about how a term such as “genre” can be used in very different ways as not only reflecting different theoretical orientations, but also stemming from axiological differences between composition studies and applied linguistics.

Axiology refers generally to the philosophy of values and, in contemporary philosophy, is usually called “value theory” (Hiles, 2008). The term was introduced in the early 20th century by French philosopher Paul Lapie (Fulkerson, 1990), and encompasses more specific notions of ethics and aesthetics, which require value theory as a way of analyzing relatively subjective concerns. The present study draws on how axiology is discussed in Fulkerson’s (1990) proposed “full ‘theory’ of composition” (p. 410). Fulkerson (1990) states that, “A full theory necessarily includes a commitment about what constitutes good writing—not necessarily a simplistic one, but some analysis of what we want student writers to achieve as a result of effective teaching. This is an axiological component” (pp. 410-411). This is important because, “Without some such aim, it is useless to teach composition since you can’t know whether a change in student writing represents progress. Without the aim, the Cheshire Cat’s advice holds: any road will do” (p. 411). With this in mind, learning objectives, classroom teaching procedures, and assessment practices are always “theory-laden”, and more specifically “value-laden” by axiological assumptions. These may be tacit assumptions in practice, but Fulkerson’s idea of a “commitment” suggests that conscious awareness of what “good writing” is, and how it should be taught, is necessary when making pedagogical about writing instruction, since:

From the initial decision that it is good to be able to read and write, to decisions about what sorts of classroom activities are useful in promoting those abilities, to the writer's decisions about whether one introduction or one word is better than another, to peer and teacher assessment of writing — value judgments are constantly being made (Fulkerson, 2010, p. 56).

In order to understand how to improve IEP and FYC writing program articulation, this dissertation will seek to draw out the axiological assumptions embedded in a case study of associated IEP and FYC programs. This study seeks to improve both the understanding of typical IEP values and practices, which has been understudied, and the understanding how these values relate to those found in FYC programs. The study develops a better understanding of what is valued in L2 academic writing in IEP and FYC programs through a comparative case study approach, identifying the underlying values of program directors and instructors in both types of instructional settings. In addition, tensions identified from the data analysis, informed by my own understanding of current research in applied linguistics and composition studies, will be discussed in terms of axiological difference, with an eye towards moving closer to better articulation between IEP and FYC programs. Data include program-level philosophies, course descriptions and objectives, curricular materials, as well as interviews with teachers and program directors.

Overview of Chapters

Chapter 1 has described the rationale and overall goal of the study. In Chapter 2, I trace the disciplinary histories and values of the fields of TESOL/applied linguistics, in order to contextualize my analysis of the disciplinary values and practices of the FYC and

IEP programs in my research context. Chapter 3 describes the method of the study. In chapter 4, I discuss the data from the research context, focusing on the overall mission of the programs, pedagogical approaches, writing tasks, and assessment practices. In Chapter 5, I discuss additional tensions that I found in the data, particularly related to the relationship between language and writing development, as well as between rhetorical and more language-focused approaches to L2 writing instruction. Finally, in Chapter 6 I reiterate my main findings, discuss practical recommendations, as well as potential further research stemming from this project.

CHAPTER 2

L1 AND L2 WRITING IN U.S. HIGHER EDUCATION

Globalization has changed the face of higher education in the United States. The default assumption that all students entering universities share similar cultural and linguistic backgrounds is no longer appropriate. Universities are still struggling with how to best meet the needs of international students, who are not necessarily already familiar with the norms of U.S. higher education, and who also are in the process of learning an additional language. Intensive English Programs (IEPs) are an important gateway for many international students seeking to study in the United States. An increasing number of IEPs offer conditional admission to university based on successful completion of their courses. For many of these students, studying at the IEP will be their first direct contact with U.S. culture, including that of the university. For such students, writing in their second (or third, or fourth) language is particularly challenging. Second language writers who attend IEPs must not only improve their language proficiency in a relatively short time, but also must learn the academic discourse conventions of U.S. higher education, which may differ greatly from what they have learned previously.

This chapter provides an overview of the history of L1 and L2 writing instruction in U.S. higher education, as well as descriptions of major teaching approaches, and will provide an analysis of the axiological development of writing instruction as it relates to FYC and IEP writing instruction at the disciplinary level. This historical narrative serves to inform my own understanding and analysis of the data from the research context described in later chapters of this study. Historical narratives are difficult to compare

directly to specific contemporary data; however, an understanding of the development of different disciplinary approaches to writing instruction is helpful in contextualizing the discussion of how the data from the research context can be understood axiologically. By understanding the how the axiologies of writing instruction have evolved over the years, a better sense of the present situation can emerge.

Composition Studies in U.S. Higher Education

It is common in academia to refer to concepts such as “discipline,” “field,” and more recently, “interdisciplinary” and “multidisciplinary.”. However, Matsuda (2000), in tracing the disciplinary history of L2 writing in relation to L1 composition, remarked that:

A major dilemma in talking about disciplinary is that it is difficult, if not impossible, to define the discipline or field in ways that can satisfy everyone involved. Inevitably, everyone has a different definition of the disciplines in which they are involved. It is inevitable because terms such as "discipline" and "field" do not refer to any physical reality. Instead, they refer to rather loosely defined sets of practices— disciplinary practices as well as pedagogical practices. Those practices are institutionalized through entities such as courses, programs, and departments as well as conferences, journals, and other types of publications. In this sense, disciplines are not things but actions; disciplines are what people in the disciplines do. In other words, *discipline* can be defined as sets of *institutional practices* (p. 104).

The present study focuses on how the institutional practices of a typical FYC and IEP program reflect the disciplinary values of composition and second language studies as

reflected in previous research within these fields. Understanding the complex historical processes that inform the formation of these disciplines is not only important as a heuristic for the present study, but also should be seen as important and useful knowledge for all teachers and researchers involved in the current increasingly multidisciplinary nature of teaching and research in higher education. By understanding the origins and formation of academic disciplines, a more nuanced understanding of the nature of our personal and institutional practices is possible.

Historical accounts of composition studies (e.g., Berlin, 1987; Brereton, 1995; Connors, 1991; North, 1987; Young & Goggin, 1993), as explained in detail in Knoblauch and Matsuda (2008), trace the roots of composition from different starting points, reflecting the complexity of perspectives in the field. Composition can be seen as originating from ancient Greek rhetorical training (Bizzell & Herzberg, 2001; Murphy, 2001), from the institutionalization of FYC courses during the late 19th century (Brereton, 1995, Connors, 1997), or from the emergence of composition as an academic discipline in the mid-twentieth century (Berlin, 1987; Lauer, 1993; North, 1987). For the purposes of this study, I will summarize the historical narrative of Knoblauch and Matsuda (2008), who begin their history with an account of the developments leading to the first modern composition course at Harvard in the late nineteenth century. Since this study focuses on the values embedded in the institutional practices of contemporary writing instruction at IEPs and FYC programs, starting from the first composition course at Harvard serves to situate the study in its particular North American context, in which the disciplinary history of L1 composition is largely tied to the role of the FYC course at colleges and universities. In addition, since IEP programs are in most cases affiliated with

universities, parallel developments in the disciplinary origins of L2 writing are also rooted in and influenced by the institutional practices (and their affordances and constraints) of higher education. Thus, the disciplinary and historical discussions of L1 and L2 writing in this study will be situated in and framed by the exigencies of U.S. higher education. However, it is important to note that the historical exigencies influencing L1 and L2 writing theory and practice have included influences beyond the United States, and that a crucial concern for the future is to continue to internationalize composition studies as well as second language studies.

In the early 19th century, higher education in the United States was primarily influenced by the British educational system (Berlin, 1984; Brereton, 1995; Knoblauch & Matsuda, 2008). At that time, students did not have majors, or take a variety of elective classes; they were trained by professionals from different occupations in subjects such as math and classical languages such as Greek and Latin. Education at this time was primarily for wealthy white males, and focused more on developing the overall maturity, taste, and suitability for public roles appropriate to the relatively privileged positions such students would eventually be expected to fulfill in society.

During this period, rhetorical training was an important component of the curriculum of U.S. higher education; while focusing mainly on oral recitation and transcription, students also were required to turn in written versions of their oral recitations, and wrote short “themes” about general topics. Knoblauch and Matsuda (2008) note that during this period, “writing was considered so crucial to higher education that students received instruction in writing, rhetoric, and speaking throughout the four years of their education” (p. 5). By the end of the nineteenth-century, writing had

become the focus of composition courses rather than public speaking (Wright & Halloran, 2001). This change was partially due to the rise of the literary study of works in English (rather than classical languages), which required students to develop their ability to consume and appreciate such texts, i.e. focusing on developing their ability to appreciate texts rather than produce them. In addition, the rising ambitious middle class led to more demand for writing instruction at U.S. colleges and universities. The growth of the middle class led to a more socio-economically diverse student population; the U.S. Congress passed legislation establishing land-grant institutions that introduced specialized agricultural and practical engineering instruction geared towards the new industrial economy. Drawing on the German approach to education, which favored specialization and research, universities began to establish academic majors, which led to the development and proliferation of specialized academic disciplines (Knoblauch and Matsuda, 2008). The German approach did not privilege rhetoric, and gradually composition instruction began to be relegated to overworked junior faculty and literature graduate students, who did their time in the trenches before moving on to other positions at the university.

Despite the creation and proliferation of first year writing courses, composition studies did not achieve disciplinary status until after World War II. After the war, the U.S. government developed training programs for returned enlisted men (Berlin, 1987; Crowley, 1998; Knoblauch & Matsuda, 2008), which emphasized basic communication for academic and business purposes, as well as training in reading and critiquing popular texts, including propaganda. Knoblauch and Matsuda (2008) make the case that this shift in the curriculum led to a situation in which instructors previously trained in literature

had difficulties adapting to a more rhetorical and communicative pedagogy. In response to this exigency, a group of concerned writing scholars attended the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE); subsequently, this group was instrumental in the formation of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC), which is now the main conference for composition professionals, as well as in the establishment of *College Composition and Communication (CCC)*, the leading journal in the field of composition. However, composition studies at this time was still devoted to pedagogical concerns, and had yet to establish itself as a recognized discipline with a rigorous research agenda. Within the CCCC organization, interest in communication diminished, and composition studies moved towards establishing itself as a distinct field through the traditional means of publishing research articles in academic journals, establishing PhD programs in the field, and advocating for composition studies as a legitimate field of inquiry in its own right. Still, the field did not have an established knowledge base to draw on, other than perhaps classical rhetoric, which was not easily translatable into teaching practice. However, classical rhetoric was being reconfigured for the modern (or postmodern) era by scholars such as Kenneth Burke and Chaim Perelman, who emphasized the role of social context and informal logic, which led to an expanded notion of rhetoric (The New Rhetoric) as “epistemic,” or knowledge creating. Composition scholars also began drawing on diverse theories and research methodologies from psychology, critical theory, creative writing, and education. As the number of journals devoted to composition studies proliferated, approaches to writing instruction informed by these new theoretical influences began to be promulgated and discussed widely within the field, establishing a relatively coherent academic discipline.

Teaching Approaches in First Year Composition

Current-traditional Rhetoric

The term "current traditional rhetoric" —without a hyphen, as pointed out by Matsuda (2003)— was introduced by Fogarty (1959), who used the term to simply describe the traditional practices of writing instruction at the time as reflected in commonly used textbooks. Fogarty had an interest in more philosophical versions of rhetoric, and saw the writing instruction practices in his day as without a real underlying philosophy. Richard Young (1978) used the term “current-traditional rhetoric” as part of his criticism of overly formalistic rhetorical approaches that neglected the role of rhetoric in building knowledge through invention. According to Young, current traditional rhetoric is characterized by an "emphasis on the composed product rather than the composing process; the analysis of discourse into words, sentences, and paragraphs; the classification of discourse into description, narration, exposition, and argument; the strong concern with usage (syntax, spelling, punctuation) and with style (economy, clarity, emphasis); the preoccupation with the informal essay and research paper; and so on" (p. 31). This approach also included the use of the rhetorical or discourse modes, e.g., exposition, description, narration, and argumentation (Crowley, 1990). The term was further popularized by James A. Berlin (who had attended Richard Young’s seminars on rhetorical invention) in Berlin (1980) and Berlin and Inkster (1982). Berlin (1980) remarked that current-traditional rhetoric is, “a rhetoric which offers principles of style and arrangement that are to be applied to the written product, not learned as a process. Significantly, invention is excluded from the rhetorical act” (p. 11). However, Robert J. Connors (1997) remarked that, “‘Current-traditional rhetoric’ became a convenient

whipping boy, the term of choice after 1985 for describing whatever in nineteenth- and twentieth-century rhetorical or pedagogical history any given author found wanting. Got a contemporary problem? Blame it on that darn old current-traditional rhetoric” (p. 5). Matsuda (2003) argued that the popular critique of current-traditional rhetoric served as a useful, but not necessarily historically accurate, discursive construction for the purpose of advocating for process approaches; in fact, “current-traditional rhetoric” became a term to represent everything that was wrong with writing instruction in the past. Connors (1986, 1997) makes the point that given the overworked composition faculty at the time, along with the post-War expansion of middle-class opportunity and ambition, it is not surprising that writing instruction focused on “proper” grammar and style. Knoblauch and Matsuda (2008) argue that, “While the focus on ‘proper’ English may have served a gate-keeping function, acquisition of such discourse may have also assisted students in their quest for social mobility (p. 11). While the “current-traditional” term may be somewhat of a straw man, this tension reflects an axiological tension between valuing product versus process; in addition, the tension between providing students with discourse immediately useful for their social advancement versus valuing students’ own invention of ideas and language is a value-laden tension between immediately pragmatic and more complex, rhetorical approaches to writing instruction.

Process and Post-process

The process movement in composition, conventionally seen as beginning in the late 1960s and early 1970s, deemphasized focusing primarily on students’ final written “products,” with the view that summative feedback did not necessarily help students become better writers. Rather than waiting until it was too late, process writing advocates

recommended that teachers better understand problems students had along the way, and intervene when necessary to shift students into a more productive writing process that would ultimately yield an adequate "product." In order to achieve this, techniques such as writing multiple drafts, peer feedback sessions, and teacher/student conferences were incorporated into the classroom. The process approach quickly became widespread, although Matsuda (2003) argued that traces of the process approach could be found in earlier composition teaching contexts going back much earlier than the late 1960s. Nevertheless, the process movement was considered a paradigm shift (Hairston, 1982), and multiple varieties of the approach emerged.

Faigley (1986) identified three different variations of composition instruction that incorporated elements of the process approach: expressivist, cognitive, and social. Expressivists, such as Peter Elbow and Donald Murray, emphasized personal experience and self-discovery in the writing classroom; this less didactic approach to writing allowed for typical process approach activities such as peer feedback, freewriting, with less (or no) emphasis on grammar, depending on the teacher. Cognitive process researchers, such as Flower and Hayes (1977, 1981) and Emig (1971) drew on research in developmental psychology and cognitive science to attempt to identify and explain the actual cognitive processes which occur as writers produce texts. However, cognitive approaches were criticized for ignoring the social, discursive nature of writing, particularly in terms of how writers functioned discursively within discourse communities (Bizzell, 1982). Bartholomae (1985), in his influential article "Inventing the University", critiqued the Flower and Hayes model as positioning the "problem" of writing as something to be solved within an individual mind, whereas Bartholomae saw his students' writing

problems as stemming from their inability to understand how language and discourse worked in the social world of the university itself. A similar critique was also leveled at expressivist pedagogies, which tended to privilege individual discovery and development over social engagement.

The third variety of process writing instruction, the social, draws on diverse theoretical influences, including post-structuralism and Marxism. This view of the writing process sees meaning as constructed through the social operation of discourse, and encourages students to understand the social contexts shaping written communication. This "social turn" (Trimbur, 1994) led to dissatisfaction with process writing, particularly the cognitive and expressive varieties, since the socially-oriented theories sought to move beyond understanding individual writers. However, the post-process movement, despite being somewhat incoherent in defining itself, was influential in expanding the scope of composition studies and in shifting the attention of researchers and teachers toward viewing writing as socially-situated and shaped by previous discourse.

From an axiological perspective, expressivist, cognitive, and social approaches differ in some ways (Berlin, 1987). Expressivism values self-discovery and the relation of personal experience, which positions "good writing" as achieving these goals. This value theory lends itself to teaching approaches that, while not necessarily ignoring issues such as grammar and organization, ultimately privilege expression itself vs. specific textual forms. Cognitive process theory suggests that writing pedagogy should focus on helping students refine their own processes of goal-setting and execution of the writing process; however, this approach does not necessarily imply an axiology of what the final texts

should embody thematically or seek to achieve. Each individual's process of writing will be geared to his or her own process of goal-setting in relation to the writing context. Social process approaches value students' understanding of how discourse is situated and operates in complex ways; in this sense what is valued is both an epistemic knowledge of the nature of discourse itself, but also the ability to negotiate and interrogate these discourses.

Rhetorical Pedagogy

Rhetorical pedagogy is ultimately rooted in classical Greco-Roman theories of rhetoric; however, contemporary practitioners of rhetorical pedagogy have adapted these theories for the modern composition classroom. Rhetorical pedagogy focuses on the rhetorical situation, the rhetorical appeals of *logos*, *pathos*, and *ethos*, informal argument, and ultimately on the role of audience in co-constructing the meaning of texts. Understanding the rhetorical practices of academic communities meshes well with FYC's institutional mission to prepare students for disciplinary and workplace writing, since an understanding of the relationships among text, author, reader, and reality are useful for entering the discursive practices of academic communities. The *WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition (WPA OS)*, widely used in contemporary composition classrooms, includes building rhetorical knowledge as an important expected outcome of FYC courses, and has been referred to as the "über outcome" (Maid & D'Angelo, 2013). Rhetorical pedagogy also generally sees genres, following Miller (1984), as being defined by recurring social actions, rather than as an amalgamation of linguistic features.

Rhetorical approaches to writing instruction can be seen as valuing the knowledge of rhetorical concepts themselves, while also valuing the procedural knowledge of how to construct a message that affects an audience in the way the writer intends. In this sense, good writing is constructed by the use of language in relation to the rhetorical situation. Matsuda (2006) argues that the default assumption of composition studies has been that FYC students are monolingual speakers of English, and this approach can be problematic if students are negatively assessed based on their linguistic accuracy if they are not provided with language support to achieve their rhetorical goals.

Critical Pedagogy and Cultural Studies

Critical pedagogy, rooted in the work of critical scholar/activists such as Paolo Freire, Henry Giroux, and Ira Shor, seeks to empower students by helping them identify how dominant discourses create and reflect structural inequality in society. The goal of writing teachers who follow this approach is to teach students to resist these hegemonic discourses through their own literacy practices that constitute *praxis*, or critically aware practice. Cultural studies shares similar goals as critical pedagogy, but is rooted in the work of British cultural studies theorists such as Stuart Hall and Raymond Williams, who incorporated neo-Marxist critique into their understanding of how popular culture texts are positioned as inferior to more reified textual forms, such as “serious” literature. They believe that the marginalization of popular culture is rooted in elitist classism, and that this marginalization both reflects and further constitutes social inequality. These approaches, part of the “social turn” (Trimbur, 1994) were criticized most notably by Maxine Hairston (1992), who argued that these approaches were too dogmatically ideological, and led to teachers’ attempting to indoctrinate their students rather than teach

them the craft of writing. Trimbur (1993) responded to this criticism by observing that all pedagogies are political in some sense, and that what Hairston considered indoctrination was actually the preparation that students desperately needed to flourish in contemporary capitalist society. This tension between the pragmatic and the critical has been an ongoing issue in composition studies. Knoblauch and Matsuda (2008) argue that, “at the center of this debate is the question that haunts all teachers of academic writing: What is this course *for*? What is it supposed to be doing?” (p. 19). This concern is ultimately about axiology; the answer to the question, “What is FYC for?” can be answered many different ways, and lead to many different approaches. In the case of critical and cultural studies, “good writing” examines and confronts power relations, often concerning issues that international L2 students may not be familiar with. Providing students with “correct” language forms may be seen in this view as reifying dominant varieties of language; however, without sufficient language proficiency L2 students may not be able to successfully understand and confront critical power relations.

Writing about Writing

The Writing about Writing approach was advanced initially by Douglas Downs and Elizabeth Wardle in their article, “Teaching about Writing, Righting Misconceptions” (2007). Downs and Wardle state that, “This pedagogy explicitly recognizes the impossibility of teaching a universal academic discourse and rejects that as a goal for FYC. It seeks instead to improve students’ understanding of writing, rhetoric, language, and literacy in a course that is topically oriented to reading and writing as scholarly inquiry and encouraging more realistic understandings of writing” (p. 553). Downs and Wardle believe that many students enter FYC courses with limited

knowledge of writing as a complex, socially situated activity, and in many cases have experienced reductive (reminiscent of so called current-traditional pedagogy) writing classes in their K-12 experiences. Downs and Wardle argue that the composition field has had difficulty in demonstrating the effectiveness of teaching a generalized version of “academic discourse”; given composition studies’ contemporary view of discourse as a social process, then teaching abstract “academic discourse” puts compositionists in a position where they are forced to deny their own scholarly positions. The axiology informing this approach can be seen to some extent as reflecting a concern for the value of composition studies itself, in that Downs and Wardle state that, “our concern is not simply to improve writing instruction but also to improve the position of writing studies in the academy” (p. 554). This approach has been criticized for ultimately not solving the problem of preparing students for disciplinary writing, and leading perhaps to some degree of “awareness” about writing, but not necessarily to actual improvement of writing proficiency (Kutney, 2007). However, this approach can be seen as solving the “content” issue of FYC; in addition, providing students with the metalanguage required to understand writing studies may be instrumental over the long term, although more empirical research will be necessary to judge whether this approach is effective.

There have been, and continue to be, multiple approaches to teaching composition in U.S higher education. These approaches are formed by axiological nuances about writing that have evolved through debate and moments of consensus, and will continue to change as the exigencies affecting higher education themselves evolve. While the preceding sections have focused on L1 composition, the following sections will focus on L2 pedagogy in TESOL, particularly as it has related to Intensive English programs.

Intensive English Programs in U.S Higher Education

Intensive English Programs (IEPs) provide a gateway to U.S. higher education institutions for students who are developing their English language proficiency that are necessary to function at the college level. Most universities and colleges require international students to provide evidence of English proficiency as part of the admission process. Many universities offer conditional admission to students who have met all other admission requirements besides the language proficiency requirement. Students can demonstrate their language proficiency by attaining a certain score on a language proficiency test, such as the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL), International English Language Testing System (IELTS), or Pearson Test of English Academic (PTE Academic). Alternatively, some institutions allow students to fulfill this requirement by successfully completing IEP coursework. In many cases, students can also enroll in a limited number of college-level courses while they are receiving language instruction at the IEP. Students at IEPs affiliated with academic institutions may also have access to facilities and services available at the institution, such as libraries, computing centers, and writing centers.

First developed at the University of Michigan in 1941, IEPs grew in number during the 1970s and the 1980s with the rise of the international student population in U.S. higher education. Although the number declined during the 1990s, it is gaining popularity as a recruitment tool for institutions seeking to attract international students in order to enhance their globalization efforts while generating a revenue stream. According to the Institute of International Education, the IEP enrollment has grown steadily since

2003; in 2011, approximately 70,000 international students were enrolled in IEPs throughout the United States (*Open Doors*, 2012).

Some IEPs are built into the institutions of higher education and others are private entities that are not part of an academic institution. Among IEPs affiliated with academic institutions, some are part of an academic unit while others are independent units within the institution. Many private IEPs operate independently to provide language instruction to students. Others have established relationships with academic institutions, providing language support services for the institution.

IEPs accomplish their goal of helping students develop their academic language proficiency in a relatively short period of time by providing rigorous language instruction at an accelerated pace. IEPs offer instruction on reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills at multiple-proficiency levels. In addition, they often provide instruction on English grammar to facilitate the development of metalinguistic awareness. Some IEPs may group students according to their intended majors together to provide more focused instruction on discipline-specific language skills. Smaller programs with limited resources may not offer multi-level courses. In some cases undergraduate and graduate students are placed in the same course. Depending on students' proficiency level and progress, they can complete a program in eight weeks to several years.

Barrett (1982) remarked that intensive English programs were strongly influenced by, "the archetypal English language Institute (ELI) at the University of Michigan" (p. 1) which he described as:

the original training ground for scores of ESL specialists, who learned their trade under the guidance of linguist Charles C. Fries and later under the direction of

Robert Lado. As a response to the increasing numbers of international students seeking ESL study here in the United States during the last 20 years, many of these former ELI staff members put their training to good use and established programs of their own throughout the country. It is no surprise, then, that 40 years after the founding of the first IEP, we can identify certain common features among the many intensive programs operating today, certain shared characteristics which allow us to say that *this* collection of courses, students, and faculty is an intensive English program and *that* one is not (p. 1).

Barrett (1982) identified nine essential features common to IEPs:

1. IEPs have multiple levels of instruction, including at the minimum basic, intermediate, and advanced classes. Most IEPs have from 4 to 6 levels, with distinct classes, materials, objectives, and approaches corresponding to each level. Students can progress from lower to higher levels in the program, with many students spending a year or more to eventually complete the entire sequence then move on to university study or employment (Barrett, 1982).
2. IEPs use some form of standardized ESL test for admissions, placement, in many cases to monitor student progress during the program (Barrett, 1982).
3. IEP programs provide instruction in the four skills of reading, writing, listening, and speaking, and usually provide courses in grammar instruction (Barrett, 1982).
4. IEPs are typically a service unit affiliated with an academic department or other administrative unit at the University (Barrett, 1982).

5. The IEP operates virtually all year round, allowing students to progress to higher levels with minimum delays between sessions. IEP schedules are often tied to the schedule of their associated academic institution, although some IEPs prefer an 8 week course schedule (i.e., two sessions per semester), while others provide 16 week courses (Barrett, 1982).
6. Typical IEPs offer from 20 to 30 hours of instruction a week, with a total of more than 200 hours for each session (Barrett, 1982).
7. The IEP offers some form of advising and initial orientation for students, and most offer ongoing orientation to U.S. academic and cultural norms, including information about the local community (Barrett, 1982).
8. IEP students are typically adults (i.e., IEPs are not usually designed for younger learners) with high school or even college diplomas, who generally plan on going on to further academic study at US institutions. Students come from many different ethnic origins, language backgrounds, and have differing levels of language proficiency (Barrett, 1982).
9. IEPs are staffed by a director and core faculty professionally trained TESOL specialists, with training and experience sufficient for executing the mission of the IEP (Barrett, 1982).

IEPs have not changed radically since Barrett's description in 1982. Standardized tests are still used for admissions purposes, and the most commonly used tests are the TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) and the IELTS (International English Language Teaching System). These tests provide subscores in different language modalities, including reading, writing, listening, and speaking; these tests can often provide students

with the opportunity to enter university upon meeting the score required by the university admissions office. Barrett's description of course offerings does not mention elective classes, which are now common at IEPs, with offerings such as American culture, business communication, and test preparation. Barrett describes IEPs as primarily affiliated with academic units; however, even in 1982, Barrett (1982) remarked that, "recently there have been a few independently established IEPs and a number of franchise ESL intensive programs that have had no affiliation with any particular institution of post secondary education" (p. 2). These days, a number of for-profit IEP programs are proliferating, such as ESLI (English as a Second Language International) and INTO University Partnerships Limited (INTO). Currently, the largest groups of students are from China, as well as Middle Eastern countries, primarily Saudi Arabia (Institute of International Education, 2012).

L2 Writing in U.S. Higher Education

Before the 1940s, universities did not have a way of preparing L2 students to meet the academic literacy demands of higher education, so students were sent to high schools and prep schools until they reached an acceptable level of language proficiency. In many cases, these L2 students entered college without adequate proficiency, so they were forced to make do without significant institutional support. The Good Neighbor policy, enacted in 1933, brought a large number of students from Latin America to U.S. higher education. In response, the U.S. State Department established the English Language Institute (ELI) in 1941 at the University of Michigan. According to Matsuda (2006), "the Michigan ELI provided a model for intensive English programs throughout

the United States and in many other countries” (p. 646). These programs initially focused on graduate students, and provided language instruction in a short period of time.

Eventually, the ELI model became more widespread and available for undergraduate students. After World War II, there was another influx of international students, which led to the proliferation of IEPs.

Matsuda (2003) describes how writing was neglected in early second language studies, partially because of the influence of audiolingual approaches to language teaching, which tended to see writing as merely the orthographic representation of spoken language. Early applied linguists made the case that phonetics should be the basis for both theoretical and applied linguistics. This view, which considered language teaching as an application of descriptive linguistics, with an emphasis on spoken language, became influential throughout the language teaching field. The ELI curriculum was heavily influenced by the work of linguists such as Charles Fries, Leonard Bloomfield, and Robert Lado. These scholars viewed structural linguistics, which focused primarily on describing spoken language, as the basis for language teaching.

The specialized knowledge of linguistics required in this view served to establish the professional ethos of language teachers, which Matsuda (1999, p. 703) refers to as “Michigan professionalism.” However, the reliance on structural linguistics led to an emphasis on spoken, rather than written, language. Matsuda (1999) argues that, “partly due to the dominance of Fries's view of applied linguistics, the study of written language or the teaching of writing to ESL students did not attract serious attention from applied linguists until the 1960s, and intensive English programs did not pay much attention to the teaching of writing beyond grammar drills at the sentence level” (p. 709). The success

and influence of the ELI in preparing language teachers spread the view of language teaching as the realm of specialists who could apply linguistic theory to pedagogical practices. Matsuda (1999) argues that “the growth of Michigan professionalism and its view of second-language teaching as the application of linguistic principles had a profound impact on the way ESL writing was positioned in the emerging field of composition” (p. 706). Prior to these developments, there had been interest in second language issues in composition studies, but as the notion spread that teaching L2 students required a background in linguistics, and with the creation of the TESOL organization in 1966, interest in L2 issues in composition gradually faded.

L2 Writing Teaching Approaches

In the 1960s, IEP instruction, which focused on spoken language, was found to be inadequate as far as developing written communication skills, so in order to prepare students for the language demands of higher education, writing courses were added as a component. Initially, instruction on writing consisted of sentence-level exercises and controlled composition. The controlled composition approach, based on a behaviorist approaches to language learning, posited that if students were allowed to make errors in their language production, they would internalize these errors, a process known as fossilization. In order to avoid fossilization, students weren't allowed to engage in free composition, and wrote about varying topics while relying on fixed sentence structures provided by teachers. However, the limitations of the controlled composition approach quickly became apparent, because the sentence level grammar exercises did not effectively help students to write their own original sentences, nor did it help them develop their ability to produce more extended discourse beyond the sentence level.

Language learning takes a long time, and few students arrived at the stage where they could engage in free composition before entering college. In order to help students move from sentence-level production to writing longer stretches of discourse, a pedagogical technique called *guided composition* was introduced, which allowed students to develop more extensive discourse with some guidance from teachers. These approaches favor a conception of “good writing” that is error free, and in contrast to process and rhetorical approaches common in FYC programs, do not particularly value students’ ideas or authentic participation in discourse communities.

Gradually, language curricula at IEPs moved from a purely structure-based curriculum to a skills-based curriculum, with separate courses for listening, speaking, writing, reading, and grammar (as well as courses on culture and other electives). In the late 70s and 80s, some innovations in second language teaching influenced the development of IEP pedagogy. One development was the introduction of a functional syllabus, which provided an organizational scheme for course content. As opposed to a grammar-based syllabus, this approach focused on the particular contexts of language use, which provided the principle for organizing the language structure and vocabulary lessons. Another major development was the introduction of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), which helped to shift the emphasis of language education from structure to the overall effectiveness of communication. These approaches can be seen as reflecting an increased concern for the communicative effectiveness of language production, rather than privileging grammatical accuracy. More recently, language teachers are beginning to focus on theme based and content based instruction, which integrates both the communicative context and the relevant content required for successful communication.

However, theoretical advances in language teaching have not always informed writing instruction at IEPs. One of the reasons is that these pedagogical discussions concerning approaches to language teaching focused on spoken rather than written communication. This tendency to neglect writing in discussions of L2 teaching and learning also was evident in the lack of opportunities for adequate preparation for teaching writing in MA TESOL programs.

In the late 1970s and the 1980s, developments in both composition studies and second language studies led teachers and researchers to move beyond considerations of L2 textual features or how L2 writers differed from L1 writers. In the field of rhetoric and composition, interest shifted to the process of writing itself, with researchers (e.g., Emig, Flower & Hayes) investigating the processes underlying the production of writing. Process was introduced to the L2 writing field by Vivian Zamel (1976), who made the case that advanced L2 writers do not differ categorically from L1 writers, and thus can benefit from instruction focusing on the writing process. Instead of focusing on reproducing previously learned grammatical structures, the process-based approach in L2 writing studies, following L1 approaches, emphasized the development of invention and textual organization strategies, revision, multiple drafts, and formative feedback from peers and teachers.

While some L2 researchers saw the widespread adoption of process approaches as a “paradigm shift” (Raimes, 1983), other scholars (e.g., Horowitz, 1986) made the case that the process approach was potentially problematic for L2 writers. Horowitz (1986) identified four caveats about the process approach for L2 writers. First, he argued that emphasizing multiple drafts does not prepare students for timed essay examinations;

second, that peer evaluation may cause students to develop unrealistic views concerning their own proficiency level; third, that the writing processes of expert writers may be inaccessible or ineffective for lower-level students, and fourth, that the inductive nature of the process approach is not always best for L2 students, who could potentially benefit from more explicit instruction in the linguistic and rhetorical features of common tasks and assignments at the university level. Even though the process approach rose to prominence in L2 writing research, incorporation into actual pedagogical practices was slow. In terms of axiology, the tension between providing students with “correct” language instruction, which could be more pragmatic, versus emphasizing the development of students’ own goal-directed writing processes is evident. Product driven approaches value the quality of the text itself, while process situates the learning goals in terms of the students’ mental development of skills and strategies. However, product and process approaches are not mutually exclusive, and a focus on the writing process does not necessarily preclude a consideration of the nature of the final product.

The writing process movement was paralleled by the development of the English for Specific Purposes (ESP) approach, which focused on the specific contexts in which L2 students would likely be writing in. English for Academic Purposes (EAP), a type of ESP, began to develop as more international L2 students entered university writing classrooms, in particular graduate students studying in the United States and other western countries. According to Silva and Leki (2004) the aim of EAP instruction is to:

...recreate, as well as possible, the conditions under which actual university writing takes place and to help learners recognize and produce features of generic forms that would be acceptable at an English-medium institution of higher

learning, while at the same time acknowledging and alerting students to the dynamic nature of genres. The writer is assumed to be pragmatic and interested for the most part in learning how to meet the standards for academic success set by members of the academic discourse community” (p. 6).

In order to teach students about different contexts for academic writing, understanding and describing the various contexts of writing became a necessity. EAP researchers began to describe writing in relation to context, developing descriptive accounts of various aspects of the academic genres that are required for composition courses and other courses across the disciplines. This approach values both textual appropriateness as well as rhetorical effectiveness. L2 writing courses began to emphasize writing for specific academic discourse communities, rather than seeing L2 writing pedagogy as remedial language instruction. However, some scholars (e.g., Spack, 1988) raised the concern that ESL teachers would likely lack the ability to understand and teach unfamiliar disciplinary writing practices effectively.

ESP genre researchers such as John Swales began to provide descriptive accounts of the types of writing advanced graduate students were required to do. This approach is sometimes considered to be competing with the process approach, although in practice the writing process can be attended to in any pedagogical approach. Because much of the ESP writing research literature focuses on advanced learners (often graduate students) in terms of proficiency level and academic achievement, very little of this research appears immediately applicable to IEP contexts, and thus these discussions of writing pedagogy can seem irrelevant to IEP instruction, even in cases where the research might have value in understanding and improving IEP writing instruction.

L2 Writing in Composition Studies

Second language writing began to be a concern in composition studies after the end of World War II, which brought a growing number of international students to the United States (Matsuda, 2012). In response, special ESL sections were developed in college composition programs. Although there had been some interest in L2 writing issues at the CCCC conference prior to this time, the creation of the TESOL organization in 1966 led to the waning of interest and L2 issues within composition studies.

While the 1940s and 1950s brought many new international students to US higher education, open admissions policies in the late 1960s (beginning in the City University of New York (CUNY) system) brought a student population to universities that was much more socio-economically and ethnically diverse than the traditional student population, which had consisted generally of relatively privileged white students. This situation led to the development of basic writing as a research interest, and scholars such as Mina Shaughnessy borrowed to some extent from ESL writing theory, particularly in her focus on student errors. Many of the non-traditional students in basic writing classes were multilingual, although some were not; however, it was common practice at the time (and in some cases still is) to place L2 writers in basic writing courses. While basic writing scholars did look to applied linguistics/TESOL for inspiration and ideas, Matsuda (2012) makes the case that, “Even with these interdisciplinary interactions, second language issues tended to play a marginal role in the professional discourse of basic writing specialists until well into the 1990s because of the persistence of the binary oppositions between first and second language, and between native-born and foreign-born populations. (p. 41).

In the 1980s, second-language writing in TESOL began to expand because of the influence of the growth of composition studies as a discipline, and some compositionists looked to second language studies for insights that could help them teach L2 writers in their writing programs (Matsuda, 2012). However, as composition studies expanded into broader topics such as critical theory and cultural studies, language issues became seen as the provenance of specialists, and sessions at the CCCCs were not well attended. In the 1990s, second-language writing began to solidify itself as an interdisciplinary field, generally construed as primarily drawing on the fields of applied linguistics/TESOL and composition studies. Around this time, key developments in the field of second language writing occurred, including the establishment of the Symposium on Second Language Writing conference and the *Journal of Second Language Writing*.

The publication of the *CCCC Statement on Second-Language Writing and Writers* (2000) was a major development in L2 writing issues in the field of composition studies. The statement advised that all writing teachers should, “recognize the regular presence of second-language writers in writing classes, to understand their characteristics, and to develop instructional and administrative practices that are sensitive to their linguistic and cultural needs”. In addition, the document emphasizes that language issues should be taken into consideration in all aspects of composition theory and practice, including theory, pedagogy, assessment, and program-level administrative practices. Reflecting on this document, Matsuda (2012) argues that, “second language writing cannot be considered a concern for only a handful of specialists; instead, it needs to be seen as an integral part of all areas of composition studies” (p. 44). Matsuda also cautions that in practice there is still much work to be done in fully integrating L2 issues into the

disciplinary practices of composition studies, including classroom instruction and writing program administration.

Axiological Tensions between L1 and L2 Writing Theory

The previous descriptions of the disciplinary histories and teaching approaches historically represented in the fields of composition studies and applied linguists/TESOL attest to the notion that these fields have been in productive communication, yet at times have diverged. For example, the ESP genre approach can be seen as a reaction to the dominance of process approaches. In addition, the stronger versions of critical pedagogies and cultural studies approaches were much less successful in being widely accepted in TESOL and applied linguistics, although that is not to say they have had no influence. Underlying these divergences are different values, or axiologies, of what good writing is, what it looks like, what it does, how it develops, how it should be taught, and how it should be assessed.

Pedagogical approaches display these values whether implicitly or explicitly; for example, ESP genre approaches generally privilege text, while rhetorical genre approaches in composition value a focus on the social factors that discursively shape genres. However, in practice teachers incorporate multiple approaches in their classrooms, with varying degrees of meta-awareness of the values embedded in their own practices. Just as Trimbur (1993) remarked in response to Hairston's (1992) critique of the social turn, no pedagogy is without a politics, and in the same way no teaching approach does not involve value judgments in prioritizing what (of the many) things should be taught to students.

One of the divergences between L1 and L2 writing theory has been in terms of political ideology. Terry Santos (1992) argued that, “L1 composition, residing mostly in English departments, has been highly influenced by critical literary theories, whereas ESL writing has identified itself as part of applied linguistics, accommodating itself to the prevailing standards of inquiry and research in that field. Their different backgrounds make L1 and L2 composition very different in their assumptions about language and the role of explicit sociopolitical ideology in theory and practice” (pp. 6-7). Silva and Leki (2004) describe L1 composition as being “left to far left in its politics” (p. 7), while applied linguistics they consider to be pragmatic and center-left politically. In contrast to L1 composition they state that, “the L2 writing literature in applied linguistics mostly exhibits a kind of cautious apolitical conservatism, arising perhaps out of an attempt to be sensitive to the great varieties of social, cultural, and political contexts in which L2 writing takes place” (p. 8). Santos (1992) also argued that L2 writing ideology has been influenced by the international character of the TESOL field, in which many competing ideologies and political systems must co-exist. Silva and Leki (2004) remark that in most EAP research, “the writer is assumed to be pragmatic and interested for the most part in learning how to meet the standards for academic success set by members of the academic discourse community” (p. 6). Atkinson and Ramanathan’s (1995) study of one university’s L2 and L1 writing programs also suggested that L2 programs are usually more pragmatic, particularly in terms of providing students with usable language and discourse structures; in their study, the L1 program emphasized critical thinking and personal expression over language or textual form. However, even in 1993, Sandra McKay argued that L2 writing research was not completely dominated by traditional

process approaches, stating, “many L2 composition professionals recognize the range of social practices that can inform the texts of L2 writers” (p. 72), citing then current research in World Englishes, contrastive rhetoric, and the influence of L1 educational contexts on L2 learning. Silva and Leki (2004), while maintaining that applied linguistics is more pragmatic than ideological, acknowledge that work by critically-oriented applied linguists (e.g., Benesch, 2001; Canagarajah, 2002; Pennycook, 1996) was having an influence. However, they argue that, “the effect of a critical applied linguistics has as yet been far less influential in L2 writing than critical approaches have been in composition studies” (p. 8).

Costino and Hyon (2011) offer a recent example of scholarship illustrating ideological tension between L1 and L2 composition, stating that, “In working together on research projects and talking about our pedagogies, the two of us – Kim an L1 compositionist and Sunny an L2 compositionist – have found that our disciplinary histories and ideologies lead us to use particular words, such as *ideology*, *power*, *critical*, *skills*, and *practice*, that trigger discomfort in the other person and make collaborative communication difficult. We call words like these our “scare words” because they represent disciplinary differences that make us doubt whether we can adopt perspectives from “the other field” in ways that are consistent with our own teaching philosophies and practices” (p. 24). The five words that Costino and Hyon focus on highlight the pragmatic vs. ideological distinction they maintain is still present in the L1 and L2 composition relationship.

L1 compositionist Richard Fulkerson (2005) stated that composition studies as a field has:

achieved a consensus about our goals: we agreed that we were to help students improve their writing and that "good writing" meant writing that was rhetorically effective for audience and situation. But we still disagreed over what sort of pedagogy would best reach the goal, over whether to assign topics, how to assign topics, and what type of topics to assign; over the role of readings and textbooks; over peer-response groups; over how teachers should grade and/or respond to writing. I called this situation 'axiological' consensus and "pedagogical diversity" (p. 655).

Fulkerson saw three main approaches in composition: critical cultural studies, expressivism, and what he called procedural rhetoric, which he saw as the dominant approach. Fulkerson's taxonomy was criticized for essentializing the diversity of the field, but his axiological approach, which refers not only to political ideologies but also to how writing itself is valued, provides a way of thinking about how disciplinary and personal values shape writing instruction. The remaining chapters of the dissertation will discuss the values present in an IEP and FYC program and how they impact and reflect notions of writing quality, pedagogical practices, writing and language development, learning transfer, and student experiences.

CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

The overall purpose of this case study is to examine the values informing writing instruction in FYC and IEP programs. For this reason, I use the concept of axiology (as described in Chapter 1) as a means to understand the underlying values of L2 writing theory and practice in the disciplines of applied linguistics/TESOL and composition studies; this concept also served as a way to understand how the data collected could be understood as reflecting disciplinary values as well as the particular nuances of the data collected from the FYC and IEP programs. Fulkerson (2010) stressed the importance of axiology as a major concern for writing theory and practice, stating that:

Clearly, value judgments pervade composition. It is axiomatic that the goal of teaching composition is to enable students to produce "good" writing. And from the initial decision that it is good to be able to read and write, to decisions about what sorts of classroom activities are useful in promoting those abilities, to the writer's decisions about whether one introduction or one word is better than another, to peer and teacher assessment of writing — value judgments are constantly being made. The task of an axiological perspective is to articulate the principles by which value judgments and value choices are or ought to be made (Fulkerson, 2010, p. 56).

Fulkerson applied his own axiological interpretations of composition teaching practices to categorize different instructional approaches in FYC programs; however, since there has been little research in IEP writing theory, my intention is to understand better the theory and practice of IEP writing instruction. The purpose of the study is to

examine the values informing writing instruction in FYC and IEP programs. In second language writing research, IEPs have not received much attention, and there were very few studies that shed much light on the culture of writing instruction in IEPs. In the field of composition studies there has been an increased interest in L2 related issues in recent years; however, IEPs are off the radar at this point in composition studies. In order to understand how these programs can be better articulated at the programmatic level, and for the purpose of benefitting L2 students who transition from IEPs to FYC programs, this dissertation seeks to identify the disciplinary values informing the practices at work in these contexts. Disciplines themselves can be seen as practices, in that research and pedagogical practices constitute the “visible” nature of a discipline. These practices are theoretically informed to different degrees; my research participants are teachers and program directors who have studied and trained in a discipline. In addition, the programs themselves have disciplinary orientations that are readily apparent. IEPs are aligned with applied linguistics/TESOL, while FYC programs are associated with the field of composition studies. By understanding the research and pedagogical practices described in the research literature, I was able to understand better the values embedded in the actual practices of teachers and program directors in my research context. Of course, disciplinary boundaries are not “real” in the sense that they are ultimately metaphorical. Further, there has been somewhat of a convergence between TESOL/applied linguistics and composition studies, particularly among those devoted to second language writing. In this sense, this project was not intended to be an open-ended, ethnographic approach. The way I have “read” these disciplines is informed by my own experiences as a student, researcher, and teacher, and others may have a different understanding of these

disciplines than me. As an exploratory case study, motivated by the lack of attention to IEP programs in the fields of second language writing and composition studies, this approach uncovers issues and questions that can be seen as “particulars rather than as generals” (Atkinson, 2005, p. 50). As a case study, the results may not be generalizable to all other IEP and FYC contexts. Based on this initial investigation into this particular context, more research into L2 writing in IEP programs, and how it might be related to FYC programs, can be undertaken with hopefully a more informed understanding of the fundamental values and issues confronting these programs.

Research Questions

The overall question that the study addresses is: What are the values and assumptions embedded in L2 writing instruction in FYC and IEP Programs? In order to answer this broader question, the following sub-questions were used to guide the project:

1. What are the values embedded in the disciplinary histories and related teaching approaches pre-existing in L1 and L2 writing theory?
2. What are the values embedded in teachers’ and program directors descriptions of their theory and practice of teaching in FYC or IEP programs?
3. What are the values embedded in the writing curriculum, particularly in the course descriptions, writing tasks, and rubrics?
4. What are the points of difference and tension that emerge in a comparison of the writing instruction between the two programs?

The Context for the Study

The research context is a state university in the U.S. Southwest, with approximately 20,000 undergraduate students and 1,000 graduate students. The two programs I collected data from are an FYC program and an IEP, both housed in the Department of English. The FYC program offers two composition courses, English 105 and 205, as well as English 100, a one-on-one individualized tutoring course offered through the Writing Center. All students entering the university are required to meet the composition requirement at this university by taking English 105 for 4 credits or taking ENG 101 and 102 (3 credits each) from another state university or college, and receiving a grade of C or better. To enroll in English 105, students must receive an ACT English score of 17 or higher, or an SAT verbal score of 350 or higher.

The FYC courses are taught primarily by graduate teaching assistants, who take part in a two-week orientation at the start of the fall semester. Teachers use standardized syllabi, and all new graduate TAs enroll in a for-credit practicum course during their first semester of teaching. As part of the practicum, all new teachers compile and submit teaching portfolios. New teachers are observed by second-year graduate TAs and by the FYC director. All students in ENG 105 and ENG 205 have their writing evaluated based on rubrics, which are used to ensure consistency across all sections.

The IEP consists of around 150 international L2 students in the program each semester. The IEP offers six levels of instruction and delivers approximately 300 hours of instruction per week. PIE students are enrolled as either conditionally admitted, or can enroll as IEP only students. Upon exiting the program, conditionally admitted students are fully admitted to the university and begin their degree programs. IEP only students

must go to the on-campus Center for International Education to apply for admission before starting a degree program.

Level 6 is technically the highest level of the program, but this level is intended for graduate students or students seeking more advanced study who do not want to continue on to university study. The level 5 class is the course that most students will take before they move on to the FYC English 105 course. Level 5 is as described in the IEP program materials quoted below:

Level 5: Students with scores of 57–69 iBT. These students may take up to 4 credits of regular NAU coursework along with 18–20 hours of PIE instruction. They gain the language skills necessary to be prepared for study at the university. This level provides the necessary transition from intensive language study to university study. Students become fluent in listening to authentic academic lectures. They learn to apply reading strategies independently in order to successfully comprehend and discuss academic texts. Students at this level study a wide range of academic vocabulary and apply it in written and spoken contexts.

Participants

FYC writing teacher participants. A total of 10 FYC teachers were recruited with assistance from the FYC program director. The program director forwarded a recruitment letter to all of the teaching staff, totaling approximately 60 individuals. 12 participants agreed initially, but two were unable to fully participate. All of the FYC teachers were graduate teaching assistants, with backgrounds in TESOL/applied linguistics, rhetoric and composition, literature, or creative writing. Since the study sought to understand the range of axiologies possibly present in the writing program,

teachers with a variety of backgrounds and experiences were recruited. The following describes the participants recruited:

Adam: Adam is a creative writing MFA graduate student. At the time of our interview, he had no previous experience teaching in FYC contexts. His native language is English and he has studied Korean.

Alexa is a student in the MA program in Rhetoric and Writing, and has taught a variety of writing classes for both native and non-native speaking students. She has been teaching in the FYC program for one year and is a monolingual English speaker.

Chellsea is an American student in the MA program in Rhetoric and Writing, and has taught in the FYC program for one year. English is her native language. She had taken language courses in Spanish and Chinese but did not consider herself proficient in either.

David is an American MA student in English literature, and has taught in the FYC program for 1.5 semesters. English is his native language and he is also proficient in Spanish.

Emily is a student in the MA program in Rhetoric and Writing, and also has an MA in TESOL. She has 2 years experience teaching writing courses in the FYC and IEP programs. Her native language is English and she has studied several Romance languages.

Jeffery is a creative writing graduate student. He has a wide variety of life experience outside of academia, and has about 1.5 years experience teaching academic writing in FYC contexts. He is a native speaker of English and is proficient in Spanish.

Melissa is an American student in the MFA in Creative Writing Program, and taught FYC for 1 year in the writing program. English is her native language and she is proficient in French, and has also studied German and Italian.

Rebecca is an American student in the MA program in Rhetoric and Writing, and has taught one semester in the FYC program. Her native language is English and she has studied Chinese to the intermediate level.

Tony is an American MA student in TESOL and has taught in the FYC program for 1 year. His native language is English and he is proficient in Spanish.

Wengshen is a male PhD student in Applied Linguistics from Taiwan. He has taught in the FYC program for one semester, and taught previously in another FYC program for one year. His native language is Mandarin Chinese.

IEP writing teacher participants. A total of 8 IEP teachers were recruited with assistance from the program director. The program director forwarded a recruitment letter to all of the teaching staff, totaling approximately 40 individuals. All of these teachers had MA TESOL degrees, or were in the process of obtaining one. The writing teachers' backgrounds are described below:

Ben is a male teacher from Bosnia-Herzegovina, and is a PhD student in Applied Linguistics. He has taught in the IEP and FYC programs. His native language is Bosnian, and he is also proficient in German.

Jane is an American MA TESOL student, and taught in the IEP program for one semester. Her native language is English and she is proficient in Spanish, and has studied some Arabic.

Joseph is an American MA TESOL student, and has taught a range of levels and courses at the IEP. He has taught at the IEP for one year. His native language is English and he has studied Spanish and other languages. He is interested in grammar and learning technologies.

Michael is an American MA student in TESOL, and has taught at the IEP for one semester. His native language is English and he has studied Japanese and Spanish.

Steven is an American MA TESOL student, and has taught at the IEP for one year. His native language is English and he has studied Chinese and Portuguese.

Theresa is a female teacher from Korea, and a student in the MA TESOL program. Her native language is Korean, and she has also studied Japanese.

Thomas is an American full-time faculty member at the IEP, and has an MA TESOL degree. His interests include assessment and curriculum design. He has taught at the IEP for one year. His native language is English and he has a strong background in studying Romance languages.

Ziyi is a female teacher from China, and is an MA TESOL student. Her native language is Mandarin Chinese, and she has experience teaching both English and Chinese in higher education contexts. She has taught at the IEP for about 6 months.

Writing program administrator participants. The directors of both the IEP and the FYC program agreed to be interviewed for the project.

Data Collection and Analysis

Interviews

Interviews with FYC and IEP writing teachers. After receiving IRB approval from ASU, and approval from the research context, program directors graciously

forwarded my recruitment letter to their staff. Teachers willing to participate contacted me and we arranged a time for the interviews in the Fall of 2012. Originally, I had planned to interview teachers more than once, but as I did the interviews I realized that this would not be necessary since there was no longitudinal aspect to the study. While I told teachers the interviews would last 45 minutes or so, many of the teachers were quite verbose (I'm thankful for it) and our interviews stretched closer to 90 minutes at times. In addition, in some cases clarifications and additional questions were asked via e-mail or Skype. The interview guides (see appendices) were designed to elicit both answers to open-ended questions and more directed questions. These interviews focused on teacher's pedagogical approaches, self-reports of their practices, and their thoughts on common issues in L2 writing instruction, such as their opinions on grammar feedback, the writing process, assessment, and other issues.

Interviews were recorded and transcribed. The data was analyzed using qualitative inductive analysis methods (Auerbach, 2003; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Strauss, 1987). Meaningful themes and patterns were identified in the data, and recursively examined in relation to the research questions and ongoing insights from the overall data collection process.

Interviews with FYC and IEP program directors. I was in contact with the program directors from the start of the dissertation project, and the FYC and IEP program directors agreed to meet with me for an interview of 45 minutes or so. Like the interviews with teachers, the program directors had many issues to raise and the interviews lasted about 90 minutes. Program directors also provided me with additional information throughout the project via e-mail.

Documents

Syllabi, writing tasks, course objectives, mission statements, etc. The FYC program directors provided me with documents such as sample syllabi, course descriptions, program overviews, lists of textbooks used, as well as sample writing tasks and rubrics. Originally, I had considered various coding schemes for this data, but I soon realized that these documents were unambiguous enough to present in the dissertation as data to describe the types of assignments students did, what learning materials they used, and how they were assessed. This constitutes the “what” and the “how” of writing instruction in these contexts, and the analysis of this data helped me to discuss the “why” question, which are the assumptions and values embedded in these practices.

CHAPTER 4

WRITING INSTRUCTION IN THE FYC AND IEP PROGRAMS

This chapter focuses on the overall program missions, course descriptions, teaching approaches, writing tasks, and assessment practices of the L2 writing instruction in both the FYC and AEP programs. I will discuss how these aspects of writing instruction are similar in some ways, yet diverge in others; some of these divergences are rooted in the different assumptions and values about writing stemming from the disciplinary influences between Applied Linguistics and Composition Studies. The first section will discuss the missions of the programs, which I consider to be how the program administrators and documents, in particular explicit mission statements, define the purpose of their programs. The following sections will describe the course descriptions, writing tasks, teaching approaches, main writing tasks, and assessment practices in the FYC and IEP programs, in order to provide a means to analyze the axiology of what is considered good writing, how students should learn English writing, and how “good” writing is identified through assessment practices.

The FYC Program

FYC Mission

The FYC program does not have a formal mission statement; when asked to describe the overall mission of the program, the FYC director responded:

Well, ideally it would prepare students for their other classes that they will have in the university, as well as, I see it, when they get out of the university. The book we’re using, *The McGraw Hill Guide: Writing for College, Writing for Life* emphasizes writing over students’ whole lives. You’re only in college for four

years, or five years or six years. But once you get out, you've got another thirty or forty years in your civic life and so forth, so we try to prepare students not just for the writing they'll do at university, the academic writing, the essay writing. They probably won't be writing essays somewhere else, but they'll be writing memos, they'll be writing letters to the school board, or they'll be writing letters to the editor, or they'll be planning a family trip and have to get their family on-board and write a family letter. That's our big philosophy, to prepare them for all that.

Can we do that in one semester? No.

The FYC director's statement stresses the value of academic writing, as shown by his statement that, "ideally it would prepare students for their other classes that they will have in the university"; however, he also states that, "we try to prepare students not just for the writing they'll do at university". Here, there is some axiological tension between what type of writing students should be doing in the FYC program, which the director acknowledges is a difficult task to achieve. This demonstrates the complexity of the often-contested purpose of composition programs. Should they be geared towards preparing students for future academic courses, or should FYC programs seek, as in this case, to enable students to achieve enough rhetorical flexibility to adapt to varied and somewhat unpredictable future writing contexts? As the director acknowledges in the above quotation, achieving all of these goals in a semester or two is not realistic.

However, this FYC program seeks to help students achieve the outcomes found in the *WPA Outcomes Statement*, which emphasizes building rhetorical knowledge. This approach is designed to enable students to think about how rhetorical concerns such as audience, genre, purpose, and context, to help students evaluate and react to different

rhetorical situations. In this sense, the axiology of writing is not so much what specific texts students are producing, but rather that what is valued is the acquisition of strategic rhetorical flexibility, which can then be applied in various situations to produce successful texts.

FYC English 105 Course Description

English 105 is a four-credit-hour survey course that introduces you to critical reading and writing in the academic community. Throughout the semester we practice the *reading process*: generating questions or deriving answers from texts; summarizing texts; identifying examples, drawing inferences, and making logical or comparative connections; organizing information in a variety of ways; seeing and learning rhetorical skills used by effective writers; and evaluating the merits of what we read. At the same time, we practice the *writing process*: identifying audience and purpose; gathering or finding ideas; organizing and interrelating those ideas for readers; drafting in order to develop, support, and illustrate ideas; revising from trial-and-error and in light of peer input; editing for clarity and accuracy.

The course description does not directly reflect the FYC Director's emphasis on preparing students for non-academic writing in the future; however, course descriptions often do not systematically or accurately describe courses. The context for writing mentioned in the course description is "critical reading and writing within the academic community"; the use of "critical" implies that the course is partially designed to improve students' ability to engage with, challenge, and question texts and ideas, e.g., "generating questions or deriving answers from texts", "evaluating the merits of what we read". The

description also positions both reading and writing as processes, and the course description overall is typical of approaches that integrate process writing pedagogy (multiple drafts, feedback, revision) with a consideration for building awareness of how rhetorical knowledge can help students write better. Here, the emphasis on *process* can be seen as an axiology valuing procedural rhetorical knowledge, i.e. the process of *how* to read texts rhetorically, and then *how* to use rhetorical knowledge to produce texts. The only focus on “correct” text is the final mention of “editing for clarity and accuracy”; “editing” here can be seen as an aspect of the writing process that logically follows the “writing” itself.

FYC English 105 Teaching Approaches

The FYC director acknowledged that it is inevitable that some teachers may choose to adopt an approach not in keeping with program guidelines; however, he stressed that it was his strong desire that teachers stick to the standard sequence of assignments, although if they wanted to modify the assignments somewhat then he was not overly concerned. Unlike the IEP program, the FYC program does not monitor teachers’ grades in real time during the semester, although FYC teachers frequently meet each other and the director to clarify any issues they are experiencing in the classroom.

The FYC Director characterized the main teaching approach of English 105 as:

It’s basically a process model of writing where students do invention activities, they get some ideas, they produce a draft, they get feedback from their teacher and their classmates, and they revise it. It’s all built around a writing workshop model. The other philosophy is that the students read a lot from the book but as soon as they produce a piece of writing they stop reading and that becomes the

focus. Every paper goes through multiple drafts, each with feedback. We have group workshops...we do peer review in several different ways. Our first assignment is a rhetorical analysis, since rhetorical knowledge is a big part of what we're trying to do. Everything revolves around that, and that's where we start. I think that students need to hear that upfront and they need to hear it constantly. What are you trying to accomplish with this piece of writing? Who's your audience? What's the context, and so forth.

The director's statement reflects the rhetorical emphasis of the program, and the axiological importance is emphasized by his statement that, "rhetorical knowledge is a big part of what we're trying to do. Everything revolves around that, and that's where we start. I think that students need to hear that upfront and they need to hear it constantly."

The FYC teachers interviewed (n=9) described their own teaching approaches in various ways. Teachers did not report their own teaching approaches directly using "standard" terms for approaches, e.g., "Cultural Studies pedagogy", but rather described their teaching activities and teaching philosophies, which can be seen as constituting their "approach". Three teachers described their approach as primarily "student centered", in that their classrooms were primarily workshop-style, and they preferred not to be overly directive in students' writing projects. Four teachers emphasized that their classes followed a "process" approach, which is in keeping with traditional terminology; however, all of the teachers interviewed incorporated elements of the process approach in their teaching. Only two teachers described their overall approach in ways that diverged significantly from the approach recommended by the program itself, which is essentially a rhetoric-based approach, uses process writing techniques, with extensive workshop and

peer review activities. Both of these teachers were literature graduate students, and their approaches clearly were influenced by the axiology informing their own disciplinary backgrounds:

Jeffery: I don't really use the book at all, maybe a little...I've got a lot of life experience, you know...and I'm a writer. You can't write anything without a voice...something to say. That's what these kids need. How can you write anything good before you find that voice? So that's what my class is about.

Adam: I know it's not a lit class...but that's my strength. I think it's OK...especially for the readings, you know, the stuff in the textbook is pretty boring really. I'm afraid they might not like writing anymore...the motivation for just doing regular essays is kind of for the grade...I have them do the required essays but in class we do other stuff and they like it.

Jeffery's statement that, "How can you write anything good before you find that voice?" reflects the notion associated with Peter Elbow (1994) that beginning writers need to find their own voice. Jeffery did not have a background in composition theory, and did not seem to value it particularly, which shows that axiologies are not necessarily tied to certain disciplines. "Voice" has been conceptualized in many different ways (Matsuda, 2001), and Elbow's graduate training was as a literary scholar of Chaucer. Adam's statement reflects his concern that the material in his class may be "boring", that students may be motivated only by getting good grades, and that, "they might not like writing anymore". This reflects an axiology that the FYC course should seek to make writing

appealing to students, and that engaging in academic writing can perhaps be demotivating for students.

Since I did not observe the teachers, I can only report on their self-reported approach. During the interviews, I felt that this question was somewhat difficult for the participants to answer. If someone had asked me what my approach to teaching FYC during my first year of graduate school was, I think I would have struggled. To some extent, “approaches” as defined by researchers are necessarily somewhat reductive when seen in the light of day; most teachers incorporate various approaches into their teaching, and often do not have the meta-language to describe their own approach succinctly.

Reflecting the current diversity of approaches to composition pedagogy, the second edition of *A Guide To Composition Pedagogies* (2014), discusses 16 composition pedagogies: Basic Writing, Collaborative Writing, Community-Engaged, Critical, Cultural Studies, Expressive, Feminist, Genre, Literature And Composition, New Media, Online And Hybrid, Process, Researched Writing, Rhetoric And Argumentation, Second Language Writing, Writing in the Disciplines (WID) and Across The Curriculum (WAC), and Writing Center pedagogies. These approaches may share axiologies and goals to some extent, although there may also be considerable divergence. However, there is not enough empirical data from composition studies to discern which approaches are most commonly used in the classroom. Teachers commonly incorporate various elements of these approaches, consciously or unconsciously, into their classroom teaching. Another confounding factor in understanding teaching approaches actually represented in U.S. composition classrooms is that many of these courses are taught by graduate students or

contingent faculty who do not have a background in composition studies, and may or may not “stick to the program”.

FYC English 105 Main Writing Tasks

The FYC English 105 main writing tasks have been designed by the program director to constitute a sequence that builds from the rhetorical knowledge developed through the first main assignment, the rhetorical analysis paper, and culminates with an extended argument essay. The assignments reflect the program director’s axiological commitment to rhetorically-based pedagogy, in which good writing is seen as making an effective argument more so than displaying “correct” language usage.

The main writing tasks in English 105 are as follows:

1. Rhetorical analysis: “a short, polished essay that shows a student’s skill in rhetorical analysis writing (approximately three to five typed, double-spaced pages).”
2. Evaluation essay: “a short, polished essay that demonstrates a student’s skill in writing an evaluation (including articulating useful criteria) (approximately three to five typed, double-spaced pages).”
3. Informational argument: “a short informational argument that shows a student’s understanding of an issue or question or problem: what are the various ‘sides’ to the topic? (three to five typed, double-spaced pages). While students may or may not be “neutral” in this paper (they can argue a side), they must cover the various ‘sides’ to the issue they’re focusing on, and they need at least six (6) sources and at least two (2) visual aids, such as charts and graphs. This gives students the

- chance to kind of ‘examine the conversation’ that is going on, about the issue or problem.”
4. Prospectus and annotated bibliography: “a prospectus and annotated bibliography that shows a student’s research and preparation for their extended argument paper: ‘here is what I’ve read (annotated bibliography) and what I plan to argue (prospectus) for my extended argument paper’.
 5. Presentation and extended argument: The prospectus and annotated bibliography lead into the **extended argument** paper, where students pick a side and construct an effective argument (**20%**) involving library research that showcases their understanding of critical reading, writing, and argumentation skills, drawing on at least ten (10) sources and four (4) visual aids (eight to ten typed double-spaced pages + individual presentation/discussion).
 6. Final reflection: a polished essay that shows a student’s skill in reflecting on their experiences in English 105 (approximately four to six typed, double-spaced pages).

According to the FYC director, the rhetorical analysis assignment was introduced several years earlier, in order to focus students’ attention on the importance of rhetoric as a kind of mental toolbox that students can use to consider their options when writing for different purposes, not only for their subsequent assignments in the class, but also for writing in their future civic, personal, and professional lives. Students do not necessarily have to pursue the same topic for all of their papers, but by the time they get to assignment four, the prospectus and annotated bibliography, they will usually stick with

the same topic for the remaining papers. Students are encouraged to think about writing for a specific audience that fits the purpose of their papers, and to adapt their writing skillfully for this audience. However, the program does not follow a genre-approach, in that students do not seem to choose a genre for their work based on the rhetorical situation, but rather stick to the essay while keeping in mind their audience.

The emphasis on argument, and argument as a “conversation”, reflects a rhetorical axiology in which good writing engages an audience, and that the arbiter of how good writing is determined is a function of the rhetorical situation itself. The writer and the text are part of this rhetorical situation, but the determination of writing quality is relational among all aspects of the rhetorical situation.

FYC Assessment

Each of the FYC rubrics contains a band that relates specifically to language use, and the language contained in the bands is consistent across all of the assignments (bolded words are as is):

Level 4: Superior editing—professional looking essay with limited errors in spelling, grammar, word order, word usage, sentence structure, and punctuation. Author is effective in using academic English. MLA or APA formatting followed with very few errors.

Level 3: Good editing—professional looking essay with few errors **per page** in spelling, grammar, word order, word usage, sentence structure, and punctuation. Author may be too casual in a few places and does not always hold the audience’s interest. MLA or APA formatting followed with some errors.

Level 2: Fair editing—essay does not quite meet professional standards because of repeated problems **per page** with the following: spelling, grammar, word order, word usage, sentence structure, and punctuation. Author is too casual in several places **AND** fails to effectively engage target audience. MLA or APA formatting followed with many errors.

Level 1: Careless editing—several errors **per paragraph** in spelling, grammar, word order, word usage, sentence structure, and punctuation; informal and ineffective language used in multiple instance **AND** MLA or APA formatting has many errors **OR** missing Works Cited/ References page.

Based on the above levels, it seems that typical (there are always exceptions) first-year L2 writers might have difficulties scoring above Level 3 without outside assistance, and for many Level 2 might be the high point. Given the range of language issues described, including spelling, grammar, word order, word usage, sentence structure, and punctuation, it is reasonable to expect even quite motivated students to have some issues with each of these per page. The language issues band of each rubric is set at 8%, which seems fair to L2 students. However, since grammar is not taught in the class it seems less fair. FYC teachers did give grammar feedback to their students, although a number of teachers expressed doubt about their own ability to give good feedback on grammar. Matsuda (2012) cautions that, “If grammar feedback does not guarantee learning, is it fair to hold students accountable? If we take the principle of instructional alignment seriously, the answer would have to be negative, and we need to stop punishing students for what they do not bring with them” (p. 155).

Self-assessment and critical reflection are also part of the FYC English 105 assessment approach. The FYC director stated that the first writing assignment, the rhetorical analysis, was the assignment that set the stage for the whole course. For this assignment, students were asked to self-assess their own work, as shown below:

Self-Assessment: Reflecting on Your Learning Goals

Now that you have constructed a rhetorical analysis, please reflect on what you have learned from this assignment:

1. *Purpose*: How successfully do you feel you constructed your rhetorical analysis?
2. *Audience*: What did you learn about your audience as you wrote your rhetorical analysis?
3. *Voice and Tone*: How would you describe your own voice in this essay? Your own tone? How do they contribute to the effectiveness of your rhetorical analysis?
4. *Invention*: What invention strategies were most useful to you?
5. *Revising*: What one revision did you make that you are most satisfied with? What are the strongest and the weakest parts of the paper or other piece of writing you wrote for this assignment? Why? If you could go back and make an additional revision, what would it be?
6. *Working with peers*: How could you have made better use of the comments and suggestions you received? How could your peer readers help you more on your next assignment?
7. How might you help *them* more, in the future, with the comments and suggestions you make on their texts?
8. What "writerly habits" have you developed, modified, or improved upon as you constructed this writing assignment? How will you change your future writing activities, based on what you have learned about yourself?

These self-assessment questions show how rhetorically-informed the FYC English 105 approach is. Students are asked to consider audience, voice, and invention strategies; in

the paper itself, students are expected to work with rhetorical concepts such as *logos*, *pathos*, and *ethos*. English 105 also uses the WPA Outcomes Statement, which is itself heavily informed by rhetorical approaches to writing. The outcomes described in the statement are organized into five categories: Rhetorical Knowledge, Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing, Processes, Knowledge of Conventions, and Composing in Electronic Environments. The Rhetorical Knowledge section has been described as the “über outcome” (Maid & D’Angelo, 2013), who specify that:

When we create the term ‘über-outcome’ we do so to refer to an outcome that reveals itself to be the most important among the others, but also one that works on a higher level; it is an outcome that also has a tendency to influence other outcomes” (p. 258).

According to the FYC Director, the rhetorical analysis assignment was selected to be the first writing task for the course because. “It really prepares them to think rhetorically about the next assignments. What’s your purpose? Who’s your audience? They might not ever write another rhetorical analysis in their lives, but what they get will help them make their own choices later.”

Matsuda and Skinnell (2012) have criticized the WPA OS for its lack of focus on language issues relevant to L2 learners, stating that:

The focus on rhetorical awareness in itself is not a problem. In fact, all writers, regardless of their linguistic or cultural background, can benefit from attention to rhetorical issues. What is problematic, however, is that the rhetorical focus in the WPA OS seems to come at the expense of language issues that a growing number of students in first year composition face (p. 234).

As Matsuda and Skinnell state, rhetorical awareness is an important part of learning how to write. However, rhetorical strategies cannot be executed without the language to do so, which potentially puts L2 writers in a difficult position. Overall, the FYC program values rhetorical pedagogy, process writing, and encouraging students to gain meta-awareness through reflection.

The IEP Program

IEP Mission

The mission of the IEP is described to students and faculty as follows:

The mission of the IEP is three-fold:

- To improve the English proficiency of international students
- To provide teacher-training for MA-TESL/PhD in Applied Linguistics students
- To facilitate research opportunities for our faculty, doctoral students, and MA-TESL students that enhance our knowledge of effective language teaching and learning

This IEP program traditionally consisted of entirely graduate TAs, and from the beginning was guided by faculty particularly strong in Applied Linguistics. In our interview, the IEP director confirmed repeatedly this three part mission, and detailed how her program seeks to balance these goals. The first part of the mission, to improve the English proficiency of international students, reflects the reality that IEPs are tasked with not only improving students' writing proficiency, but with improving their overall language proficiency, including reading, listening, speaking, with a consideration for cultural adaptation to academic and everyday life in the U.S.

Teacher training is an ongoing concern for the IEP, and the Director hires experienced teachers to be full-time lecturers, who serve as mentors and coordinators. Because some MA and PhD students teaching at the IEP did not have teaching experience before their graduate programs, experienced full-time instructors are considered valuable assets in facilitating the teacher training mission of the IEP. Finally, since the English department at this institution is quite strong in applied linguistics, the IEP is a major research context for graduate students at the institution, and many teachers are engaged in research supporting the IEP's mission.

IEP Level 5 Reading/Writing Course Description

This course is designed to improve your academic writing abilities. Students in this class will regularly practice the processes of academic writing. This includes planning, drafting, revising, and editing. In this class, you will also learn to write summaries and critiques of reading texts. Throughout the 16 weeks, you will practice writing skills and strategies which will prepare you to write academic papers for the English-speaking university environment.

In this course description, improving academic writing is the explicit goal of the course; the expected future writing challenge for students is to “write academic papers for the English-speaking environment”. This is to be expected since IEPs attract students who are primarily interested in pursuing academic study at U.S. universities and colleges. The course description also positions the course as a process writing course, including drafting, revising, and editing. The course description also indicates a concern for understanding and critiquing reading texts, as well as skills and strategy development. The text of the course description appears to be written with students in mind, and

addresses them as “you”, while the FYC course description consistently uses “we”, and uses language most likely difficult for typical L2 first year students (and some L1 students as well). The course description does not explicitly mention language learning directly, but it is clear from the overall context of the IEP program practices that overall language proficiency development is the major goal of the IEP, which is reflected in the teaching approaches represented, textbooks used, and assessment practices, which will be further discussed in the following sections.

IEP Level 5 Writing Teaching Approaches

The IEP teachers’ responses (n=10) concerning their own personal teaching approaches were fairly consistent, and generally reflect the mission of the IEP as expressed by the director. The IEP teachers also did not particularly use terminology that fit exactly with how teaching approaches in research literature (particularly in composition studies literature, which embraces a wide variety of teaching approaches) are defined. Instead teachers responded by describing the practices they engaged in, which included an emphasis on multiple drafts, multi-staged revision practices moving from global to specific textual concerns, evaluating sources, avoiding plagiarism, and expanding students’ repertoires of reading and writing strategies. At the IEP, the Director, level coordinators, and assessment team carefully consider each main writing assignment and rubrics; the Director has access to teachers’ grade books electronically during the semester, and has the ability to essentially monitor whether teachers are deviating from the required curriculum. The IEP Director stated that:

One of the things that helps us with the formal assessment is that we watch students’ grades. The level coordinators review the grades, and we look for issues,

for example, why is everyone in the class getting 98%? We ask them about what's going on, and we have a discussion. We're going to talk to you about it, and make sure we know why they're all getting high grades. You want to look at other assignments and the formal assessments, and are they matching up? So, if we see a student with a 98% in everything but 55% in the skills assessment, again, we're going to talk to that teacher. It's something we pay a lot of attention to. We keep the information about grades in a database. We have all the assignments, so I can pull up any student and look at all the assignments, at all the grades, and see the breakdowns of all the classes.

In addition, level coordinators and experienced instructors continually train and mentor new teachers in the IEP's culture of writing. Thus, it is not surprising that there was consistency in the responses. The present study did not involve observations of classroom activities, so it is impossible to confirm whether teachers actually perform the approach they reported. Below are representative sample responses of the teaching approach at the IEP.

Michael: Well...in the writing class, you know, there are the main assignments, and pretty much that's how the class is organized. We do maybe more with reading than other IEPs...reading strategies is big here. I try to comment on their ideas, organization and not overload them too much with grammar from the start.

Steven: Writing is tough...it's not their favorite class. I really want them to not get discouraged so I give them lots of feedback...I want them to focus on their ideas first...they always ask about the grammar but I keep saying we'll worry

about that later. So I'd say it's basically process writing, and also helping them choose sources and get better at reading so they can take what they read...and put that into their writing.

Jane: I teach it like I guess a typical ESL writing class...I don't really know about other IEPs though. We follow the writing process...there's so much going on in writing that it's tough but overall they're doing OK. We do peer feedback and I try to help them a lot with, you know, trying to come up with reasons for their ideas...not just the first thing they think of. Then it's about organizing it and revising. I give them lots of examples...

These responses capture the IEP's axiological orientation, which emphasizes the writing process in producing essays in four rhetorical modes: argumentative, cause/effect, compare/ contrast, and process. (Chapter 5 will discuss rhetorical modes-based instruction in more detail). The IEP director described the overall approach of the program as follows:

We have a fairly rich curriculum I would say, and we are a little different than some IEPs in that we have content based instruction [in the lower levels], and skills classes, and computer assisted language learning, people do different combinations, but our students will take 24 hours a week, so we're doing more. That said, I'd say our overall writing approach is a process approach, and so during the writer's workshops...we do more work on timed writing... but in the main classes, ...it is a process-based approach that we take overall in our

program, and then we use rubrics for every type of writing, and so we use those for revision and then ultimately for scoring the end product.

IEP Level 5 Reading/Writing Main Writing Tasks

The following are the assignments that IEP Level 5 Reading/Writing can assign:

1. Process analysis essay: Suggested topics from the textbook include: “The steps in applying for a bank loan to purchase a vehicle”, “how to get a passport most efficiently”, “ways to convince citizens to support a candidate”, and “teaching children to paint” (Folse & Pugh, 2010, p. 30).
2. Cause/effect essay: Suggested topics from the textbook include the cause/effect of pollution, violent crime, problems with literacy, increased voting rates among young people, and the growth in popularity of “extreme sports” (Folse & Pugh, 2010, p. 83)
3. Compare/Contrast essay: Suggested topics from the textbook include comparing and contrasting: “your siblings”, “your favorite singers”, “vegetarian and nonvegetarian diets”, “political parties”, and similar topics (Folse & Pugh, 2010, p. 56).
4. Argumentative essay: Suggested topics from the textbook include issues such as: “Limiting oil exploration in environmentally sensitive areas”, “capital punishment”, “mandatory military service”, “raising the driving age”, “merits of standardized testing”, and “using animals for medical research” (Folse & Pugh, 2010, p. 111).

The essay types correspond to the rhetorical (or discourse) modes, and are commonly found in IEP textbooks. Modes based teaching has been criticized as being reductive, and

were an element of current-traditional pedagogy. The modes are not “genres” per se, but to the extent these types of essays are very common in IEP programs (and perhaps in some FYC programs) they constitute pedagogical genres that students must learn to make it through the IEP. The implications of modes-based teaching approaches will be discussed further in Chapter 5 of this dissertation.

IEP Level 5 Reading/Writing Assessment

The main writing assignments in Level 5 reading/writing class are assessed using analytic rubrics that have been designed by the assessment team. The bands for each rubric include content, organization, language use, and source use, with exception of the process paper, which does not require sources. There are some variations in language in the rubric specific to each assignment, but the rubrics have been designed to provide consistency in how students are generally graded on their essays. In contrast, the FYC rubrics for the assignments described above display much more variation in terminology, and are markedly different from each other depending on the assignment, perhaps reflecting the less psychometrically-informed assessment approach of the FYC program compared to the IEP. The IEP is particularly focused on assessment issues, and has strong support from the applied linguistics faculty and the IEP’s own assessment team in validating and improving the assessment program continually.

FYC and IEP Program Articulation

In my research context, the FYC and IEP director have a cordial relationship, and have had limited opportunities to discuss administrative issues related to their programs.

At the same time, there are some gaps; when asked whether he knew what the IEP was doing in terms of writing instruction, the FYC director responded:

That's a good question, and I don't know. We send them all of our information, so they have our syllabi. Some of our teachers teach in [the IEP]. There could be better coordination and articulation, but I think we're getting there, but like anything else at a university, things move slowly. The applied linguistics faculty here is really good, top notch, and they're involved in the oversight over the [IEP]. But like we do, they sometimes move from crisis to crisis with student complaints and teacher problems. They get really busy and bogged down and it's really hard to do the bigger...you see all those trees but really don't see the forest. We need to do a better job of that kind of coordination. They should coordinate exactly; we should not duplicate what they do. And we've just had that kind of conversation over the last couple years where they now have all of our materials so they can see what we do. I don't know that I have their materials, now that I think about it. I don't know what I would do with them anyway, but it would be nice to...

When asked about how the FYC program approached writing instruction, the IEP director responded:

That is hypothetical, so it is difficult for me. In both reading/writing and CBI classes [at the IEP], they're using sources in their projects and in the essays for those classes, but I'd say the expectations there [in the FYC program] are much higher for what they're able to do once they exit. But these are lower level students. So you know...yeah. So our expectations for them are different. So I'd

say that the expectation [in FYC] that they can do it, and just do it, is much higher. This year, we've made a real effort to set up some goals for ourselves to better collaborate... We have this liaison to work with. Right now, what we want is better understanding. What is it that First-Year Writing does, because they're very busy over there. What is it that's really going on, because a lot of our teachers don't know, or they're gone. How do we want to adjust based on what our better understanding of what they're doing is? I think we're never really done with that. We want that always to be an ongoing conversation. And then we're sending people from our program to help those TAs who have L2 writers and give them feedback and so I'm really excited about it. First Year Writing is not all they're going to do. In an ideal world, what could I provide for students? What could I get them ready for? Everything!

During these interviews, the directors raised many issues they had to deal with at once: complaints from students, teacher problems, scheduling issues, working with the Dean's office, etc. It is important to keep in mind that part of the gap between these programs is due to the reality of everyday experience for these directors. As they indicate, sometimes their jobs feel like moving from one crisis to the next, although they both indicated they enjoyed their jobs and were very proud of their teachers and students. Program-level articulation will not be easy given the day-to-day demands of leading such programs; in addition, the teachers in each context are very busy themselves, and many are graduate students pursuing their own time-consuming research projects. Nevertheless, the more communication channels are expanded between the programs, the more knowledge is

shared, the more likely it is that the programs can successfully provide the language and writing support that L2 writers need.

CHAPTER 5

TENSIONS AND OPPORTUNITIES

This chapter will examine tensions relevant to ongoing discussions in the field of second language writing that emerged during the study related to writing instruction within IEP and FYC programs. Given the relative lack of attention to second language writing in IEP contexts, and the lack of attention to how IEP writing instruction compares to that in FYC programs, this chapter examines particular tensions emerging from the study in light of previous research in TESOL and composition studies. The tensions discussed in this chapter are rooted in sometimes differing goals, necessarily driven by value judgments, which inform any approach to writing instruction. When administrators and teachers make decisions about writing instruction, they must consciously or unconsciously draw on disciplinary values, their own ideas of what “good writing” is, and the particular contextual issues their programs embody. This study cannot account for the particularities of all contexts, and the issues here may not be generally present in all contexts. These tensions have been discussed in previous literature in second language writing, TESOL, and composition studies, which suggests that their emergence in this study is not coincidental. The tensions will be discussed with the purpose of understanding more about how previous research can inform future attempts to better align IEP and FYC programs. This dissertation cannot immediately reconcile these tensions, and more research will be needed to empirically support the existence of these tensions and how they can be reconciled.

The first section will discuss the tension between writing pedagogy that is “general” in the sense that it does not seek to teach specific disciplinary discourse

features and practices, but rather seeks to raise students' language proficiency through general skills development. Since both the IEP program and the FYC program teach writing from this "general" view, this section examines this approach in light of the axiological perspective taken up in this study. The tensions discussed in this chapter are rooted in sometimes differing goals, necessarily driven by value judgments, that inform any approach to writing instruction. IEP and FYC programs both are tasked with developing students' language and writing skills for future contexts; they must foster development of skills, while also promoting learning transfer. This raises the question of: what exactly these programs should develop? Rhetorical knowledge? Grammatical accuracy? These outcomes are part of the development of writing proficiency, but perhaps cannot be achieved within one program. This raises the related question of sequence: can writing be learned by extrapolating from, for example, a five-paragraph compare/contrast essay? Is it the best way? And how long should this take? Do IEPs have enough time to realistically prepare students for the demands of university study? The same questions can be asked of FYC programs. Finally, this chapter will discuss administrative concerns related to FYC and IEP programs, with an eye towards how these programs can mutually support each other and achieve curricular articulation.

General vs. Specific Pedagogy

In English for Academic Purposes (EAP) research, there has been an ongoing debate about whether it is advisable (or even possible) to teach general principles of academic English outside of a specific disciplinary context. Spack (1988) argued that WAC/WID and ESP approaches to writing instruction were not advisable, because ESL teachers were not likely to have the necessary subject matter and discourse community

knowledge to teach specialized subjects. Since students who complete IEP programs will take not only FYC courses, but also courses in various disciplines, the question of whether IEPs and FYC programs are capable of preparing students for discipline specific writing is an important consideration. Teachers in both the IEP and FYC programs reported some concern about whether what students were learning would benefit them in discipline specific courses. Of the seven teachers interviewed who taught only at the IEP, responses concerning this issue fell into two main categories: a somewhat ponderous and vexed response that showed their concern about potential for learning transfer into disciplinary courses (n=4), and those (n=3) that showed some concern, but concluded they were satisfied with the general approach at the IEP. The IEP provides content and theme based instruction at lower levels, but not in the upper level writing classes, where students choose their own topics to explore. Jane remarked that:

I worry about that...I don't know that much about what students do here at [SWU]. I don't think hardly any of us did our undergrad [degrees] here so we don't know specifically how much writing they do. They're learning in FYC and the IEP...they're doing well...but do these papers help them in a history class or something? I can't really say.

This response shows the difficult position that IEPs are in; their mission is to bring students' language proficiency to the level of "admissibility", while at the same time preparing them for future writing demands. Other teachers, such as Michael, commented that:

It's an issue but I try not to worry...we have them here and do our best to help them with everything...it's not just writing and our students do well after here, I

think. Organization is important, they revise, they get feedback...I think if they keep up with it those things will help.

This response seems to reflect the underlying belief that there are certain general aspects of writing that will benefit students in all areas of writing, such as revising and carefully considering how to organize one's thoughts. For IEP teachers, the sense was that better language proficiency will always help students in the future, and that the IEP writing instruction provided the basic building blocks for improving writing: knowledge of the writing process, useful organizational patterns, grammar and vocabulary etc. The FYC program stresses rhetoric as a way of thinking that can generally be applied to various situations; this view reflects social-constructivist approaches to writing which are resistant to the idea that there are universal features of academic writing. However, rhetorical approaches assume that rhetorical thinking is itself generally useful. This relationship between the general and the specific has been an ongoing issue in both English for academic purposes research and composition studies.

Hyland (2002) argues that "the teaching of specific skills and rhetoric cannot be divorced from the teaching of a subject itself because what counts as convincing argument, appropriate tone, persuasive interaction, and so on, is managed for a particular audience" (p. 390). Hyland (2002) identifies and counters four main arguments in favor of teaching what he refers to as a general ESP approach. The first argument, exemplified by Spack (1988), is that EAP teachers do not have the necessary knowledge to identify disciplinary writing practices, which would prevent them from coming up with a set of general principles for a given discipline. However, Hyland argues that disciplinary conventions are being identified by ESP researchers with increasing sophistication, and

that these insights can be incorporated by L2 writing teachers. The second argument for general EAP is that it is simply too difficult for L2 students to learn disciplinary conventions, and that they need to improve their linguistic proficiency before moving on to specialized subjects. Hyland argues that second language acquisition research does not support this claim, and that even lower-level students can at least be exposed to disciplinary writing practices.

The third argument is that it is not economically feasible for EAP programs to be able to research all of their students' future literacy needs, which Hyland acknowledges may be true, but is not a good enough reason by itself to teach general ESP. Finally, the fourth argument is that ESP teaching is itself general EAP, in that "business English" or "English for engineers" courses are based on generalized notions about diverse and sometimes conflicting fields. Hyland counters that such courses are not good examples of true ESP, which should be much more specific.

However, even if teachers and course materials can incorporate insights from ESP researchers about the discourse conventions of specific communities, the problem still remains that students will not likely see the distinctions between these conventions as salient if they are not meaningfully part of such discourse communities. In the case of IEP students who plan on entering university at the undergraduate level, this level of participation is still distant, so IEPs will likely have a difficult time with teaching discipline specific writing conventions.

The FYC program foregrounds the meta-awareness of rhetoric as an adaptable resource that can be employed in new contexts. However, some composition scholars are skeptical about whether rhetorical knowledge itself is too "general" or abstract to be

useful in other contexts (e.g., Russell, 1995; Smit, 2004; Wardle, 2009). Russell (1995), drawing on activity theory, criticizes what he refers to as “GWSI” (general writing skills instruction), stating, “If writing were an autonomous skill generalizable to all activity systems that use writing, improving writing in general would be a clear object(ive) of an activity system. However, writing does not exist apart from its uses, for it is a tool for accomplishing object(ives) beyond itself” (p. 57). Russell’s viewpoint that writing instruction should be situated in particular discourses is reflected in Smit’s (2004) book *The End of Composition Studies*, in which Smit makes the case that there cannot be a single definition of what “good writing” is that is transferable to a multitude of settings. Smit’s concern can be seen as an axiological tension between universal and relative theories of value. If “good writing” is context dependent, then how can writers successfully apply their knowledge to other contexts? At the same time, “good writing” may not be radically different depending on the similarity of contexts, and students’ ability to understand and discern the differences between the contexts. Goggin (1995) suggests that rhetorical approaches to writing are not “general” in that they provide students with procedural knowledge of how to discern the differences between discourses using the rhetorical concepts such as audience, genre, and style. However, in this study several teachers expressed that they were not well aware of the types of tasks that students did in the future; better knowledge of future writing tasks among IEP and FYC teachers would likely help in understanding better how to bridge these general and specific approaches. With the continuing growth of the international student population, this thorny issue of how to best balance the “general” and the “specific” in L2 writing instruction needs more attention.

Language Development and Learning Transfer

Given both IEP and FYC programs' responsibility for encouraging language development and learning transfer, a concern for future outcomes is understandable and necessary. Some composition researchers (e.g., Rounsaville, Goldberg, & Bawarshi, 2008) have stressed the importance of understanding what students have learned about writing in *previous* contexts; however, this discussion has focused primarily on learning more about what happens in US high schools. FYC programs, depending on the institutional mission in the local context, have many types of students in their classes; some may be monolingual English speakers raised entirely in the United States, others may be resident multilingual students with varying degrees of English proficiency, while others may be international students who have largely been educated outside the United States. Given the situation, it is difficult for programs to work effectively to meet the needs of such a diverse group of students. FYC programs are part of the required general education curriculum at most universities, and are considered to be intended to benefit students throughout their academic careers, in a range of majors and academic programs. However, it would be beneficial for FYC programs to know more about the different paths that students take into their programs. In addition, FYC programs can benefit from the knowledge about L2 issues that IEP instructors have. In the case of IEPs, students come (potentially) from many different countries. However, the largest number of students come from China and the Middle East; in order to understand more about IEP students, more research is needed in the previous academic experiences of IEP students, particularly from these regions.

Rounsaville, Goldberg, and Bawarshi (2008) make the case that:

Understanding the types and uses of students' prior discursive resources—as they range from writing new media, to clinging to formulaic models of paragraph development, for instilled attitudes regarding the appropriateness of public and creative writing to school domains—can provide important insights into the diverse meta-cognitive habits and assumptions students bring with them into FYW courses, and how these meta-cognitive habits and assumptions inform how students make use of their prior resources (pp. 98-99).

Rounsaville, Goldberg, and Bawarshi imply that not that all “incomes” are necessarily beneficial to students in FYC courses. They mention "formulaic models of paragraph development" and "instilled attitudes regarding the appropriateness of public and creative writing to school domains"; these statements reflect a somewhat critical opinion of K-12 writing instruction, which has been described as either overly formulaic or over dependent on literary texts and personal expression. IEP writing pedagogy could easily be critiqued from this angle as reductive, in that IEP curricula and learning materials do reflect a more structuralist approach to writing, allowing for the use of formulas, including formulaic language, to help students meet their goals. Therefore, learning transfer research can also be seen as influenced by the axiologies and disciplinary backgrounds of the researchers themselves, which can influence whether transfer is seen as positive or negative in relation to student learning.

Writing Development

IEPs do language, FYC does writing. Clearly, this dichotomy is not tenable, and the IEP and FYC programs in this study did not embody such a stark divide; however, it

is reasonable to conclude that the IEP is more language-focused, while the FYC course focus on “higher level” discourse concerns, i.e. writing. The relationship between the constructs “language development” and “writing development” is not easily defined. Language proficiency could be seen as a component of writing proficiency, or language proficiency could be considered as a necessary antecedent before writing proficiency can be displayed. In the case of IEP programs, which do focus on overall language proficiency, there is a danger that students may be picking up various discrete language skills without expanding their flexibility and rhetorical knowledge to write for different audiences and purposes. For FYC programs, the danger is that teachers may be asking students to perform complex manipulations of discourse, such as adapting an argument into different genres, without providing the actual language to perform the task.

A contributing factor to this dilemma is the researchers in second language acquisition have tended to focus on spoken rather than written language. Cumming (2012) argued that, “research on second language acquisition has focused primarily on the development of oral rather than written language” (p.1), and offers three reasons why. One reason is that writing proficiency is mediated by educational and professional institutions (i.e., school and the workplace), which can vary greatly, and thus, “writing development is highly variable and contingent on education, opportunities for learning, and needs for use. This is particularly so in second languages” (p. 1). A second reason is that, “fixed forms of written texts expose the complexity of discourse, making visible and requiring control over—as well as inviting analyses from—a multitude of aspects of communication that are seldom otherwise salient or needed” (p. 1). These aspects include conscious decisions about spelling, punctuation, and word choice, which are either not

present or less readily evaluated in everyday speech, or in the more personal process of making sense of texts when reading. The multidimensional nature of writing:

makes it difficult to point toward uniform, integral dimensions of writing development, particularly in second languages. There are so many dimensions along which writing abilities can develop...there cannot be a single, comprehensive theory of second language writing development because there are too many contradictory purposes, situations, and conceptual issues that it would have to serve” (p. 2).

The third reason Cumming identifies as partially explaining the neglect of writing in the field of SLA is that many language learners do not seek to master writing, but rather they may want to focus on speaking or reading and only develop the written skills they immediately need, which in many cases does not require producing extended discourse. However, Cumming (2012) makes the case that the global spread of English has led to a proliferation of educational programs and research devoted to L2 English writing, through:

increased international mobility and migration as well as emphasis on the significance of writing to display knowledge, for purposes of the valuation, and as a marker of cultural identity and education as well as for communications, both locally and globally, about specialized technologies and in various forms of work” (p. 2).

With writing proficiency increasingly in demand, educational programs will have to consider where they stand on issues of development. Composition scholar Richard Haswell (2005, p. 191) has argued that composition studies does not align well with

theories of human development. He cites Min-Zhan Lu's (1999) argument that, "composition studies have long questioned the function of the developmental frame, especially the plot line of 'you have to...before you can'" (p. 341). Lu's point is that multilingual students do not need to master the dominant language before developing their own voice. Haswell (2005) counters that developmental theories are much more flexible and dynamic than composition studies has acknowledged, and do not imply or advocate a linear developmental learning sequence. Without some sense of the role of human development, talk of "outcomes" becomes problematic. Haswell (2005) wrote concerning the WPA OS statement:

In terms of particular well-documented developmental sequences, some of the outcomes fit well enough, others do not. But where the Outcomes Statement most transgresses developmental lore, it does as a whole, not part by part. To the degree that the Outcomes Statement mirrors the all-angles-covered format of a rhetoric textbook or of a professionally sanctioned program, it departs most deeply from the developmental frame. (p. 197).

Haswell (2005, pp. 195-196) states that, "Under Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing, the statement expects first-year students to 'Understand a writing assignment as a series of tasks', a narrative-order or 'second-order consciousness' outcome that we reasonably might look for in schoolchildren", while at the same time seeking the outcome of understanding the relationships among language, knowledge, and power, which Haswell describes as an "outcome found only in a minute portion of college graduates" (p. 196). Factors such as gender, social class, age, life experience, and emotional resilience are all

factors contributing to human learning, including language and writing development.

Haswell declares:

Imagine a first year outcomes statement that would sort writing processes, skills, knowledge, and metaknowledge into four categories: already internalized, in acquisition, in doubt, and for the future. It would be a much more contentious decree, but more realistic from a developmental perspective.

Haswell's four categories are reminiscent of how cognitive approaches to Second Language Acquisition describe language development; however, until writing development is better understood then it will be difficult to fully articulate IEP and FYC programs, and also difficult for each program to balance language, rhetoric, and the different developmental trajectories and futures of their students.

The developmental issue also has implications for IEPs in terms of fitting the recursive, life-long process of language acquisition into necessarily intense time frames. The FYC director commented on whether IEPs have enough time to prepare students for the rigors of university:

I think that is the tension of IEPs, isn't it? You have people...I mean, we can't...there's not a consistent path for language learning. And yet, there's a semester system, and if they're sponsored they only have so much time, that's always the tension, always, and you think, well, no, I think everybody who works at an IEP wants to have more time and then students don't have it.

FYC programs also face the difficult challenge of being asked to prepare students for all different kinds of future writing situations, while working with students with diverse backgrounds and needs for only a semester or two. It is perhaps inevitable for teachers to

lament not having enough time to help students achieve every goal, but writing development and learning transfer are difficult to wrestle into a pre-determined time frame.

The developmental issue also relates to how learning itself is understood. Is it more useful to think of learning transfer as function of human development itself, or as the reuse of discrete knowledge and skills in new contexts? The FYC director stressed to me that he wanted students to be able to write for their own personal, professional, and civic lives, in addition to just academic writing. He described English 105 class as ideally providing students with a “toolbox”, in which their rhetorical skills could help them adapt to new situations better. This is reminiscent of the argument by DePalma and Ringer (2011), who make the case that learning transfer should not be understood as the reuse of prior knowledge, but rather as the adaptation of prior knowledge to new contexts. In this view, different contexts will potentially elicit different kinds of adaptive transfer, and teachers should be aware of and support students’ attempts to reshape their prior knowledge in potentially unexpected ways. In the case of IEP students moving into FYC and introductory classes in the disciplines, instructors in the different contexts may not be aware of what students have already learned, and thus may not be able to recognize students’ efforts to adapt their prior knowledge. Another concern is that students obviously cannot adapt what they have not learned, so instructors need to understand more about what students have learned before they enter their classrooms. In order for this to occur, IEPs, FYC, and disciplinary classes would benefit from a deeper understanding of what is being taught in each setting, what skills students have acquired, and what they still need to master.

Rhetorical Modes and IEP Writing Instruction

When learning anything, you have to start somewhere. The five paragraph essay has been a staple of writing instruction, but has become stigmatized, perhaps rightfully so. However, the form can be seen as a developmental building block for further writing tasks. On the other hand, teaching a fixed, *a priori* organizational scheme such as the five-paragraph essay can mislead students; as students encounter more complex writing tasks their textual organizing strategies need to emerge from a consideration for audience, context, purpose, genre, and other aspects of the rhetorical situation. In the IEP, all of the main writing assignments were essays in the rhetorical modes, and the textbook (Folse & Pugh, 2010) informs students that:

The most common form of essay that is taught in textbooks is the five-paragraph essay. In a typical five-paragraph essay, paragraph 1 introduces the topic, paragraphs 2-4 develop the topic by giving details, and paragraph 5 concludes the essay. The five-paragraph essay form is emphasized because it allows writers great freedom to explain their ideas on a given topic to their readers. At the same time, the traditional assignment in many writing classes is a five-paragraph essay. In addition, if you understand how to write a five-paragraph essay, you can easily expand this structure to include more paragraphs to address increasingly complex and sophisticated ideas. An essay can range from three paragraphs to ten or more. Regardless of the length of your essay, it should always consist of an introduction, a body, and a conclusion (p. 2).

While it may be the case that some FYC teachers (not in my research context) assign five paragraph essays, this would be not in line with the recommendations of virtually any

contemporary composition studies scholar. The above passage reveals a fairly stark divide between how textual organization and genre are conceived in typical IEP learning materials vs. those found in FYC programs. In addition, the textbook, as well as the main assignments in the IEP in my context, were organized around the traditional rhetorical or discourse modes, e.g. narration, classification, and cause/effect. The rhetorical modes approach has been prominent in L1 and L2 composition textbooks, but has been heavily criticized in composition theory (Connors, 1981). One of the main criticisms of writing pedagogies that emphasize the modes of discourse is that the modes do not exist as independent forms in authentic discourse. A further criticism is that static conceptions of the rhetorical modes conflate the discourse forms with the aims of discourse (Kinneavy, 1971). According to Kinneavy, discourse can be classified into referential, persuasive, expressive, and literary aims; the nature of each type of discourse is determined by an interactive relationship between the writer, the reader, the text, and reality (Kinneavy's model applied to both written and spoken discourse, and he used the terms encoder, decoder, signal, and reality). For example, the aim of persuasive discourse is more dependent on the reader's response, while expressive discourse embodies the aims of the encoder, or writer. Depending on writers' aims, they will incorporate different modes (e.g., cause and effect or classification) into their compositions. However, asking students to write a cause and effect paragraph without a consideration for audience and purpose puts the cart before the horse; discourse production does not start with the form, but rather from an interactive negotiation between writer, audience, text, and reality.

The type of advice offered by the textbook may be initially helpful for students who are transitioning from writing sentences and paragraphs to producing longer

discourse, but implying that an essay is essentially an extrapolated paragraph, and a longer essay can be produced through a linear expansion of a five-paragraph essay only speaks to the form of the text and not the function. While it is true that essays in English are comprised of paragraphs, the paragraph does not organize discourse itself, and does not lend itself well to prescriptive rules (Braddock, 1974, Rodgers, 1966; see also Duncan, 2007 for a detailed history of different paragraph theories). That being said, the question of sequence is an important consideration for language and writing development. No one can jump straight into writing extended prose in a second language without starting with something more elementary. However, an upper level IEP writing course should be beyond such a level if students are realistically going to write ten page extended arguments in their FYC class, perhaps weeks after they exit the IEP. Finally, from a learning transfer perspective, the ability of students to extrapolate a five-paragraph essay into more extended forms may not happen if students themselves do not perceive the tasks to be similar enough. It remains an open question exactly how students move from a very basic level of writing ability to that of an expert. There certainly are students who have done it; many IEP students go on to become highly proficient writers.

Grammar and Error Correction

The IEP teachers interviewed did not find giving grammar feedback to be controversial, and they stressed that in writing projects they focused initially on global issues, and then gave more detailed grammar feedback later on in the writing process. Among the FYC teachers, the need for grammar feedback for L2 students was acknowledged, but there was some concern about their own ability to provide useful feedback on language issues for L2 students. For example:

Alexa: I know I'm not supposed to care about their grammar, but I don't think native speaker readers could really get past all the mistakes they make. I usually fix or underline or something their mistakes. I feel bad about not teaching grammar... not that I really know how anyway [laughing].

Steven: I think they've taken grammar classes before...I mean it's obvious they haven't learned all of it...we don't teach grammar in English 105 anyway because it's not really an English class...it's a writing class.

In L1 composition theory and practice, explicit attention to grammar issues in the classroom has been extensively criticized. Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer's influential book *Research in Written Composition* (1963) made the case that previous research supported the conclusion that grammar teaching had either negligible benefit for students, or was even harmful to their development of composing proficiency. Grammar teaching also came under attack from scholars with a background in the humanities, who saw the work of early applied linguists as overly scientific, too focused on oral language, and ultimately at odds with humanistic and literary orientations towards language and writing (Matsuda, 2012). However, these criticisms did not take into account the differences between first and second language acquisition, and particularly the differences between L2 and L1 grammar knowledge. An important distinction between L2 and L1 writers is that L1 writers have largely internalized the grammar of their first language through the natural process of first language acquisition. Therefore, L1 users can judge the grammaticality of sentences in English without studying the structure and grammar of the language explicitly. L1 writers do not always produce grammatically accurate prose either, but their "errors" are more accurately characterized as "mistakes

rather than errors stemming from their internalized sense English grammar (Corder, 1967). L2 writers, on the other hand, are still developing their knowledge of English grammar. Second language acquisition is a lengthy process, and it is unlikely that typical L2 errors will completely disappear from student writing as a result of taking IEP or FYC classes. This does not mean that L2 writers will never achieve the same level of quality as L1 writers can in their writing, just that it will take more time and require more conscious attention to developing their knowledge of the structure of English and the conventions of written composition in English.

Plagiarism Policies and Practices

Every teacher interviewed expressed concern over plagiarism issues in their classrooms, and there were also concerns about how plagiarism issues were handled administratively. Some teachers resented having to meet with program directors and the suspected students to discuss the “evidence”. These teachers felt that as professionals (even if they were grad students) they should be trusted to make their own decisions independently about the matter. However, the directors stressed that in the contemporary environment of U.S. higher education that students can and do complain to various university authorities about possible mistreatment or discrimination, and that it is in the interest of teachers to make sure they have evidence to back up their claims. A number of teachers reported giving lower grades to student papers that they believed were plagiarized, yet did not feel they had definitive evidence to bring to the director. Teachers were aware that numerous online businesses sell papers to IEP students; these companies provide original essays that cannot be detected by plagiarism detection software or Internet searches.

The IEP plagiarism policy, provided to students in each course syllabus and the student handbook, reads as follows:

Academic integrity is important in American universities and IEP takes it seriously. All the work you do in the program is expected to be your own work. Plagiarism is cheating. This includes copying from your friends, classmates, the Internet, books, or any other source. If you are not sure, ASK before handing in an assignment. Any student suspected of cheating will be asked to meet with the IEP administration. If it is determined that a student has cheated or plagiarized, the IEP administration will decide on a course of action, and a report will be placed into the student's permanent file.

The FYC plagiarism policy, provided to students in each course syllabus, reads as follows:

Plagiarism is a form of theft. It is grounds for failing the course. Plagiarism occurs when a writer uses someone else's phrasing, sentences, or distinctive insights without giving proper credit. Be sure to acknowledge your sources! In this age of downloadable papers, remember that turning in work that, in whole or in part, is not your own is also plagiarism. When in doubt about quotation, citation, or acknowledgment of sources, see me. All of your papers should be cited accurately and completely.

In Defining and Avoiding Plagiarism: The WPA Statement on Best Practices (Council of Writing Program Administrators (2003), plagiarism is defined as follows: "In an instructional setting, plagiarism occurs when a writer deliberately uses someone else's language, ideas, or other original (not common-knowledge) material without

acknowledging its source”. This can be problematic for L2 students. I know in my own experience writing in Japanese that I always would search the Internet for phrases that I could incorporate into my writing. I didn’t see it as stealing ideas, but rather in the Bakhtinian spirit of using the language around me. As a non-native speaker of the language, I felt that it was almost unfair to be expected to be able to generate completely original work, and avoid using “someone else’s language”. In the case of *speaking* a second language, it just won’t happen if you avoid using the language of the people around you.

However, students whose work contains evidence of intertextual practices in violation of the norm face the serious consequences of academic failure and even expulsion. Universities have explicit policies about the penalties and consequences students will face, but it is not always the case that students are specifically taught the textual practices that are considered acts of plagiarism, nor are they necessarily aware of how these practices vary according to disciplinary discourses and genres (Chandrasoma, et al., 2004). L2 writers from diverse backgrounds may bring different beliefs and attitudes to the composition classroom about plagiarism, and they face the challenge of learning U.S.-centric academic literacy practices while also developing their English language proficiency.

Plagiarism is commonly viewed as “stealing” words and ideas that belong to someone else. Some (e.g., Howard, 1995; Pennycook 1994, 1996; Scollon, 1994, 1995) have argued that the “Western”/Enlightenment notions of the self, originality, and individual authorship only emerged relatively recently, and are linked to industrial modernization and the development of intellectual property laws. As a result, the author

as “owner” of ideas and language is considered a culturally specific concept. In this view, labeling as plagiarism intertextual practices that diverge from the dominant norms of Western society is an act of cultural imperialism. Despite this line of criticism, students will be at a disadvantage if they do not learn how to avoid suspicion of plagiarism.

Howard (1995) identified “patchwriting” –the copying of words and grammatical structures from source texts—as a necessary transitional strategy that students use to mimic and learn the practices of a target discourse community. However, this strategy in many cases would be considered a type of illegitimate paraphrasing, and thus plagiarism. Paraphrasing can be more difficult for L2 writers, who may not have the language repertoire to imagine a different way of restating a phrase or idea from a source text (Ouellette, 2004). Howard (1995) advises that viewing plagiarism in either too rigid or too lenient terms is not beneficial for student writers; students still need to be aware of how patchwriting could violate institutional plagiarism policies. At the same time, institutions need to take into account the pedagogical benefits of patchwriting for students trying to expand their repertoire of academic language. L2 writers who are developing their English proficiency, while at the same time learning the discursive practices of the university, may feel that patchwriting is beneficial. If students are too afraid of breaking the “rules” by plagiarizing, they may avoid raising their own original ideas, leave out common or prior knowledge, or over-reference sources as defensive strategies (Angelil-Carter, 2000; Ouellette, 2004, 2008). Providing a range of examples and strategies that illustrate acceptable and unacceptable textual borrowing practices will be helpful for both L1 and L2 writers in developing their own sense of how to avoid plagiarizing in various writing contexts.

Teacher Training

The IEP teachers consistently stated that they were general satisfied with the training and support they received at the IEP, reflecting the director's comments and program mission statement that teacher training and mentoring was essential. The IEP director stated that:

Because our lecturers and instructors have a huge responsibility for the teacher training they're professional role models. Do they participate in the wider field? What do they do? What are they interested in doing? How are they models for other teachers? We take a very collaborative approach in the planning. We don't have the kind of autonomy that a lot of IEPs have where a teacher will look at their materials and course objectives and they say 'yay you're good to go, go do what we hired you do'. We say excellent, join the group and see how we do it. That's not for everyone. Some people, that's really their thing, to go do what they want, and it's beautiful and they're great at it, but we train so you have to have an ability to supervise.

IEP teachers also consistently mentioned the value of having an assessment team capable of helping design and assess new materials and tests. Both IEP and FYC teachers expressed appreciation for the level of support they received from English department faculty, and considered the course work they took as part of their degrees as directly beneficial to their own teaching.

Program Administration and International Student Recruitment

Both the IEP and FYC director expressed general satisfaction with the position of their programs administratively. The IEP director appreciated the strong level of faculty

support from the English department, particularly from the Applied Linguistics faculty. These faculty members were particularly helpful in designing and implementing the assessment programs, and in coordinating research initiatives beneficial to the IEP. The FYC director also had a good working relationship with English department faculty. The IEP and FYC staff is involved with university committees related to the recruitment and support of international students. The FYC director did recount a few incidents of disciplinary faculty complaining to the writing program complaining about multilingual students, but he believed this was to some extent inevitable.

The IEP director expressed some concern about competition from private, for-profit programs, particularly regarding instruction for lower-proficiency students.

I think it has a lot to do with what kind of admissions policies you have. Are you going to take those students, or aren't you? And that's a financial thing, that's a bigger picture administrative thing. Do you have that luxury to say we won't take students under this level? Then you're asking for other kinds of issues, because there are for-profits that come and knock on university doors and say, "We can get everybody ready for far less than what you do"...INTO [a for-profit IEP corporation], and other programs like that, are looking to say we can do what you do for less, and so, hey, an administrator who doesn't even know what the IEP is exactly thinks they can save some money. So if we say, well, we won't take those students, and ELS [another for-profit IEP corporation] says, hey we'll take them...

The FYC director also indicated that international student recruitment was related to the university bottom line. The director stated to me that he was much more concerned about

the international students who did *not* attend the IEP before moving into FYC and other university classes. He alluded to various exchange programs where international students were recruited outside of the IEP admissions process, and he felt that many of these students were much less prepared than students who came from the IEP. He stated that:

We get some students here you literally can't understand. But yet they're here, and the university said we want you here because you bring in big bucks. But they really aren't prepared for a writing class. And it's going to continue to grow, because they want to keep bringing that money in.

Private, for-profit IEP pathway programs are not necessarily a bad thing, and there is little available research as to whether or not their programs are functioning well.

However, through this dissertation I have come to learn how much language and writing programs benefit from a good relationship with their academic departments or units, and also from the expertise shared by faculty members with knowledge relevant to IEP and FYC programs. Private, for-profit IEPs may not have this level of engagement and interest with academic departments, which may put such IEPs in a position of relative invisibility, a situation that many IEPs (and FYC programs) have struggled to overcome.

CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

One of the first challenges I faced during the initial stages of this dissertation project was that there is very little current research devoted to IEP programs, and research looking at writing instruction in IEPs is virtually non-existent. Thus, this dissertation, in my mind, serves more to raise questions than to answer them. I found this troubling at first, but I realized that this was one of my first findings. No one has been paying much attention to IEPs. Now that international students are increasingly sought after by universities, IEPs need to come out of the shadows, so to speak.

In this dissertation, I have taken a somewhat “bird’s eye” view of these programs. I did not include student data and did not observe classroom activities. This too, concerned me at first, but I realized nothing would come out of that without first having a better understanding of the essential nature of IEPs: what is their mission, why do they undertake it, and how do they seek to achieve it. At the same time, while I had spent much time reading composition journals, and taught composition myself, I realized I did not have a strong sense of how typical FYC programs operated beyond my own institution. I read extensively about the history of composition studies, identified the major pedagogical approaches, and considered the rationales for each approach. I had the sense that process-based, generally rhetorically-focused composition classrooms were becoming the norm, but I remembered reading that, “we do not really know what is happening in composition classrooms across the country. Our field would benefit from a

more concrete understanding of what is actually happening in writing programs across the country" (Knoblauch & Matsuda p. 20).

My major finding was the tension between how FYC and IEP programs approach rhetoric and language. In the IEP, language proficiency is the focus, and the pedagogical approach seeks to teach writing by providing students with stable structures and patterns to write in. On the other hand, in the FYC program language issues were not the focus, and students were expected to be able to develop their own ways of organizing their texts, although the overall focus was still on writing essays. Since the FYC program uses the WPA Outcomes Statement, the program expects students to be able to use, and reflect on their use, of rhetorical concepts that most L2 students are unfamiliar with. With this in mind, IEPs should consider exposing their students to rhetorically-informed writing instruction. This does only mean learning the meaning of concepts such as genre and the rhetorical situation, but also having some experience with coming up with their own organizational patterns, or authentic genres, that enable them to best meet the needs of their intended audience.

These different practices reflect different disciplinary values. Composition studies tends to emphasize the role of rhetoric as a tool that students can agentively employ to help them write in future rhetorical situations. IEP programs also seek to provide students with generalizable tools for the future, but these are relatively fixed, structural tools. The pedagogy seeks to build from words to sentence-level writing, then paragraphs, and then essays. L2 writers do need to build their vocabulary and grammatical knowledge; these tools are necessary for L2 writers, who do not already have the internalized sense of the rules of English grammar that native speakers of a language have. However, structures

such as the five-paragraph essay and the discourse modes may not be as transportable to future settings. That being said, as someone who has studied a number of different languages, starting from scratch, I knew that the stigma against “rote” learning was somewhat shortsighted. I did memorize thousands of vocabulary words, learn and attempt to combine sentence-patterns, and used fixed patterns to learn how to produce genres such as formal thank you letters and spoken self-introductions. However, I think my proficiency level in these languages was likely lower than typical international students trying to study in U.S. higher education contexts. Given the rhetorical approach generally advocated by composition scholars, it is hard to imagine that they wouldn’t find some of the approaches to writing instruction in IEPs as reductive. This reflects the values of composition studies. In the ends, the issue is not whether any particular approach is reductive, or is “complex”, “dynamic” or “situated” (isn’t everything?), but rather whether it works. More empirical research is needed into which approaches actually work best for L2 writers in IEP programs, and until such research is conducted I am hesitant (and unable) to label the IEP pedagogy as necessarily flawed in its undoubtedly “reductive” nature. You gotta crawl before you walk.

That being said, I can switch hats and adopt a more composition studies influenced way of thinking and discuss my next finding, which is that textbooks used in IEPs still do not reflect contemporary research in second language writing. Even with “reductive” approaches, concepts such as genre, exigency, *kairos*, can be taught to even intermediate level L2 writers, as long as the concepts can be exemplified, clearly explained, and integrated into classroom activities. For students moving on to university study, the upper level IEP classes could benefit from exposing students to rhetorical

concepts, which students will need in FYC classes. Textbooks used in IEPs need to be evaluated more closely by applied linguistics and TESOL specialists, in order to make sure that contemporary research is making its way into textbooks.

Finally, my findings revealed the necessity to understand more about the nature of language and writing development. This is a very difficult issue to approach, because the relationship between “language” and “writing” is difficult to fully grasp theoretically. It is also difficult from a research perspective to design studies that distinguish and evaluate language development as distinct from writing development. I believe it is overly simplistic to advocate that IEPs “do the language” and FYC programs “do the writing”. L2 writers need both. Since language and writing are closely interrelated phenomena, designing a sequence of learning from IEP to FYC contexts requires more conceptual clarity concerning the relationship between language and rhetoric. One way to do this is by not penalizing L2 writers in composition classes for their errors in language use; this positions “writing” as the construct of interest. However, students still need to learn linguistic forms in FYC courses to function, which still requires reasonable and effective feedback on grammar issues. At the IEP, perhaps at least one of the main assignments could be evaluated purely in terms of its rhetorical effectiveness. This sounds somewhat radical or naïve when I switch into language student mode, but students might be able to figure out (as I did) that language choices are the essence of rhetoric. The available means of persuasion are realized and expressed ultimately through language of some kind, whether written or using other semiotic resources; it’s what makes us human.

This relates to the next finding: both IEP and FYC programs have issues with plagiarism. The plagiarism policies position using someone else’s “language” as

potentially a form of theft. In second language acquisition theory, the acquisition and use of “formulaic language” is essential. As users of a language develop the ability to “chunk” phrases, there is less demand on short-term memory retrieval and other cognitive operations necessary to comprehend and produce language. Students need to be able to experiment with formulaic strings of language, that they may not be able to generate themselves. Of course, outright wholesale appropriation of others’ ideas and lengthier stretches of language can be considered classic cases of plagiarism. As researchers and teachers in IEPs consider why and how students plagiarize, a consideration for the important role of “borrowing” language in language acquisition needs to be taken into account.

Recommendations for Writing Programs

1. Improve teacher training at the local level

The IEP examined in this study was committed to teacher training as part of its mission, and generally teachers were satisfied in their training. However, the type of additional training that IEP teachers could benefit from at the local, institutional level would involve understanding more about the relationship between their own pedagogical assumptions and practices in comparison to other writing teachers at their own institution, such as instructors of FYC, technical writing, creative writing, legal writing, etc. This type of interaction will help teachers understand not only the practices of others, but also help teachers to reflect on their own practices.

Ongoing professional development can be a challenge for teachers, who are already busy trying to meet the needs of their students. However, teacher training can also be facilitated through workshops, attending relevant conferences, and establishing

study groups for teachers working at IEP and FYC programs. Training practicum for FYC programs often face very tight schedules before classes begin, and it is difficult to bring graduate students without a background in second language issues up to speed in such a short time. However, teaching practica for all writing teachers should include a discussion of L2 writing perspectives on topics such as feedback and assessment, encouraging language development, and cultural issues in the classroom. In addition, programs can hold workshops, invite guest speakers, and if possible provide grants for teachers without a strong background in second language writing to attend conferences such as the Symposium on Second Language Writing. Teachers with a background in TESOL would also benefit from learning more about composition studies; of course, exposure to new information does not necessarily bring new understanding, so program directors and affiliated faculty should play a role in helping teachers incorporate new approaches that may be outside of their usual disciplinary understanding. Writing is increasingly seen as requiring interdisciplinary, or multidisciplinary, approaches, so teachers should not limit themselves to only the disciplines of TESOL/Applied Linguistics and composition studies. The complexities of teaching writing, particularly to second language writers, can seem overwhelming. However, teaching L2 writers is not radically different than teaching L1 writers, so it is possible for writing teachers of all backgrounds to teach L2 writers, as long as they have sufficient training and support.

2. Improve graduate education for all writing teachers

TESOL master's programs often do not include a course solely devoted to writing, but rather writing is discussed alongside listening, speaking, and reading in an

overall teaching methods course. In my experience as an MA TESOL student, I only learned about composition studies approaches to writing through my own desire to learn more. Even when courses devoted to writing are offered, in some cases the courses do not reflect the richness and diversity of current second-language writing research. In addition, many TESOL and applied linguistics programs do not incorporate perspectives from composition studies into their classes about writing. A further issue is that many TESOL master's students do not go on to teach in higher education, but prefer to teach at local language schools or overseas. In these settings, writing is not necessarily what students are looking for, and would rather concentrate on learning everyday conversation or on preparing for standardized tests.

In particular, MA TESOL students are not usually exposed to rhetorical approaches to writing instruction, and may not understand how concept such as genre, audience, and argument theory relate to writing pedagogy. Likewise, graduate students in rhetoric and composition may not have the opportunity to take courses such as second language acquisition, pedagogical grammar, and sociolinguistics, which would be particularly beneficial for composition teachers working with second language writers. In addition, not all composition studies graduate programs offer teaching methods courses; such courses might be ideal sites for incorporating insights from TESOL and applied linguistics.

3. Perform a comprehensive needs analysis

In order to better understand the needs of L2 students, institutions should conduct a comprehensive needs analysis that looks at not only writing skills, but also considers L2 students needs for support in reading, listening, and speaking. In addition, affiliated

programs such as writing centers and WAC/WID programs should make sure that they are fully prepared to work with L2 students. Needs analysis can also be beneficial in examining curricular materials. In particular, textbooks used in IEPs need to be evaluated closely. A major issue with IEP textbooks is the continued reliance on the rhetorical modes (e.g., narration, description, classification) as essential to learning how to write. Modes-based instruction has been criticized in composition theory, and has been associated with the stigmatized notion of “current-traditional rhetoric.” One of the main criticisms of writing pedagogies that emphasize the modes of discourse is that the modes do not exist as independent forms in authentic discourse. As IEP students move on to FYC courses and other courses across the disciplines, they may face challenges in adapting their conception of the writing process to new contexts. In addition, the representation of “academic writing” also tends to be reductive, rather than based on accurate descriptions of what happens in academic contexts informed by genre descriptions that are already available in professional literature. In order to facilitate better curricular articulation between IEP and FYC programs, both IEP and FYC programs can share and discuss each other's textbooks; L2 writing textbooks used in IEPs need to be further examined by both L2 and L1 writing specialists, and improved to reflect the actual needs of students in higher education. In order to better facilitate learning transfer, FYC programs should consider the full range of where their students are coming from. This includes understanding what local K-12 and community colleges are doing in writing classes, as well as IEPs and, as much as possible, the previous writing contexts of international students who do not enter through the IEP. IEP programs can also seek to understand more about writing instruction around the world.

4. Language support “czar”

In order to facilitate these recommendations, I believe it is necessary to have a language support “czar” to ensure that programs across the university are meeting the needs of L2 students. In the case of international students, who are seen as good for the university’s bottom line, it is an ethical imperative that the university find out what these students really need and then provide it. FYC and IEP programs share similar challenges from an administrative perspective. Both face potential pressure from other stakeholders in the wider university community, who may complain about their students and the type of instruction that the programs are doing. It would be helpful to have a visible leader dedicated to these issues, who could learn to negotiate the complexities of university administrations without risking a backlash on specific programs. Directors of IEPs and FYC programs are perhaps the most suited to transition into such a position, but in most cases they have more than enough on their plates.

Limitations and Future Research

A limitation of the study is that it is difficult to generalize these findings in terms of how they may resonate in other institutional contexts nationally. There are many ways that writing could potentially be taught in other IEP and FYC programs, and many permutations in the administrative relationships, pedagogical approaches, and local conditions that may be possible. However, the overall importance of understanding more about writing instruction in IEP programs, and how they can be better articulated with FYC and other sites of writing instruction at the university level has been highlighted by this study. Further research can provide more generalizable data about IEP writing instruction. In particular, the teaching approaches, types of writing assignments, and

assessment practices typically used in IEPs should be identified in ways that can provide a generalizable description of IEP instructional practices. This is particularly important in the case of IEPs because, as was the case in this dissertation, there is an inevitable exploratory nature to doing research about writing in a context that is not known well enough to generalize about.

In addition, since this study is concerned with axiology, my own subject position as a researcher is important to consider; I inevitably have certain values of my own concerning the question of what is good writing, how it develops, and how it should be taught. The identification of underlying values from empirical data is by nature interpretive and limited to some extent by the researcher's own background and experiences. At the same time, my own background as a researcher and teacher with knowledge of applied linguistics and composition studies was instrumental in understanding and describing the values of IEP and FYC programs. Another researcher may come to different conclusions than I did, but due to the nature of the study as a situated, exploratory approach this is to be expected. Hopefully, more researchers will begin looking more closely at IEP writing pedagogy, and more generalizable data can be accumulated and developed.

During my dissertation background research, I realized that Intensive English Programs have been understudied, which is problematic for several reasons. IEPs are an important gateway to higher education for many L2 writers, and thus function not only as language preparation programs, but also as the first introduction to the literacy practices of U.S. higher education itself. However, the larger university community is often not aware of the function of IEPs, which is not to help students "master" the English

language, but rather to bring students to the level required for admission to the university. However, “college-readiness” is itself a difficult concept to define and target, which puts IEPs in the position of often focusing on discrete language skills, which are only one aspect of college preparation. In the case of academic writing, students need more than language; they need a purpose, an audience, an exigency, an awareness of genre, as well as a disciplinary knowledge base to draw on. Based on these considerations, I have several research projects in mind that directly relate to second language writing instruction in IEPs. First, there is a lack of descriptive research that details the dominant teaching approaches, student and teacher experiences, assessment practices, administrative issues, and other issues at IEPs. My dissertation does this via a case study method, but more generalizable data is needed. This information is “out there” in the lived experience of teachers, program directors, and students, but a proper synthesis will require a mixed methods approach using survey research (both quantitative and qualitative) qualitative in-depth interviews, and discourse analysis of written documents such as textbooks, student writing samples, mission statements, writing tasks, and descriptions of pedagogical outcomes. Without this basic descriptive empirical research, it is difficult not only for researchers to develop more specific research questions related to IEPs, but also is a rhetorical problem for IEPs in that without a somewhat generalizable knowledge base it is hard to move beyond the, “Well, this is what we do in our program, but it could be different somewhere else.”

Further, it would be useful to conduct a study that compared international students in U.S. higher education who attended an IEP with those who did not. In my study, I found that the FYC director had more issues with international students who came

directly to FYC classes than with those from the IEP. It is possible that newly arrived international students would struggle more initially than those who had been socialized into academic life via the IEP, regardless of language proficiency. Also, since IEP students do more than just take IEP classes, more research is needed into how IEP instruction may or may not benefit students in courses in the disciplines.

References

- Angelil-Carter, S. (2000). *Stolen language? Plagiarism in writing*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Atkinson, D., & Ramanathan, V. (1995). Cultures of writing: An ethnographic comparison of L1 and L2 university writing/language programs. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 539-568.
- Barrett, R. P. (1982). *The administration of intensive English language programs*. Washington, DC: NAFSA.
- Bartholomae, D. (1985). Inventing the university. In M. Rose (Ed.), *When a writer can't write: studies in writer's block and other composing-process problems* (pp. 134-165) New York: Guilford Press.
- Benesch, S. (2001). *Critical English for academic purposes: Theory, politics, and practice*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Berlin, J. A. (1980). Richard Whately and current-traditional rhetoric. *College English*, 42, 10-17.
- Berlin, J. A. (1984). *Writing instruction in nineteenth-century American Colleges*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Berlin, J. A. (1987). *Rhetoric and reality: Writing instruction in American colleges, 1900-1985. Studies in Writing & Rhetoric*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Berlin, J. A., & Inkster, R. P. (1980). Current-traditional rhetoric: Paradigm and practice. *Freshman English News*, 8(3), 1-4, 13-14.
- Bizzell, P. (1982). College composition: Initiation into the academic discourse community. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 12, 191-207.
- Bizzell, P., & Herzberg, B. (Eds.). (2001). *The rhetorical tradition: Readings from classical times to the present* (2nd ed.). Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's Press.
- Braddock, R. (1974). The frequency and placement of topic sentences in expository prose. *Research in the teaching of English*, 8, 287-302.
- Braddock, R. R., Lloyd-Jones, R., & Schoer, L. (1963). *Research in written composition*. Champaign, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

- Brereton, J. C. (1995). *The origins of composition studies in the American college, 1875-1925: A documentary history*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2002). *Critical academic writing and multilingual students*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Connors, R. J. (1981). The rise and fall of the modes of discourse. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4), 444-455.
- Connors, R. J. (1986). The rhetoric of mechanical correctness. In T. Newkirk (Ed.), *Only connect: Uniting reading and writing* (pp. 27-58). Upper Mountclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.
- Connors, R. J. (1991). Writing the history of our discipline. In E. Lindemann & G. Tate (Eds.), *An Introduction to composition studies* (pp. 49-71). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Connors, R. J. (1997). *Composition-rhetoric: Backgrounds, theory, and pedagogy*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learner's errors. *IRAL-International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 5(1-4), 161-170.
- Costino, K. A., & Hyon, S. (2011). Sidestepping our “scare words”: Genre as a possible bridge between L1 and L2 compositionists. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 20(1), 24-44.
- Council of Writing Program Administrators. (2003). Defining and avoiding plagiarism: WPA statement on best policies. Retrieved from <http://wpacouncil.org/positions/WPAplagiarism.pdf>
- Crowley, S. (1990). *The methodical memory: Invention in current-traditional rhetoric*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Crowley, S. (1998). *Composition in the university: Historical and polemical essays*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Cumming, A. (2013). Writing development in second language acquisition. In A. Ohta (Vol. Ed.), *Social, dynamic and complexity theory approaches to second language acquisition*, C. Chapelle (Series Ed.), *Encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- DePalma, M-J., & Ringer, J.M. (2011). Toward a theory of adaptive transfer: Expanding disciplinary discussions of “transfer” in second-language writing and composition studies. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 20 (2), 134-147.

- Downs, D., & Wardle, E. (2007). Teaching about writing, righting misconceptions: (Re)envisioning "first-year composition" as "introduction to writing studies". *College Composition and Communication*, 58(4), 552-584.
- Duncan, M. (2007). Whatever happened to the paragraph? *College English*, 69(5), 470-495.
- Emig, J. (1971). *The composing process of twelfth graders*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Faigley, L. (1986). Competing theories of process: A critique and proposal. *College English*, 48, 527-542.
- Flower, L. S., & Hayes, J. R. (1977). Problem-solving strategies and the writing process. *College English*, 39(4), 449-461.
- Fogarty, D. (1959). *Roots for a new rhetoric*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Folse, K. S., & Pugh, T. (2010). *Greater essays*. Boston, MA: Heinle Cengage Learning.
- Fulkerson, R. (1990). Composition theory in the Eighties: Axiological consensus and paradigmatic diversity. *College Composition and Communication* 41(4), 409-429.
- Fulkerson, R. (1996). Axiology. In Enos, T. (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of rhetoric and composition: Communication from ancient times to the information age* (pp. 56-58). New York: Garland.
- Fulkerson, R. (2005). Composition at the turn of the twenty-first century. *College Composition and Communication*, 56(4), 654-687.
- Hairston, M. (1992). Diversity, ideology, and teaching writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 43(2), 179-193.
- Hairston, M. (1992). Diversity, Ideology, and Teaching Writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 43, 179-193.
- Haswell, R. H. (2005). A development outlook on outcomes. In S. Harrington, K. Rhodes, R. Fisches, & R. Malenczyk (Eds.), *The outcomes book: Debate and consensus after the WPA outcomes statement* (pp. 191-200). Logan: Utah State University Press
- Horowitz, D. (1986). Process, not product: Less than meets the eye. *TESOL quarterly*, 20(1), 141-144.

- Howard, R. M. (1995) Plagiarisms, authorships, and the academic death penalty. *College English*, 57, 788-806.
- Hyland, K. (2002). Specificity revisited: how far should we go now? *English for Specific Purposes*, 21, 385-395.
- Institute of International Education. (2012). Open doors online report on international educational exchange. Institute of International Education. Retrieved from: <http://www.opendoors.iienetwork.org>
- Kinneavy, J. L. (1971). *A theory of discourse*. New York: Norton.
- Knoblauch, A. A., & Matsuda, P. K. (2008). First-year composition in the 20th century U.S. higher education: An historical overview. In P. Friedrich (Ed.), *Teaching academic writing* (pp. 3-25). London, UK: Continuum.
- Kutney, J. P. (2007). Will writing awareness transfer to writing performance? Response to Douglas Downs and Elizabeth Wardle, "Teaching about writing, righting misconceptions". *College Composition and Communication*, 59(2), 276-279.
- Lauer, J. M. (1993). Rhetoric and composition studies: A multi-modal discipline. In T. Enos & S.C. Brown (Eds.), *Defining the new rhetorics* (pp. 44-54). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lu, M-Z. (1999). The vitality of the ungrateful receiver: Making giving mutual between composition and postcolonial studies. *JAC: A Journal of Composition Theory*, 1, 335-357.
- Maid, B. M., & D'Angelo, B. J. (2012) Is rhetorical knowledge the uber outcome? In D. Roen, D. Holstein, N. Behm, & G. Glau (Eds.), *The WPA outcomes statement: A decade later* (pp. 257-270). Anderson, SC: Parlor Press.
- Masuda, P. K. (2000). *ESL writing in twentieth-century US higher education: The formation of an interdisciplinary field*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Purdue University, IN.
- Matsuda, P. K. (1999). Composition studies and ESL writing: A disciplinary division of labor. *College Composition and Communication*, 50(4), 699-721.
- Matsuda, P. K. (2003). Process and post-process: A discursive history. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(1), 65-83.
- Matsuda, P. K. (2006). The myth of linguistic homogeneity in U.S. college composition. *College English*, 68(6), 637-651.

- Matsuda, P. K. (2012). Let's face it: Language issues and the writing program administrator. *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, 36(1), 141-163.
- Matsuda, P. K., & Skinnell, R. (2012). Considering the impact of the *WPA outcomes statement* on second language writers. In N. N. Behm, G. Glau, D. H. Holdstein, D. Roen, & E. White (Eds.), *The WPA outcomes statement: A decade later* (pp. 230-241). Anderson, SC: Parlor Press.
- McKay, S. L. (1993). Examining L2 composition ideology: A look at literacy education. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 2(1), 65-81.
- Miller, C. R. (1984). Genre as social action. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 70(2), 151-167.
- Murphy, J. J. (Ed.). 2001. *A short history of writing instruction: From ancient Greece to modern America* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- North, S. M. (1987). *The making of knowledge in composition: Portrait of an emerging field*. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook Publishers.
- Ouellette, M. (2004). Voices on the landscape: Reconceptualizing plagiarism, voice appropriation, and academic competence in ESL freshman composition. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 65/03, 866.
- Ouellette, M. A. (2008). Weaving strands of writer identity: Self as author and the NNES "plagiarist". *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(4), 255-273.
- Pennycook, A. (1994). Incommensurable discourses? *Applied Linguistics*, 15, 115-138.
- Pennycook, A. (1996). Borrowing others' words: Text, ownership, memory, and plagiarism. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(2), 201-230.
- Raimes, A. (1983). Tradition and revolution in ESL teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17(4), 535-535.
- Rodgers, P. C. (1966). A discourse-centered rhetoric of the paragraph. *College Composition and Communication*, 17(1), 2-11.
- Rounsaville, A., Goldberg, R., & Bawarshi, A. (2008). From incomes to outcomes: FYW students' prior genre knowledge, meta-cognition, and the question of transfer. *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, 32(1), 97-112.
- Russell, D. (1995). Activity theory and its implications for writing instruction. In J. Petraglia (Ed.), *Reconceiving writing, rethinking writing instruction* (pp. 51-77).

- Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Santos, T. (1992). Ideology in composition: L1 and ESL. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 1*(1), 1-15.
- Scollon, R. (1994). As a matter of fact: The changing ideology of authorship and responsibility in discourse. *World Englishes, 13*, 33-46.
- Scollon, R. (1995). Plagiarism and ideology: Identity in intercultural discourse. *Language in Society, 24*, 1-28.
- Silva, T. & Leki, I. (2004). Family matters: The influence of applied linguistics and composition studies on second language writing studies—past, present, and future. *The Modern Language Journal, 88*, 1-13.
- Smit, D. W. (2004). *The end of composition studies*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Spack, R. (1988). Initiating ESL students into the academic discourse community: How far should we go? *TESOL Quarterly, 22*(1), 29-51.
- Tate, G., Rupiper, A., Schick, K., & Hessler, B. *A guide to composition pedagogies* (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Trimbur, J. (1993). Response to Maxine Hairston, “Diversity, ideology, and teaching writing.” *College Composition and Communication, 44*(2), 248-249.
- Trimbur, J. (1994). Taking the social turn: Teaching writing post-process. *College Composition and Communication, 45*, 108-118.
- Wardle, E. (2009). ‘Mutt genres’ and the goal of FYC: Can we help students write the genres of the university? *College Composition and Communication, 60*, 765–789.
- Williams, J. (1995). ESL composition program administration in the United States. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 4* (2), 157-179.
- Wright, E.A., & Halloran, S. M. (2001). From rhetoric to composition: The teaching of writing in America to 1900. In J. J. Murphy (Ed.), *A shorty history of writing instruction: From ancient Greece to modern American* (2nd ed.) (pp. 213-246). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Young, R. E. (1978). Paradigms and problems: Needed research in rhetorical invention. In C. R. Cooper & L. Odell (Eds.), *Research on composing: Points of Departure* (pp. 29-48). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Young, R. E., & Goggin, M. D. (1993) Some issues in dating the birth of the new rhetoric in departments of English: A contribution to a developing historiography. In T. Enos & S.C. Brown (Eds.), *Defining the new rhetorics* (pp. 22-43). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Zamel, V. (1976). Teaching composition in the ESL classroom: What we can learn from research in the teaching of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 10(1), 67-76.

APPENDIX A
IRB PROTOCOL



To: Paul Matsuda
LL

From: Mark Roosa, Chair
Soc Beh IRB

Date: 08/30/2012

Committee Action: **Exemption Granted**

IRB Action Date: 08/30/2012

IRB Protocol #: 1208008154

Study Title: Second Language Writing in Intensive English Programs and First-Year Composition

The above-referenced protocol is considered exempt after review by the Institutional Review Board pursuant to Federal regulations, 45 CFR Part 46.101(b)(2) .

This part of the federal regulations requires that the information be recorded by investigators in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects. It is necessary that the information obtained not be such that if disclosed outside the research, it could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability, or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

You should retain a copy of this letter for your records.

APPENDIX B

INFORMATION LETTER FOR WRITING TEACHERS

Dear Writing Teacher:

I am a graduate student under the direction of Professor Paul Kei Matsuda in the Department English at Arizona State University. I am conducting a research study to investigate multilingual students' writing in Intensive English Programs and First Year Composition classrooms. I am inviting your participation which will involve participating in one approximately 45 minute interview during the fall of 2012. The purpose of the interview is to learn more about your approach to teaching writing to multilingual students. Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time, there will be no penalty. Your responses will be confidential.

The results of this study may be used in reports, presentations, or publications but your name will not be used. I would like to audiotape this interview. The interview will not be recorded without your permission. Please let me know if you do not want the interview to be taped; you also can change your mind after the interview starts, just let me know. The tapes will be kept in a locked cabinet in Professor Matsuda's office and will be destroyed after one year. If you have any questions concerning the research study, please contact the research team at: paul.matsuda@asu.edu or mhammill@asu.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a subject/participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board, through the ASU Office of Research Integrity and Assurance, at (480) 965-6788. Please let me know if you wish to be part of the study.

Thank you in advance for your time and help with this study.

Paul Kei Matsuda
Matthew Hammill
Arizona State University

APPENDIX C

INFORMATION LETTER FOR WRITING PROGRAM DIRECTORS

Dear Writing Program Director:

I am a graduate student under the direction of Professor Paul Kei Matsuda in the Department English at Arizona State University. I am conducting a research study to investigate multilingual students' writing in Intensive English Programs and First Year Composition classrooms. I am inviting your participation which will involve participating in two approximately 45 minute interviews during the fall of 2012. The purpose of the interviews is to discuss issues in writing program administration for multilingual students in your institution. Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time, there will be no penalty. Your responses will be confidential. The results of this study may be used in reports, presentations, or publications but your name will not be used.

I would like to audiotape the interviews. The interview will not be recorded without your permission. Please let me know if you do not want the interview to be taped; you also can change your mind after the interview starts, just let me know. The tapes will be kept in a locked cabinet in Professor Matsuda's office and will be destroyed after one year. If you have any questions concerning the research study, please contact the research team at: paul.matsuda@asu.edu or mhammill@asu.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a subject/participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board, through the ASU Office of Research Integrity and Assurance, at (480) 965-6788. Please let me know if you wish to be part of the study.

Thank you in advance for your time and help with this study.

Paul Kei Matsuda
Matthew Hammill
Arizona State University

APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR IEP WRITING TEACHERS

1. What is your educational background and previous teaching experience?
2. What is your teaching approach?
3. What do you see as the role of Intensive English Programs?
4. What are the overall goals for your course?
5. What are the main writing assignments for the course?
6. What are the learning objectives for your writing assignments?
7. What problems do your students have with writing?
8. What do you think are the characteristics of good writing at the IEP level?
9. How do you evaluate students' written work?
10. What kind of feedback do you give students on their written assignments?
11. To what extent do you think students use what they've learned in your classes when they are in college?
12. What particular knowledge or skills that students learn at IEPs will help them in college?
13. What kind of writing assignments do you think students do in FYC classes?
14. What kind of writing assignments do you think students do in first year courses in the disciplines?
15. What do you think are the characteristics of good writing in FYC classes?

APPENDIX E
INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR FYC TEACHERS

1. What is your educational background and previous teaching experience?
2. What is your teaching approach?
3. What do you see as the role of FYC?
4. What are the overall goals for your course?
5. What are the main writing assignments for the course?
6. What are the learning objectives for your writing assignments?
7. What problems do your students have with writing?
8. What do you think are the characteristics of good writing in FYC classes?
9. How do you evaluate students' written work?
10. What kind of feedback do you give students on their written assignments?
11. To what extent do you think students use what they've learned in FYC in other classes?
12. What particular knowledge or skills that students learn at FYC will help them in college?
13. What kind of writing assignments do you think students do in IEP classes?
14. What do you think are the characteristics of good writing in IEP classes?

APPENDIX F

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR FYC WRITING PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR

1. What is the overall philosophy of your writing program?
2. What are the backgrounds of the teachers in your program?
3. What do you think are the main learning objectives of IEP writing classes?
4. How does your writing program address the specific needs of L2 writers?
5. How much do you communicate with the IEP program administrators?
6. How much do you communicate with professors in the disciplines regarding your program?
7. How does taking FYC classes benefit students after they complete the program?
8. What are the biggest challenges in meeting the needs of L2 writers?
9. Do you feel students coming from the IEP are prepared for FYC classes?
10. What do you think students learn in the IEP program?
11. How is your program different from the IEP program?
12. What skills do IEP students entering your program need to have?
13. Do you think the IEP prepares L2 students adequately for FYC classes?
14. Is there anything else you would like to share about your program?

APPENDIX G

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR IEP WRITING PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR

1. What is the overall philosophy of your writing program?
2. What are the backgrounds of the teachers in your program?
3. What do you think are the main learning objectives of IEP writing classes?
4. How does your writing program address the specific needs of L2 writers?
5. How much do you communicate with the FYC program administrators?
6. How much do you communicate with professors in the disciplines regarding your program?
7. How does taking IEP classes benefit students after they complete the program?
8. What are the biggest challenges in meeting the needs of L2 writers?
9. Do you feel students coming from the IEP will be prepared for FYC classes?
10. What do you think students learn in the FYC program?
11. How is your program different from the FYC program?
12. What skills do IEP students need to succeed in FYC?
13. Do you think your program prepares L2 students adequately for FYC classes?
14. Is there anything else you would like to share about your program?