

Fall 12-2016

Faculty Members' Perceptions of Teaching Writing to Students Who Use English as an Additional Language

Nathan Lindberg

Follow this and additional works at: <http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Lindberg, Nathan, "Faculty Members' Perceptions of Teaching Writing to Students Who Use English as an Additional Language" (2016). *Theses and Dissertations (All)*. 1456.
<http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/etd/1456>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by Knowledge Repository @ IUP. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations (All) by an authorized administrator of Knowledge Repository @ IUP. For more information, please contact cclouser@iup.edu, sara.parme@iup.edu.

FACULTY MEMBERS' PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHING WRITING TO STUDENTS WHO
USE ENGLISH AS AN ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE

A Dissertation

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies and Research

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Nathan Lindberg

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

December 2016

© 2016 Nathan Lindberg

All Rights Reserved

Indiana University of Pennsylvania
School of Graduate Studies and Research
Department of English

We hereby approve the dissertation of

Nathan Lindberg

Candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Gloria Park, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of English, Advisor

Bennett A. Rafoth, Ed.D.
Distinguished University Professor

David I. Hanauer, Ph.D.
Professor of English

ACCEPTED

Randy L. Martin, Ph.D.
Dean
School of Graduate Studies and Research

Title: Faculty Members' Perceptions of Teaching Writing to Students Who Use English as an Additional Language

Author: Nathan Lindberg

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Gloria Park

Dissertation Committee Members: Dr. Bennett A. Rafoth
Dr. David I. Hanauer

More commonly, English as an additional language (EAL) students are being taught writing by teachers from across the curriculum, yet these teachers have not been the subject of many studies. The few studies that have been done provide evidence that some writing across the curriculum (WAC) teachers felt they were not prepared to teach EAL students, and some teachers asked for assistance. However, more research needs to be done to understand the situation. For this reason, this study was conducted to investigate the sentiments of WAC faculty members teaching EAL students.

To conduct this mixed-method study, a survey questionnaire was sent to 240 WAC faculty members who teach at a single university. One hundred and twenty-two responded and 30 of them were interviewed. Results from the survey indicated that 59% of participants were knowledgeable about teaching EAL students, 52% had academic training to teach EAL students, 55% were positive or very positive about training to teach EAL students, and 71% were positive about receiving more training. In sum, this study presents evidence that the majority of WAC faculty participants had experience teaching EAL students and were interested in receiving training.

Qualitative findings give some indication of how WAC faculty perceived teaching EAL students and what training might benefit them. In general, some contextual factors affected if faculty members altered their pedagogies to accommodate EAL students. Some of these factors

were academic, such as the field teachers worked in. Other factors were personal, such as teachers' backgrounds. These factors and other study findings were used as a framework to start to build relevant training and other assistance that might be suitable for WAC faculty teaching EAL students.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Writing this dissertation would not have been possible without the assistance of my dissertation committee, especially my chair Dr. Gloria Park who through patience and wisdom guided me through the process. I would also like to thank Dr. Ben Rafoth who was always willing to meet with me and discuss matters of concerns, and to provide insight and germane suggestions. In addition, I would like to thank Dr. David I. Hanauer.

I would like to thank my friends and colleagues Lynn Reid, Kyle Nuske, John Baker, and Emily Simnitt who were gracious enough to provide feedback. I would especially like to thank my friend and colleague Fang-Yu Liao who not only gave me feedback, but helped me work through data coding.

Finally, I would like to thank my wife Chun-Ling and daughters Josephine and Gwendolyn who endured my long hours of studying. Without their support and love I would have never been able to finish this dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
ONE	LISTENING TO PROVIDE RELEVANT ASSISTANCE.....1
	Study Background.....3
	Statement of the Problem4
	Purpose of the Study and Research Questions5
	Brief Description of the Study.....6
	Significance of the Study7
	Definition of Terms.....8
	Organization of the Remaining Chapters9
TWO	REVIEW OF THE RELEVANT LITERATURE10
	The Rise of the EAL Population and Its Implications10
	The Rise of WAC Programs and Its Implications11
	Research Concerning Faculty Working With EAL Students.....14
	Studies in First-Year Writing Programs15
	Studies in WAC Writing Programs21
	Summary of the Literature29
THREE	METHODOLOGY.....32
	Research Design Overview33
	The Study Context.....33
	Study Participants and Recruitment34
	Study Interviews.....36
	Data Analysis.....47
	The Phases of Data Analysis.....48
	Initial Line-by-Line Coding.....49
	Writing Memos50
	Theoretical Sampling.....50
	Focus Coding51
	Theoretical Coding51
	Limitations.....54
	Ethical Concerns55
FOUR	SURVEY RESULTS.....56
	Teachers' Pedagogical Experience57
	Teachers' Experience with EAL Students.....58
	Teachers' Attitudes Toward EAL Students.....63
	Summary of Survey Findings65

Chapter		Page
FIVE	TEACHERS ACCOMMODATING AND NOT ACCOMMODATING EAL STUDENTS	67
	EAL Students Do Not Need Accommodating.....	68
	Discussion on EAL Students Do Not Need Accommodating	75
	EAL Students Need to Meet Certain Standards	76
	Discussion on EAL Students Need to Meet Certain Standards	84
	Teachers too Busy to Accommodate EAL Students Individually	87
	Larger Classes Mean Less One-on-One Time.....	89
	Discussion on Teachers too Busy to Accommodate EAL Students.....	94
	Desiring Diversity Motivates Accommodation	99
	Discussion on Desiring Diversity Motivates Accommodation.....	107
	Motivated by Empathy to Accommodate EAL Students	110
	Discussion on Motivated by Empathy to Accommodate EAL Students.....	115
	Addressing the Research Question	118
	Academic Field Context	118
	Academic Professional Context	120
	Personal Context: Empathy as a Motivator to Accommodate	121
	Chapter Conclusion.....	122
SIX	HOW TEACHERS ACCOMMODATE EAL STUDENTS	124
	Addressing Cultural Differences	125
	Cultural Differences Can Bring Challenges to EAL Students.....	125
	Accommodating Cultural Difference	128
	Discussion on Cultural Challenges and Accommodating Cultural Difference	135
	Encouraging EAL Students to Contribute to Classes	139
	Not Contributing to Classes	139
	Facilitating Participation.....	143
	Discussion on Encouraging EAL Students to Contribute to Classes	147
	Teachers' Pedagogical Accommodations for EAL Students	149
	Various Pedagogical Accommodations	150
	More Written Texts Help EAL Students and Others.....	155
	Making Small Groups to Help in Large Classrooms.....	157
	Discussion on Pedagogical Accommodations	160
	Teachers' Views and Ways of Accommodating EAL Students' Surface Discrepancies	165
	What are Sentence-Level Discrepancies?.....	165
	Working With the Nitty-Gritty.....	167
	Doubting If Addressing Sentence-Level Errors Helps	172
	Discussion on Teachers' Views and Ways of Accommodating EAL Students' Surface Discrepancies	174

Chapter		Page
	Teachers Advocating One-on-One to Work With EAL Students	179
	Discussion on Advocating One-on-One	183
	Teachers Accommodating EAL Students for Testing	186
	Feeling Empathy for EAL Students Taking Tests	186
	Giving Extra Time for Tests	188
	Different Accommodations for EAL Student Testing.....	192
	Discussion on Teachers Accommodating EAL Students for Testing	194
	Teachers Grading EAL Students With Leniency	197
	Discussion on Teachers Grading EAL Students With Leniency	202
	Teachers Referring EAL Students to the Writing Center	205
	Writing Center Advantageous for EAL Students.....	205
	Referring EAL Students to Writing Center for Language and Other Problems	206
	Using the Writing Center as a Proxy for One-on-One	214
	Discussion on Teachers Referring EAL Students to the Writing Center.....	216
	Addressing the Research Question	220
	Surface-Level Discrepancies.....	221
	Outsourcing EAL Students	224
	Chapter Conclusion.....	226
SEVEN	TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF TRAINING TO TEACH EAL STUDENTS	228
	Teachers' Desire for Training and Their Thoughts About Training	228
	Wanting Training to Teach EAL Students	229
	Thinking About Types of Training	234
	Using Colleagues as a Resource for Teaching EAL Students	238
	Discussion on Teachers' Desire for Training and Their Thoughts about Training	241
	Addressing the Research Question	245
	Do Teachers Want Assistance?.....	245
	Developing Resources for Teachers.....	246
	Chapter Conclusion.....	252
EIGHT	WHAT HAPPENED AND WHAT COULD HAPPEN	253
	Summary of the Findings	253
	A Case for Increasing Dialogue.....	257
	Study Limitations.....	259
	Implications for Future Research.....	260
	Final Thoughts	261
REFERENCES	263

Chapter	Page
APPENDICES	274
Appendix A - Questionnaire for Potential Participants	274
Appendix B - Interview Protocol.....	277
Appendix C - Consent Form	279
Appendix D - Survey Results	281

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 All Faculty Interviewed	38
2 Sample of Table	54
3 Demographic Information of Faculty Positions and Backgrounds	58
4 Faculty Levels of Pedagogy for Teaching EAL Students	59
5 Faculty Training to Teach EAL Students	60
6 Faculty Perceptions About Training.....	60
7 Faculty Perceptions About Receiving More Training	61
8 Faculty Exposure to EAL Students Outside of Academia.....	62
9 How Many EAL Students Faculty Taught	62
10 How Many Courses with EAL Students Faculty Taught	63
11 Faculty Perceptions of Teaching EAL Students	63
12 Faculty Perceptions of How Well University Supports EAL Students	64
13 EAL Students Do Not Need Accommodation	69
14 Perceiving Onus on EAL Students to Meet Standards and Address Issues	77
15 Teachers too Busy to Spend Time.....	88
16 Larger Classes Means Less One-on-One Time.....	90
17 Adding Diverse Perspectives	100
18 Feeling Empathy for EAL Students	111
19 Cultural Differences Can Bring Challenges to EAL Students.....	125
20 Accommodating Cultural Difference	129
21 Not Contributing to Classes	140
22 Facilitating Participation.....	143

Table	Page
23 Various Pedagogical Accommodations	150
24 More Written Texts Help EAL Students and Others	155
25 Making Small Groups to Help in Large Classrooms	157
26 What are Sentence-Level Discrepancies?.....	166
27 Working With the Nitty-Gritty	168
28 Doubting if Addressing Sentence-Level Errors Helps	172
29 Advocating One-on-One.....	179
30 Feeling Empathy for EAL Students Taking Tests	186
31 Giving Extra Time for Tests	189
32 Different Accommodations for EAL Student Testing	192
33 Grading EAL Students With Leniency	198
34 Writing Center Advantageous for EAL Students.....	206
35 Referring EAL Students to Writing Center for Language and Other Problems	207
36 Using the Writing Center as a Proxy for One-on-One	214
37 Wanting Training to Teach EAL Students	229
38 Thinking About Types of Training	234
39 Using Colleagues as a Resource for Teaching EAL Students	239

CHAPTER ONE

LISTENING TO PROVIDE RELEVANT ASSISTANCE

In universities today, teachers from across the curriculum are more frequently teaching writing to students who are still struggling with academic language proficiency skills. A science teacher, for example, might go over the written format of lab reports with students whose only previous experience writing in English was for high-stakes test preparation. Or a psychology teacher might teach research writing to students who have never written more than a few paragraphs in English. How do these faculty members perceive teaching writing to these students who use English as an additional language (EAL)? Do these teachers have difficulties? If so, which teachers have which difficulties, and why do they have these difficulties? Would these teachers be receptive to receiving training, and, if so, what would such training look like?

Unfortunately, very few studies have specifically focused on teachers' perceptions of teaching EAL students. The few that have, though, gave indication that some teachers have difficulties working with EAL students and some of these teachers want assistance. (Ferris, Brown, Hsiang, Eugenia, & Stine, 2011; Matsuda, Saenkhum, & Accardi, 2013; Ives, Leah, Leming, Peirce, & Schwartz, 2014; Tardy, 2011). However, these studies do not elaborate on teachers' situations, nor do they attempt to determine why difficulties occur. If there were studies that focused on which teachers were having which difficulties, such studies might provide evidence of why these difficulties were occurring. Then this information could be used to create appropriate assistance to alleviate these teachers' difficulties. Addressing these points was the intention of this study.

To investigate faculty perceptions, a survey questionnaire (Appendix A) was sent to 240 faculty members who taught writing intensive courses at a Midwestern university. One hundred

and twenty-two faculty members responded. Survey results show that 59% of participants had some knowledge or more to teach EAL students. In addition, 55% were positive or very positive about training to teaching EAL students, and 71% wanted more training. Thus evidence is given that WAC faculty with knowledge about teaching EAL students were positive about training and receiving more training.

This survey contained an invitation for teachers to be interviewed, and 30 teachers accepted. The qualitative data gathered from interviews provides a closer view of how teachers perceive teaching EAL students. One major resulting theory is that teachers' contexts can be thought of as either encouraging accommodating or not accommodating EAL students. For example, the context of certain academic fields might lead teachers to think of themselves as gatekeepers to their profession and, consequently, they might be reluctant to make accommodations to any students, including EAL students. Teachers' personal contexts might also influence how they accommodate EAL students. For example, a teacher who had experience studying in an additional language abroad might feel more empathy toward EAL students and be more motivated to make accommodations for them.

This concept of accommodating and not accommodating serves as a foundation to create a framework for developing the assistance that teachers desire. The core principle is that assistance should be given with faculty members' context in mind. For example, recommending that teachers give EAL students extra time on tests might not be well received by a teacher in a context where he or she is a gatekeeper to a profession. To develop a better solution, an EAL specialists needs to talk to teachers and understand their situations.

Study Background

The impetus for this study was a conversation I had in the second year of my dissertation coursework. I spoke to a TA who was teaching first-year composition and struggling to work with an EAL student. The student did not seem to understand the TA's assignments, appeared to be resistant to instruction, and turned in work that was riddled with discrepancies (e.g. grammar errors). The TA had no training to work with EAL students, and she felt all the problems were her fault. Consequently, she gave the EAL student a high grade out of sheer guilt.

Since I had worked with EAL students throughout my career, I felt I could help her and other teachers by creating some kind of a resource—maybe a list of tips, perhaps a website of advice, or even a book of sorts. However, all of these were one-way approaches: a specialist passing information to a non-specialist. Such an approach failed to take faculty members' perspectives into consideration. For example, which kind of faculty would want such advice? What kind of advice would be useful? Indeed, was there even use for such advice? I decided I needed to know more about faculty perceptions of teaching writing to EAL students.

I began searching for studies that focused on faculty perception. Now, four years later, I have gathered only a handful of relevant articles from various fields. Some of these articles point out the differences between faculty perceptions of pedagogical approaches and specialists' recommended practices. This gap between approach and recommendation can be useful in assessing what is lacking in teachers' approaches to teaching EAL students writing and what might be gained from an EAL specialist's insights. However, these same articles do not try to understand why this gap occurs, and even if faculty members might have valid alternative approaches.

By listening to faculty, I have been able to better assess what assistance they might need and also what advice they might have to offer. I have also been better able to understand their situations and use this knowledge to create guidelines to determine what sort of assistance might be relevant to their various situations. Ultimately, then, this has helped me to return to my original impetus, to develop assistance for faculty across the curriculum who teach writing to EAL students.

Statement of the Problem

The focus of this study is faculty from across the curriculum who teach writing to EAL students. This situation has become more common because there has been an increase in writing across the curriculum (WAC) programs. Traditionally, teaching writing was the duty of English department faculty (Bereton, 1995; Berlin, 1987). However, over the last four decades this duty has been spread out across the curriculum and has increasingly become a task for teachers from different disciplines (Thaiss & Porter, 2010). At the same time, international student enrollment has increased to an all time high (Institute of International Education, n.d.a) and more than one in five residents of the United States speak a language other than English in their homes (United States Census Bureau, 2015). As the above evidence indicates, today more EAL students are being taught writing by more faculty members from across the curriculum.

As this situation has become more common, related difficulties have increased as well. Some of these difficulties occur because faculty members from across the curriculum are not prepared to teach EAL students (Matsuda, 2006; Preto-Bay & Hansen, 2006; Silva, 2010). Consequently, these teachers' pedagogies might be incongruent with what EAL specialists deem best practice (Tardy, 2011; Zamel, 1995). In fact, some teachers have confessed that they are not sure what the suggested practices are (Tardy, 2011). And some teachers have reported feeling

unprepared to teach EAL students and have asked for more training (Ferris, Brown, Hsiang, Eugenia, & Stine, 2011; Matsuda, Saenkhum, & Accardi, 2013).

Such faculty members could benefit from EAL specialists' assistance, but assistance is currently limited due to a lack of research on the subject. If assistance were based on research that explored which teachers are having what kinds of difficulties, this assistance could be more sensitive to and suited toward particular teachers' needs. The main purpose of this study is to provide such research and make pedagogic suggestions based on it.

Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

Currently there is a lack of research concerning faculty perceptions of teaching EAL students in writing classes across the curriculum. The research that does exist indicates that some teachers are having difficulties working with EAL students, and some of these teachers desire assistance. However, the extant research does not, for the most part, examine which teachers are having what type of difficulties, nor does it determine how problems might be addressed.

With these points in mind, I began this study with a general question of what are teachers' perceptions of teaching EAL students. However, as I investigated teachers' perceptions, in many instances I realized that teachers were in situations which encouraged them to reach out to EAL students and try to make changes that would accommodate them. In other contexts, though, teachers were in situations where they had an obligation to ensure students met certain standards, such as university requirements or professional expectations. In these instances, teachers had incentive not to make accommodations for EAL students. Thus, whether teachers accommodated or did not accommodate EAL students appeared to correspond to different contexts. Thus my first research question evolved into the following:

1. What conditions impede or enable teachers to accommodate EAL students?

A second research question arose while I was reading literature. Researchers often compared faculty members' perceptions of teaching EAL students to effective teaching practices recommended by EAL writing specialists. These comparisons can be used to show how well best practices were being disseminated. Any gaps disclosed could show specialists the pedagogical issues that need to be addressed. This information might also help elucidate why certain recommended practices are adopted by teachers and why some are not. In addition, new research could gather information on effective grassroots teacher practices that specialists could disseminate to other teachers. Considering these points, this study addresses this second research question:

2. How do faculty members' perceptions of teaching EAL students compare to the recommendations of specialists in EAL related fields?

My final research question comes from my original impetus for this study: a desire to create assistance for teachers. My intention was that if I answered my first two research questions, then I would be able to better determine what assistance would be appropriate for which teachers. Here is my third and final research question:

3. What assistance would be suitable to provide for faculty from across the curriculum teaching writing to EAL students?

Brief Description of the Study

The collection of data for this study took place from the fall of 2013 to the spring of 2014. Initial data were collected through a survey sent to 240 teachers who taught intensive writing classes at a single Midwestern university. One hundred and twenty-two teachers responded to the survey, the majority who had taught for more than three years and were tenured faculty. The

survey contained an invitation to be interviewed and 53 accepted the invitation. Of these, 30 faculty members were actually interviewed. Each of these teachers was interviewed once from 21 to 57 minutes, averaging 36 minutes.

After interviews were recorded, data were transcribed and coded following Charmaz's (2006) version of grounded theory. Then, based on this preliminary process, new questions were made for subsequent interviews with other faculty members. In addition, for each interview, lines of data were assigned initial coding. Later, these initial codings were grouped into focus codes. Then these focus codes were grouped into theoretical coding, which was used to create the themes and theories presented in chapters Five, Six, and Seven.

The resulting themes and theories describe aspects of teachers' context that encourages or impedes their accommodating EAL students. These themes and theories were then used to create suggested guidelines for developing support for faculty members teaching writing to EAL students. In addition, coding was used to find patterns that are compared to existing literature to help determine if EAL specialists' recommendations have disseminated to the classroom.

Significance of the Study

Thus far, the perceptions of faculty teaching EAL students in writing classes across the curriculum have rarely been studied. Research into this situation can lead to a more complete picture of the EAL students in writing classes across the curriculum, a situation which is becoming more common. Research can also help us learn how teachers are teaching EAL students and how this compares to specialists' recommendations. By better understanding the difference between EAL specialists' recommendations and actual teaching pedagogies, we can determine which practices are being effectively utilized. Furthermore, we can elucidate why this

is happening. Then we might be able to determine how best practices could be adjusted to better fit faculty.

In addition, by knowing which teachers need assistance and how specialists' recommendations might better suit them, we can gain a better understanding of which teachers need what kind of assistance. If we use this knowledge to make guidelines for assistance, we can start to provide assistance that is germane and practical for teachers. We can then offer this assistance to teachers who can give feedback on its effectiveness, thus creating a dialogue between researcher and teacher. In this way, teachers might be more willing to adopt such practices. This might help to close the gap between teachers' pedagogies and specialists' recommendations. But more importantly, it could help teachers to adjust their pedagogies to better accommodate EAL students. Ultimately, this would provide a better learning atmosphere for EAL students.

Definition of Terms

In this study, I am using the term EAL as opposed to other more common terms such as ESL, L2, or multilingual. This is a personal choice. I feel the term *additional* is more accurate and respectful than other terms. As Block (2003) pointed out, terms that use the word *second* imply a monolingual bias that a mother tongue is mastered before a second language is added. In reality, more often languages are learned simultaneously and not necessarily mastered. Block suggested using the word *additional* because it is more accurate. Furthermore, *additional* circumvents an implied hierarchy (Shuck, 2010). Alternatively, the term *multilingual* has become widespread and also avoids connotations of rankings. However, it applies to any languages, and in this study all students of concern were in United States universities using English. Thus the term EAL is more accurate than *multilingual*, but it too is respectful. This is why I use EAL in

this study, though I should note that when I refer to others' studies that use other terms, I use their original terminology.

Organization of the Remaining Chapters

Chapter Two examines related literature to provide a more detailed look at the difficulties the study addresses and to demonstrate the need for this study. Chapter Three explains what methodology was used and why it was used. Also the methodological steps are explained in detail, giving examples of coding and analysis in context of these steps. Chapter Four presents the results and interpretation of the survey questionnaire results.

Chapters Five to Seven present and interpret interview data. These three chapters contain tables of coding followed by explanations of the coding. The reader may choose to read these and then judge if the interpretations I made of them are warranted. However, the reader may also choose to use the tables and explanations for reference, in which case the reader could skip the data and explanations and proceed to the discussion sections. In the discussion sections, the data are summarized; then conclusions and implications are made. Finally, at the end of each of these three chapters, a relevant research question is addressed. Chapter Five addresses the first research question by presenting and interpreting related data. Chapter Six addresses the second research question by presenting and interpreting related data. Chapter Seven addresses the third research question in similar fashion, and includes recommendations for working with faculty who teach EAL students. Chapter Eight contains a summary of findings, an appeal for dialogue between researchers and teachers, limitations of the study, suggestions for future research which might address these limitations, and some final thoughts.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE RELEVANT LITERATURE

The intent of this chapter is to provide background information and to show that the study's research questions are worthy of addressing. The first argument made is that trends indicate that more EAL students are being taught writing by more teachers from across the curriculum. Thus this is an expanding area that is becoming more prevalent and warrants attention. Next, relevant literature is reviewed which indicates that some teachers are having difficulties teaching EAL students writing and some of these teachers would like assistance. Finally, the argument is made that existing studies investigated if teachers' pedagogies were different than EAL specialists' recommendations, but not why these discrepancies occur. It is purported that if faculty perceptions were understood, then researchers would understand why their pedagogies differed from EAL specialists' recommendations, and then assistance could be offered that would work with faculty in their particular contexts.

The Rise of the EAL Population and Its Implications

There are more EAL speakers in the United States than ever before. The Census Bureau (2015) estimated that in 2013 291 million people over five years old were living in the United States and 60 million of them spoke a language other than English in their homes. Fairly recently, this number has increased significantly, at least in part, from immigration. In 1960, about one in 20 residents, or 5% of the population, were classified as "foreign born," most of them from Europe. In 2013, one in eight residents, or 13% of the population, were foreign born, and the majority of them were from Asia or Latin America (U.S. Census Bureau, 2013).

In colleges, the number of international students has risen to an all-time high, increasing 10% in 2014-2015 from the previous year and reaching nearly one million total (Institute of

International Education, n.d.a). These international students bring in about 70% of their funding from outside the country (Institute of International Education n.d.b), which adds up to billions of dollars (Institute of International Education n.d.c). These figures make international students very attractive enrollees, and there is no reason to believe that universities will not continue to seek them actively.

Despite the rise in the EAL population, teaching EAL students has long been relegated to specialists (Matsuda, 1999). However, some scholars have argued that this must change. Matsuda, Fruit, and Lamm (2006) contended that the EAL population had reached a critical point and compositionists could no longer ignore EAL students. Other scholars have made similar arguments. In fact, Preto-Bay and Hansen (2006) even claimed the growth of the EAL population is near a “tipping point” when writing teachers can no longer think of the general population of students as monolingual native speakers of English, and educators will have to change the way students are taught. As they stated,

When the population for whom instruction is designed changes, the whole system often needs to be re-envisioned. If enrollment trends in composition classes persist—and it looks as though they will—composition programs may need to do just that: rethink the whole system. (p. 43)

Perhaps things have not quite tipped yet, but the student population has changed substantially. Now more than ever, using monolingual standards to teach writing no longer serves the needs of a diverse population (Matsuda, 2006).

The Rise of WAC Programs and Its Implications

In the 1970s about the same time the EAL university student population began to increase (Matsuda, 2003), WAC programs became more common and have increased in prevalence ever

since (Bazerman, Little, Bethel, Chavkin, Fouquette, & Garufis, 2005). From 2006-2008, Thaiss and Porter (2010) surveyed tertiary institutions and found that WAC programs had increased by roughly a third since a similar study was conducted in 1987. Overall, of the 1,338 institutions Thaiss and Porter investigated, about 57% had established WAC initiatives and about 13% were planning them. In addition, some of the universities without a WAC program, or plans to make one, still had writing intensive courses in the disciplines.

It stands to reason that if the EAL student population has increased in universities at the same time WAC programs have increased, then today more EAL students are being taught more writing by more teachers from across the curriculum. Hall (2009) described this as the “next America,” and claimed that WAC programs must also adapt. In fact, he proclaimed that all faculty members who teach writing should have training to teach EAL students. The future of WAC, Hall attested, depends on it. He contended,

The future of WAC, I will argue, is indissolubly tied to the ways in which higher education will have to, willingly or unwillingly, evolve in the wake of globalization and in response to the increasing linguistic diversity of our student population. (p. 34)

Other researchers have made similar arguments regarding the adaption of WAC programs (Harklau, Siegal, & Losey, 1999). Unfortunately, the increase in WAC programs has not led to an increase in EAL student support or assistance for the faculty that teach them. In fact, Cox (2011) purported that “WAC has increased emphasis on writing across undergraduate programs without creating mechanisms that help L2 students succeed as writers and without creating faculty development programs that offer training in working with L2 writers” (L2 Writers and WAC section, para. 15).

Without faculty development programs, one might assume teachers would be unprepared to work with EAL students, especially new faculty. Matsuda (2006) assumed this when he pointed out that “the vast majority of U.S. college composition programs remain unprepared for second-language writers” (p. 637). After reviewing literature regarding the training adjunct faculty and TAs received to teach composition, Preto-Bay and Hansen (2006) came to similar conclusions:

There is little reason to assume that graduate students or adjunct faculty are learning more than a few basics about how to teach writing in general, and may, consequently, have and even greater lack of knowledge of how to address issues of linguistic and cultural diversity in their classrooms. (p. 45)

The researchers above based their statements on logical assumptions. They did so because there are no widespread surveys concerning how much or what kind of training college-level faculty receive to teach EAL students before or after they start teaching. There is, however, research on the K-12 level. On the K-12 level, teachers are required by law to address linguistic diversity (Light, 1967; No Child Left Behind Act, 2001), which is perhaps why there is more research on the subject. Surveys conducted to investigate the training and assistance K-12 teachers receive show that the amount and quality are mixed. In one study of 100 preservice students, only 30% received training to teach EAL students, though 81% wanted such training (Dekutoski, 2001). In another study, 279 high school teachers felt they had not received adequate training to teach EAL students (Reeves, 2004).

In studies concerning the quality of training, some programs were shown to have a positive influence on teachers’ attitudes toward EAL students (Blake & Culter, 2003; Garcia-Nevarez, Safford, & Arias, 2005; Mantero & McVicker, 2006; Smith, 2004). However, in other

cases, training was viewed as ineffective (O'brien, 2011). In sum, K-12 studies give indication that training is not always provided even when it is desired. When it is provided, it can have positive effects, but not all training is effective. Similar research on a tertiary level could be greatly beneficial, but so far it is lacking.

Even though tertiary research may be lacking, some scholars do offer advice to faculty who teach EAL students writing. For example Cox (2014) and Johns (2001) give practical advice, but it is based on students' needs, not teachers'. Non-EAL specialists have also offered advice to their colleagues (Alster, 2004; Fishman & McCarthy, 2004), and universities have set up resources to offer advice to faculty (Fischer, 2016). This advice can be useful and informative, but could greatly benefit from informative research. Such research could give indication of how different teachers are working with EAL students and what needs they have in their particular contexts. Then assistance could be customized to particular teachers' needs. In addition, research could include faculty input so researchers and teachers might determine together what is needed. Unfortunately there are only a handful of relevant studies that have been done so far, and none of them have offered much information about assistance. These studies do, however, give evidence that assistance is needed and wanted.

Research Concerning Faculty Working With EAL Students

A substantial amount of studies have focused on EAL students' perceptions of working with WAC faculty (e.g. Chiang & Schmida, 1999; Kanno & Varghese, 2010; Zhou, Knoke, & Sakamoto, 2005). However, very few have focused on faculty's perceptions of teaching EAL students. Since there are so few, each one can be discussed in detail, beginning with three that are focused on first-year composition faculty.

Studies in First-Year Writing Programs

Three studies focused on the first-year writing teachers' perceptions of teaching EAL students. Matsuda, Saenkhum and Accardi's (2013) study took place at a large university with a large EAL population. They surveyed 74 first-year writing teachers who had a range of education and experience, from doctoral degrees in literature to BAs in creative writing. Matsuda, Saenkhum and Accardi (2013) were specifically focused on faculty perceptions because they wanted to know "the real impact of L2 writing research" (p. 69) and understand instructors' comments about their context and professional development. The researchers discovered that some teachers felt comfortable working with EAL students and felt that their EAL students were competent and diligent. However, they also found that some instructors had more negative perceptions of working with EAL students.

On one of Matsuda, Saenkhum and Accardi's (2013) survey items, 15 of 46 teachers¹ indicated feeling less than confident when working with EAL students. In survey open fields, three teachers confessed they did not know what multilingual students' needs were. One wrote, "I am not trained in ESL, so I really have no idea" (p. 75). Seven of the instructors indicated that they wanted more professional preparation opportunities. One wrote, "I don't have any multilingual students in my class at this time. But as a teacher, I would love, absolutely love, more training in this area" (p. 79). Another wrote, "I would love to see a workshop at [this university] directed toward learning how to effectively respond to writing of multilingual students in FYC." And another wrote, "It would also be helpful to have more strategies to use when working with this population" (p. 79).

Some instructors indicated that they were willing to spend more time, perhaps during their office hours, to give EAL students more personal attention because the instructors felt it

¹ Due to technical errors, only 46 of the 74 participants were able to complete this item.

helped EAL students succeed. One instructor even wrote, “More attention = More learning” (p. 77). Other instructors encouraged EAL students to find help from tutors or the writing center. But 12 instructors were accused by the researchers of *outsourcing* their EAL students to the writing center rather than trying to work with them.

When working with language issues, Matsuda, Saenkhum and Accardi (2013) described one instructors approach as “in line with the position advocated by the second-language writing specialist” (p. 79). This instructor did not grade on grammar and did not consider EAL students less competent if they made surface errors. However, other teachers were not sure how to address surface errors. In fact, one believed that the university had discouraged him from working with students on surface issues, so he had to do it outside of class.

In this study, some instructors felt confident teaching EAL students and appeared to work in congruence with EAL specialists’ recommendations. But the researchers also show that some teachers do not feel confident and want some type of training. In other cases, instructors’ pedagogies conflicted with what EAL specialists recommend, including not outsourcing EAL students and working, at least to some degree, with language. These findings caused the researchers to recommend that institutions strengthen its professional development opportunities for graduate students. They also suggested further research be done “to establish the patterns of teachers’ awareness and practices across different institutional settings” (p. 82), in other words, in WAC contexts.

Another study by Ferris, Brown, Hsian, Eugenia, and Stine (2011) contained similar results, though it was focused on teachers’ perceptions of language errors. Again the researchers were purposely focused on instructors’ perceptions, and, in particular, non-EAL specialists’ perceptions. The researchers reasoned that one cannot always assume that EAL students are

taught by specialists, and, therefore, to truly know how writing teachers are responding to EAL student writing, one needs to consider the non-EAL specialists' perspective. They also wanted to compare non-EAL specialists' pedagogies to practices recommended by EAL specialists. For even if EAL specialists' recommendations have been "widely disseminated," they contend that "there is little evidence as to what effect those suggestions or prescription have had on actual teacher practice" (Ferris et al., 2011, p. 208).

Ferris et al. surveyed 129 first-year as well as basic writing instructors at two universities and six community colleges, then interviewed 23 of the respondents. These teachers ranged from tenured professors who taught no more than two courses a semester to an adjunct professor who reported teaching six courses at four different institutions. Like Matsuda, Saengkhum and Accardi (2013), Ferris et al. found that instructors whose pedagogies were in agreement with EAL specialists' recommendations. Ferris et al. (2013) contended that, "These teachers understood that not all L2 writers are alike and worked to understand each student as an individual" (p. 221). They further found that instructors looked past EAL students' grammar issues, and some provided extra attention to EAL students.

However, Ferris et al. also found evidence that some teachers felt that they did not have time to help EAL students nor did not feel confident teaching them. Consequently, these teachers recommended that EAL students seek a tutor or go to the writing center. These actions were understandable, Ferris et al. (2011) suggested, if these instructors did not feel adequately trained to help EAL students, but the researchers criticized instructors who outsourced their EAL students instead of working with them. They also criticized instructors who denied any responsibility to teach EAL students. For example, one teacher had written in bold on her syllabus "This is not an ESL class" (p. 220), insinuating that she would not work with language

or cultural issues. Ferris et al. (2011) rejected this stance, declaring that “teachers should take primary responsibility for assessing and addressing the needs of all of the student writers in their classes” (p. 224).

Ferris et al. found evidence that many instructors were not teaching in accordance to EAL specialists’ recommendations. About 70% of instructors primarily focused their feedback on grammar and not content, as recommended by EAL specialists. Ferris et al. (2011) lamented, “Though composition researchers have been highlighting this point [focusing on content] for nearly 30 years now, it is apparent from our data that this advice has not necessarily been adopted by at least some classroom practitioners” (p. 224).

Some teachers also expressed feeling inadequately prepared to work with EAL students and some wanted assistance. For example, in open fields on the survey, four teachers expressed frustration or uncertainty teaching EAL students, with one stating, “I would love to go to a class where somebody tells me Ukrainian students are going to have this particular difficulty and Japanese students will have that particular difficulty, and this is what you should tell them” (Ferris et al., 2011, p. 219).

The researchers concluded that even though their study was in an area with a high percentage of EAL students, “it cannot be assumed that teachers will have acquired the knowledge to adjust their strategies to respond more effectively to their L2 student writers” (Ferris et al., 2011, p. 225). The researchers recommended that instructors become more aware of EAL students’ language process and learn about effective pedagogical practices. However, they gave a note of caution that this knowledge could not be gained in a one-time event, noting that some instructors “believed that teachers could understand L2 writers’ difficulties by

completing ‘a quick two-hour [training] class’” (p. 225). Instead, the researchers suggested that training might be given in coursework for graduate students.

In another first-year writing program based study, Tardy’s (2011) primary motive was to determine the status of promoting multilingualism at the university where she worked. Though she had very different motives than Matsuda, Saenkhum and Accardi (2013) or Ferris et al. (2011), similar patterns exist in her findings. Tardy surveyed 59 teachers and interviewed 18 of them. The teachers’ experience ranged from new faculty to those with 30 years of experience, but only five had done graduate coursework in EAL related matters. Though Tardy (2011) also surveyed and interviewed students, she was purposely focused on faculty because she felt that studying this population was essential for “reimagining the postsecondary classroom as a multilingual space” (p. 638), contending classroom change would most likely occur if faculty were involved. In addition, she wanted to explore “the extent to which scholarly arguments engage current practice” (p. 638).

Like the other two studies cited above, Tardy (2011) found instructors teaching in accordance to EAL specialists’ recommendations. Some instructors encouraged EAL students to use any variety of language for writing and researching activities. Tardy commented, “These teachers recognized that inviting students to draw on their multiple linguistic resources could facilitate their writing and literacy development” (p. 645). However, most teachers did not practice EAL specialists’ recommendations for encouraging multilingualism. Tardy ruminated that on her survey, teachers’ most common responses for strategies used to support EAL students were “to provide additional help during office hours or to recommend that the student visit the writing center” (p. 645). She criticized such practices as “falling into the ‘policies of linguistic containment,’ by limiting the visibility of language issues in the writing classroom” (p. 645).

Tardy also felt that there was a disconnect between belief and practice. Though 17 to 21% of the university's student population could be considered multilingual, less than 10% of students reported that they had included a language other than English in any kind of paper. (Tardy, 2011, p. 644). Tardy contrasted this to an average of 84% of instructors who believed students could use a language other than English in prewriting and informal writing to 41 % who believed that using another language was suitable for final papers (Tardy, 2011, p. 647). In response, Tardy observed, "This seeming contradiction could be related to a disconnect between teachers' beliefs about what should be done and what is actually done in the classroom" (p. 647). Alternatively, she contended, teachers might just be telling her what they thought she wanted to hear.

During Tardy's interviews, not all teachers were clear about what best practice was. In fact, one teacher said that no one really knew how to incorporate multilingualism and that teachers were "pretending it doesn't exist to a certain extent" (Tardy, 2011, p. 651-652). Other teachers, and even students, were confused about how papers that contained different languages should be graded, and some teachers thought EAL students should not use their first languages because they would benefit more from being immersed in an English only environment. Thus it appeared that teachers knew about the theories of multilingualism and similar theories such as translanguaging, but they were not sure how to enact them in the classroom. Consequently, some chose not to act at all. As one teacher envisaged "right now, it's like we're pretending it [multilingualism] doesn't exist to a certain extent" (p. 652). Tardy felt this confusion could be addressed by making explicit institutional language policy, and on her survey, 54% of teachers agreed with her (Tardy, 2011, p. 652). However, others expressed concerns that such a policy might become too rigid or constraining and thus counterproductive.

The three studies cited thus far have some similarities and produced similar findings. All three were focused on faculty, at least partially, in order to find out if teachers' practices were in line with EAL specialists' theory. All three interviewed a wide array of faculty, despite all being situated in first-year writing programs. All three found examples of teachers who were following EAL specialists' recommended practices, and all three found evidence of teachers who were not. All three gave evidence that some teachers were aware their knowledge of EAL writing studies was lacking, and Matsuda, Saenkhum and Accardi (2013), and Ferris et al. (2011) gave examples of teachers who would like more assistance; Tardy (2011) did not, but implied it. As for providing assistance, Matsuda, Saenkhum and Accardi and Ferris et al. recommended graduate students be offered or required to take coursework in EAL writing, but they offered nothing for existing faculty. Tardy recommended teachers create their own language policy to serve as guidance. While such policy could help faculty, it could never cover all situations.

Studies in WAC Writing Programs

Only a few studies have focused on WAC faculty outside of first-year writing programs. One was done by Zamel (1995) just over two decades ago but still often cited. Zamel had been organizing seminars and workshops to help with what faculty members in the disciplines saw as the "ESL problem." To get a better sense of faculty members' concerns, Zamel sent out a survey, but unfortunately received few responses. However, the responses she did receive included feedback on teachers' perceptions of EAL students. Zamel chose to elaborate on just two teachers' perspectives, not because they were representative of all teachers but because they represented two very divergent views: an instructor who was teaching in line with what EAL specialists recommended, and one who was not.

Zamel praised one English department instructor who had taught an EAL student who at first was preoccupied with surface errors. Rather than focus on the errors, the English instructor focused only on content and reported that by the EAL student's fourth paper the student had started to worry less about surface errors and turned his attention to content. Ironically, the English instructor noted, this switch helped the student improve his mechanics and grammar. Zamel explained that the instructor was able to look past surface errors and allow the student to develop linguistically through participation. In Zamel's own words, "This response suggests a rich and complicated notion of language, one that recognizes that language evolves in and responds to the context of saying something meaningful, that language and meaning are reciprocal and give rise to one another" (p. 508).

The second instructor was an art historian who complained that her EAL students had not been given adequate English instruction and therefore could not create grammatically correct documents. She bemoaned, "I have been particularly dismayed when I find that they have already completed 2 ESL courses and have no knowledge of parts of speech or terminology that is used in correcting English grammar on papers." Then she added, "I am certainly not in a position to teach English in my classes" (p. 509). Zamel accused the art historian of having a "static notion of language" and a belief that students must master a language before succeeding in academia. Zamel further explained,

This response is shaped by an essentialist view of language in which language is understood to be a decontextualized skill that can be taught in isolation from the production of meaning and that must be in place in order to undertake intellectual work. (p. 510)

Zamel claimed the art historian's comments were an illustration of Rose's idea of the myth of transience, "the notion that these students' problems are temporary and can be remediated" (p. 510).

Similar to Zamel's study, Ives, Leah, Leming, Peirce, and Schwartz's (2014) study gave evidence of teachers working in accordance with EAL specialists' recommendations and those who were not. And yet they also inadvertently exemplified that making such a judgment is not always clear. Ives et al. surveyed 104 instructors, who ranged from TAs to tenured faculty in different fields at a university and a community college. Their survey contained two paragraphs, one written by an EAL student that was complex but contained obvious surface errors and another written by the researchers that was error free, but far less complex. Teachers were asked to rate the paragraphs. Overall, 44% of the teachers deemed the paragraph written by the EAL students as substandard, whereas only 18% of the instructors rated the researchers' paragraph substandard. Furthermore, in open fields, teachers indicated that they were more likely to comment on content for the error-free paragraph than they were for the EAL student's paragraph.

There was only one teacher who ignored surface issues and commented on problems with critical thinking skills and content knowledge. Ives et al. surmised,

For this instructor, unlike the majority of survey respondents, surface-level departures from SAAE do not preclude focus on content or organization. Although s/he is dissatisfied with the student's work at the sentence level, s/he expressed understanding that levels of conformity to the prescribed standards of SAAE will vary in linguistically diverse classrooms. (p. 223)

However, other teachers' comments complicate matters. First, some teachers were aware that the way they approached surface errors was problematic. For example, one teacher

proclaimed that when grading surface errors, she held EAL students to the same standard as other students. But then she expressed doubt, stating, “I don’t know if that was the right thing to do” (p. 224). Another teacher appeared to ignore surface level errors at all, but felt guilty. She proclaimed, “I pass everybody. I’m responsible for some of the problem, right?” (p. 226) Her implications were that she was not addressing surface errors and thus not solving the “problem.”

In addition, some teachers indicated that if there are enough surface-level discrepancies in a text, the surface level discrepancies can create global problems. For example, in interviews, an anthropology teacher claimed that the EAL student’s paragraph had so many errors that it was “so garbled as to be nearly incoherent” (p. 217). And a biology teacher complained that, “If something is poorly written, the reader will get bogged down and it doesn’t matter how it is organized or what the content is” (p. 217). For these teachers, to ignore surface-level discrepancies and focus on content was difficult because the surface-level discrepancies distorted the content meaning. Thus the line between local and global errors is not always apparent.

Furthermore, one might ask if teachers’ contexts might have influenced the way they looked at errors. For example, was there something about the biologist’s situation that made him decree that some writing “bogged down” readers? Perhaps in his field errors were not tolerated. One might also ask about the teacher who was able to look past surface errors? Perhaps her field tolerated surface errors more readily. The research, however, did not investigate this, nor did they make links to teachers’ fields and their types of perceptions. In fact, they did not always specify what instructors’ fields were. This was not the case with Zawacki and Habib’s (2014) study. They too focused on how WAC faculty working with EAL students’ language differences, but they linked teachers’ academic areas to teachers’ perceptions and found that instructors’ fields influenced their dispositions toward teaching EAL students.

Like most of the studies reviewed so far, Zawacki and Habib appear to have been motivated by a desire to see if faculty were in step with EAL specialists' recommendations. They interviewed 18 full-time faculty from 16 disciplines to see "what kind of attention they paid to students' language practices, and how willing—or not—they seem to be to engage in negotiations around perceived and actual error in L2 student writing" (p. 185). However, Zawacki and Habib were interested in understanding why teachers made their judgments—something they felt essential to their positions as administrators. They promulgated,

To enact theory, in our pedagogy and writing program administration, we needed to first understand teachers' attitudes towards L2 errors and the kinds of errors they described as most troublesome or problematic or 'disturbing.' Without that understanding, it would be difficult, not to mention presumptuous, to suggest that they consider other possible interpretations of the mistakes they reported students making. (p. 188)

Similar to other studies reviewed, Zawacki and Habib gave evidence that some instructors' attitudes toward errors were in line with EAL specialists' recommendations while others were not. However, the researchers went further and noted that faculty's attitudes "seemed to be related to disciplinary contexts and/or to their own individual preferences and/or writing and language backgrounds" (p. 192). This was something, they noted, that was also identified in Thaiss and Zawacki's (2006) study of WAC faculty attitudes toward all student, domestic and EAL.

One of the main themes Zawacki and Habib identified was that instructors were very concerned about what would happen later to their EAL students if their language issues were not addressed. These instructors saw themselves not only as gatekeepers for other classes but also for their particular professions. For example, a bioengineering teacher stated,

No one's going to give them a break when they're working because they're from wherever. You just get left behind, so why not get told that now when you're a student rather than get hit in the face with it when you get out there working. (p. 198)

Some teachers believed it was imperative in their field that students be able to produce accurate texts in Standard English. For example, a math teacher touted,

Math is a precise discipline, so if we say that there is 'a' solution, we know that there may be another solution, but if we say 'the' solution, that means there cannot be another solution. So in this case knowing the articles is very important and this goes back to how they translate their [EAL students'] thinking to English. (p. 199)

For some professions, accuracy of language was not as important. For example a civil engineer instructor only took off a small percentage for language errors, explaining "An engineering major who can't write still has the job" (p. 199). The civil engineer instructor, then, was more compelled to prepare students to be engineers, not writers.

Zawacki and Habib believed examples like these demonstrated that teachers were not just considering EAL students' classroom situations, but were giving feedback based on a wider context. They elucidated,

The negotiations, in other words, are never just between the student and the instructor but include a whole host of interested others who populate the contact zone where error is negotiated, with the student writer, whether English L1 or L2, having the least power but the highest stakes in the negotiations. (p. 187)

Zawacki and Habib then compared instructors' perceptions of error not just to EAL specialists' recommendations, but to the context of instructors' fields and professions. The researchers theorized that "their expectation of Standard Written English is driven by a strong

sense of the stakes involved, whether perceived or real, e.g. accrediting agencies, state mandates, future job performance” (p. 202). In some situations, these stakes can be quite high, especially when they are dealing with human lives. Zawacki and Habib reasoned,

If the stakes are perceived to be high for L2 writers as students, there are also real stakes around correct usage in the fields some of the students will enter. A faculty member from social work, for example, explained that, although there may be ‘minimal mistakes,’ if students ‘are going into healthcare, they have to make sure that what they are writing is exactly what they are meaning to say; any case records that they do and any communication has to reflect exactly what they mean. So people aren’t reading between the lines for those kinds of things’. (p. 198)

High-stake writing is also common for nursing students. Nursing teacher Alster (2004) gave her firsthand testimony as a non-EAL specialist and also a non-writing specialist. Her main intention was to claim that writing is important for nurses, but she revealed also how crucial accuracy is. Alster commented, “Nursing is a profession in which simple human error can have grievous consequences. No delete key is available to undo a medication error” (p. 172). Communicating accurately is so crucial for nurses, Alster claimed, that it is natural for nursing faculty to focus on correcting surface-level discrepancies.

These observations are supported by Leki’s (2003, 2007) longitudinal study of undergraduates, which involved an EAL nursing student named Yang who struggled with language problems. In one incident, Yang had confused an opiate suppository with an orally taken medication. This episode caused such concern with Yang’s advisors that Yang was forced to drop out of the clinical course she was in, delay her graduation date, and eventually move out of pediatrics into general nursing (Leki, 2007).

Though judging students on their language discrepancies might seem draconian, in fields such as nursing, linguistic errors can have devastating results. For example, Leki (2003) pointed out that documents produced by nurses can be legal documents, and legal documents can be used in lawsuits. In addition, nursing students must pass a board test to enter their profession, and language errors can bring nursing students' scores down, which can negatively impact a program's reputation. With these points in mind, to judge nursing instructors as out of synch with EAL specialists because they focus on language accuracy seems uninformed or even insensitive to the context of nursing.

It would seem, then, that in some fields EAL students may start with a disadvantage because the field demands language accuracy and some EAL students may not have advanced language skills. However, many EAL students have rich cultural experiences that are revered in some fields. In such fields, EAL students can have an inherent advantage over domestic monolingual students and become an asset to a class. Cultural anthropologist Sieber (2004) believed that her EAL students were advantaged in her class. She touted,

Before even entering my class, ESOL students are already bicultural, bilingual minorities making good progress in negotiating a culturally different, if not alien, university and broader social environment. This life situation requires a critical, relativistic approach to cultural issues that is readily evident in students' thinking, classroom conversation, and in particular in their writing. (p. 132)

Sieber claimed that her EAL students frequently were information resources for their classmates and even the teacher. This is something Johns (2001) pointed out that is true in other fields. As Johns proclaimed,

The literature suggests many ways for faculty to draw from ESL students' strengths. In linguistics, language, literacy, and education classes, students can provide examples from their spoken or written first languages to exemplify certain teaching points. In anthropology, students can discuss the kinship terms used in their families, in sociology, the various cultural norms of student groups can be a topic for discussion or writing. Postmodern historians can draw from students' own lives of history or of the history of their own countries or families, demonstrating that historical retelling is socially constructed. Even in the sciences, students' first-cultural theories about evolution or other topics can be discussed as ways of viewing natural phenomena. (pp. 149-150)

Summary of the Literature

In this literature review, the argument was made that the rise of the EAL population and the increase in WAC programs mean that more EAL students are being taught writing by more faculty members from different fields. Because the EAL population has increased so substantially, some scholars are calling for writing and WAC programs to be more inclusive of EAL students, and this entails assisting faculty (Cox, 2011; Hall, 2009; Matsuda, Fruit, & Lamb, 2006). The question that remains is what kind of assistance should be given and what would this assistance entail? In order to know, it is imperative to understand teachers' situations. In fact, it is prudent to start by asking if they actually need or want of assistance. In order to determine these questions, it is helpful to consult faculty and even start a dialogue with them. Very few studies have done this.

The few studies that have focused on faculty perceptions gave evidence that some teachers who were practicing in accordance to EAL specialists' recommendations, but others were not. One repeated finding was that some teachers stressed surface errors too much when

responding to and/or grading EAL writing (Ferris et al, 2011; Ives et al. 2014; Zamel, 1995). Yet, some teachers in Ives et al.'s (2014) study indicated that there is not always a clear distinction between global and surface errors, something other researchers have pointed out (Rafoth, 2015). Another repeated finding was that some teachers who did not take responsibility for teaching EAL students but chose to outsource them to tutors or the writing center (Ferris et al., 2011; Matsuda, Saenkhum, & Accardi, 2013; Tardy, 2011). However, researchers did not investigate in depth why this might be occurring.

Studies also indicated that there were teachers who were unsure how to teach EAL students writing and some requested assistance, though researchers had few suggestions about what kind of assistance could be provided (Ferris et al., 2011; Ives et al, 2014; Matsuda, Saenkhum, & Accardi, 2013). Both Matsuda, Saenkhum, and Accardi (2013) and Ferris et al. suggested more graduate courses on teaching EAL students writing should be offered or required, but none of the researchers suggested anything for existing faculty.

Most studies had little to say about faculty context, though studies involved an array of teachers, from tenured faculty teaching no more than two courses to adjunct faculty teaching six course, and WAC faculty working in many fields, from art history to math. Most of the researchers did not attempt to link faculty context to faculty perceptions toward teaching EAL students—except Zawacki and Habib (2014). In their study, Zawacki and Habib gave evidence that some teachers' attitudes toward their students were shaped by their concern for how students would function in subsequent courses and eventually in their careers. In this way, Zawacki and Habib were able to not just show that teachers' pedagogies could differ from EAL specialists' recommendations, but indicate some of the reasons *why* they differ. These insights came by

having a dialogue with faculty. If this approach were developed more, it has great potential to guide specialists' making recommendation

Researchers have suggested that all faculty need assistance, such as training and/or professional development opportunities to teach the growing EAL population. Researchers have also given evidence that some writing teachers are out of step with current EAL specialists' recommendations and could benefit by being exposed to such recommendations. However, researchers did not offer much guidance for what assistance could be given.

There are, however, researchers who have offered advice. Cox (2014) and Johns (2001) both offered detailed suggestions to help faculty. However, their advice is primarily focused on addressing EAL students' needs, and not on faculty needs. Contrastingly, Shuck (2006) attested she works as adviser to faculty to determine individual teachers' best approach to teaching EAL students. All of these scholars could benefit from research that would give faculty perspective on teaching writing to EAL students.

Such research could give context to faculty's perceptions, not just telling what they are but why they have such conceptions, as was done by Zawacki and Habib (2014). Further research can offer more details about other contexts that could affect the way faculty work with EAL students, but have not yet been studied. For example, teachers' backgrounds and language experiences could also be taken into consideration. In other words, talking to faculty to learn about their contexts can help determine who needs what kind of assistance. This study aspires to contribute to this research.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The impetus of this study was to develop resources and assistance for faculty from across the curriculum who teach EAL students writing. However, achieving this goal was difficult without knowing the perspectives of these faculty members. Thus this study began by investigating teachers' perceptions of teaching EAL students. As data were collected, a pattern began to emerge. Teachers' perceptions appeared to be influenced by their conditions which encouraged or discouraged them from accommodating EAL students. Thus this study was undertaken to address this first research question: What conditions impede or enable teachers to accommodate EAL students?

The way teachers accommodate EAL students can give an indication of how faculty members' pedagogies compare to EAL writing specialists' recommendations. Thus this second research question is addressed: How do faculty members' perceptions of teaching EAL students compare to the recommendations of specialists in EAL related fields?

Finally, knowledge of faculty perceptions of teaching EAL writing students can be used to determine which kinds of resources and assistance would be suitable for faculty—if any is wanted. Thus the final research question is addressed: What assistance would be suitable to provide for faculty from across the curriculum teaching writing to EAL students?

This chapter outlines the steps taken to gather and analyze the data in order to answer these research questions. It outlines the research design of the study and the data analysis utilized. At the end of the chapter, some of the limitations to this approach and some ethical considerations are provided.

Research Design Overview

Below is a list of the key steps taken in this study. This provides a convenient overview of the data collection process. Afterwards, each of the steps is explained in detail:

1. A survey (Appendix A) was sent to 240 teachers who taught writing intensive courses and/or taught in the English department.
2. Interviews were conducted with 30 of the survey participants.
3. After each interview was conducted, it was transcribed and transcripts were coded with line-by-line initial coding. Simultaneously, memos were written about the transcripts, and then new questions were created for subsequent interviews.
4. Next, the initial codes were grouped into focus codes. Then the focus codes were grouped into theoretical coding. The majority of these focus codes and theoretical codes appear in tables in chapters Five, Six, and Seven and are the basis of this study's conclusions.

The Study Context

This case study took place at one mid-sized public Midwestern university which I call Midland University. Using one location provided the convenience to have face-to-face meetings so participants would feel more comfortable providing personal information. In addition, having participants from one primary location meant that they were all working under the same institutional policies. This meant that comparing factors, such as access to professional development opportunities, was more consistent. Focusing on one location also meant that data collected in this study has the potential to be used in policy making at Midland University or similar institutions.

When this study began in the fall of 2013, the student population at Midland University was 15,379 students. The university grouped its population in these major categories: White (77%), Black (10%), and international students (5%). The remaining 8% were classified as Hispanic, multiracial, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander and other. These numbers fluctuated somewhat in 2014 when this survey's data gathering concluded. White enrollment dropped to 66%, Black enrollment stayed the same at 10%, and international students increased to 6%.

The international student population had fluctuated over the past decade, but overall had steadily increased. In 2002 there were 517 international students. In 2007 there were 626 and in 2012 there were 765. Of these 765 students, 441 were undergraduates. The top five countries of origin for international students were China (177), Saudi Arabia (153), India (140), Taiwan (52), and Korea (32). By 2014 there were 969 international students. The top five countries of origin were Saudi Arabia (254), China (184), India (155), Taiwan (42) and the West Bank (42).

Study Participants and Recruitment

Since this study is focused on writing classes, participants were all WAC faculty members. To determine who taught writing courses, first I consulted the university catalogue. Midland University mandates all of its departments maintain at least two courses designated as writing intensive, which students majoring in the departments are required to pass in order to graduate. I compiled a list of all teachers who had taught writing intensive courses the previous academic year; who were teaching writing intensive courses at the onset of data gathering; or who would be teaching writing intensive courses in the semester after the study began. In addition, I included all English teachers, reasoning that, for the most part, writing was an intricate part of their courses. In total, my list was composed of 240 faculty members.

In November of 2013, I sent out an electronic survey (Appendix A) to all of the 240 writing faculty members. The items on the survey had two main purposes. The first was to gather background information about writing faculty at the university. Questions of this nature referred to four categories: (a) faculty members' academic career positions, (b) faculty members' experience with EAL students, (c) faculty members' training to teach EAL students, and (d) faculty members' attitudes toward EAL issues. I used this information to make general comments about faculty members' demographics and perceptions in Chapter Four. The second purpose of the survey was to recruit participants via the last item of the survey, which asked for permission to contact survey takers. If survey takers consented, they were asked to give their name, email address, and the best way to contact them. Approximately four weeks after I sent out the initial survey, I sent the same survey again to those who had not completed it the first time. In total, 122 of the 240 faculty members completed the survey.

Results of the survey indicated that the majority of participants were experienced WAC teachers. More specifically, 88² faculty members were tenured or tenure-track faculty, and 88 of them had taught writing at the university level for more than three years. In addition, most teachers (85%) had taught one or more courses with EAL students in them, and 90% had some exposure to EAL students outside of Academia. Considering teachers' attitudes toward teaching EAL students and training to teach EAL students, 57% were positive or very positive about teaching EAL students, 52% had received some type of training to teach EAL students, and 64% were positive about receiving more training. In sum, survey participants were seasoned faculty who had experience with EAL students, were positive about teaching EAL students, and were positive about training to teach EAL students.

² Two participants did not indicate their position. The other statistics are all for 122 participants.

Study Interviews

Of the 122 surveys that were completed, 53 teachers consented to be interviewed. Of these, 19 were determined to be EAL specialists because they worked specifically in EAL writing or had academic training to work with EAL students. Another four did not respond to requests to set up interview times and dates. In total, then, 30 teachers were interviewed one time each.

The interviews took place from December 2013 to May 2014—about six months. The interviews ranged from approximately 25 minutes to almost an hour, with an overall mean of 36 minutes. To conduct interviews, first I contacted teachers to set up a time and location to meet. Before each interview, I told the interviewees that I would protect their identity. This meant that, though I would use what we discussed as data for my research, I would not include material that could reveal their identity. I also said I would not discuss their identities with anyone, and I would keep all data in a password protected file. This was consistent with my IRB protocol (Appendix B). Finally, I told interviewees that I would transcribe our conversations and send the transcription to them, at which point they could make changes and I would only use the revised transcript, permanently destroying the previous transcript. I also promised to permanently destroy all audio recordings once data interpretations were completed. All of this is included in my consent form (Appendix B). Before each interview, I signed and dated two copies of the consent form, giving one to the interviewee and keeping one for my records.

For my initial interview, I began with set interview questions (Appendix C). The interview questions cover three main areas of interest: (a) faculty members' background information, (b) faculty members' understandings of EAL students' needs, and (c) faculty members' understandings of addressing EAL students' needs. From this starting point, I let

faculty guide interviews to their areas of concern. As part of the grounded theory process, after interviews I looked for salient topics that I wished to know more about. Then in subsequent interviews, I asked questions about these salient topics.

Interviewees came from all six of the colleges at the university, and taught in the following departments and programs: Anthropology, Biology, Child Development and Family Relations, Communications Media and Instructional Design, Criminology, Geoscience, History, Interior Design, Management Information Systems, Mathematics, Nursing, Political Science, Psychology, Safety Science, Sociology, and Theater. As stipulated by my Interview Protocol (Appendix C), I am committed to protecting the identities of my participants, which means I had to exclude any data which could reveal participants' identities. Thus I used pseudonyms and only listed the colleges that teachers worked in, not the departments or programs. Table 1 is a list of all the pseudonyms of faculty, the college they worked in, and their professional status.

Table 1

All Faculty Interviewed

Pseudonym	College	Professional Status
Shannon	Business and Information Technology	Adjunct
Jane	Education and Educational Technology	Professor
Sue	Education and Educational Technology	TA
Kenny	Education and Educational Technology	Professor
Holly	Fine Arts	Professor
Eva	Health and Human Services	TA
Kristen	Health and Human Services	Professor
Sean	Health and Human Services	TA
Harriet	Health and Human Services	Professor
Josh	Health and Human Services	Professor
Loraine	Health and Human Services	Professor
Brian	Health and Human Services	Professor
Yvonne	Humanities and Social Sciences	TA
Joe	Humanities and Social Sciences	Professor
Adam	Humanities and Social Sciences	Professor
Aaron	Humanities and Social Sciences	Adjunct
Elizabeth	Humanities and Social Sciences	Professor
Dennis	Humanities and Social Sciences	Professor
Jillian	Humanities and Social Sciences	Professor
Robin	Humanities and Social Sciences	Professor
Henry	Humanities and Social Sciences	Professor
Charlie	Humanities and Social Sciences	Professor
Robert	Humanities and Social Sciences	Professor
Karl	Humanities and Social Sciences	TA
Natalie	Humanities and Social Sciences	Professor
Tammy	Humanities and Social Sciences	Professor
Esther	Natural Sciences and Mathematics	Professor
Gary	Natural Sciences and Mathematics	Professor
Philip	Natural Sciences and Mathematics	Professor
Mike	Natural Sciences and Mathematics	Professor

To give the reader a more in-depth understanding of the interview participants, below I give a brief description of each one. The descriptions consist of the college the teacher taught in, the years the teacher had taught, the number of EAL student the teacher taught, and some personal details.

1. Aaron was an adjunct professor in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences who had taught at the tertiary level for about three years. Aaron estimated he had only taught six EAL students; however, he admitted there may have been more he was not aware of. As an adjunct professor, Aaron complained about his employment situation. He had recently been told his contract would not be renewed and he was looking for work at another university.
2. Adam was a professor in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences for 25 years. He taught mostly small graduate courses which had a maximum of 15 students, a third of who were typically EAL students. Working in this atmosphere had altered Adam's pedagogy, and his classes often focused on cultural discrepancies.
3. Brian had been teaching as a graduate student for about five years, but had only a semester prior to our interview started teaching as an assistant professor in Midland College of Health and Human Services. At the previous university where he taught, he said about 10% of his students were Hispanic and some were Asian, but he did not feel his students had any language skill difficulties that required special attention. It was only the semester before our interview that he taught a student with an English language ability so low it inhibited the student's work. Brian said the student was from Africa, soft spoken, and difficult to understand in class. Brian worked individually with the African student, but Brian still felt he had not helped the student effectively.
4. Charlie had taught at a tertiary level for a total of 23 years, including teaching he did during his graduate studies. At Midland University, Charlie had taught both graduate and undergraduate courses for 19 years in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences. He said he had averaged about two EAL students per semester, which, over the years,

calculates to about 92 EAL students. As a student, Charlie had studied the German language abroad and also had experience with EAL pedagogy. During his BA studies, Charlie took a course on teaching ESL, which he described as theoretical, and after he earned his BA, he volunteered to teach English in China. In China, the program sponsoring Charlie put on workshops, but Charlie said he mostly “taught by the seat of my pants.”

5. Dennis had only taught on the tertiary level for about five years, and all of it at Midland University in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences. However, he had taught for many years at the secondary level, during which he taught one ESL secondary class. On the tertiary level, he had taught three courses with EAL students—six EAL students total. Dennis did not feel confident teaching EAL students and was actively seeking someone to help him, asking the writing center and EAL specialists to work with his EAL students.
6. Elizabeth had taught for about six years in universities, with the last five spent in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences. Before becoming fulltime faculty, she worked five years in Africa, mostly teaching English. Though her department was focused on culture matters, oddly the department only had a few EAL students who were in majoring in the graduate program and none that were majoring in the undergraduate program. In fact, the only substantial amount of EAL students Elizabeth had taught at Midland University was in her undergraduate introductory courses. These courses involved writing, but were not writing intensive.
7. Esther had served as a director in her department in the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics for nearly a decade. About three years prior to our interview, she stepped down from her director’s position and gradually took on a full teaching load. It was only

then that she taught a substantial number of EAL students. Esther sometimes felt she was not serving her EAL students well, and wanted to know how she might encourage them to speak up in class.

8. Eva was a TA and graduate student who worked in the College of Health and Human Services in a program that was very demanding of its students. Eva had taught for seven years in the university while she took courses working toward her PhD. Eva estimated she had taught between five to seven EAL students total. Eva was suspicious that some of her EAL students were trying to use their lack of language skills as an excuse not to do work or to ask for special favors. However, she was adamant that all students had to meet the same program standards.
9. Josh worked in the College of Health and Human Services, teaching graduate courses in small classes, some composed of only six or seven students. He estimated that in the graduate department there were about five EAL students, which he thought was about 8% or 9% of the total graduate student population. He believed this was typical of his department. Josh had lived and worked abroad and spoke an additional language.
10. Gary taught introductory courses that were a part of undergraduate requirements. Gary could not recall any particular issues with EAL students, and he had very little insight to offer about them. Gary had taught in the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics for three-and-a-half years. Before that, for four years he had also taught mostly lab sections as a graduate student. He estimated that about 5% of his students were EAL students—about two per a class of 35 students. Teaching four courses per semester, Gary would have taught 56 EAL students total. Gary also worked with one or two EAL

students in labs he taught as a graduate student. Gary was an EAL student in elementary school, but moved out of ESL courses at an early age.

11. Harriet had been teaching in the College of Health and Human Services for 16 years in a program that actively recruited international students through faculty contacts, though many of the EAL students took only a few courses before returning home. Harriet had only taught six to eight EAL students and none in a writing intensive course. However, she also worked as an adviser and had EAL student advisees. As an adviser, Harriet empathized with EAL students' cultural difficulties, which she herself had recently experienced when she studied an additional language abroad.
12. Henry had been teaching for 30 years, with 26 of them spent in Midland's College of Humanities and Social Sciences. He taught both graduate and undergraduate courses and thought he might typically have two EAL students in one of his undergraduate classes of 40 to 60 students he might typically have two EAL students. However, in his graduate classes of 12 to 20 students, he might have had two to six EAL students. Teaching courses that deal with different cultures, Henry did not see EAL students as burdensome, but advantageous because they could add global opinions to discussions.
13. Holly had been teaching for 15 years, but had just recently transferred from a university that is close to the Mexican border. At her previous university of employment, Holly estimated about 20% of her students were EAL students, which over the years would add up to a substantial amount. However, Holly said most of her students' English skills were high and thus language was not an issue. In her position at Midland University, Holly thought about 15-20% of her students were EAL students. Holly said she felt it was her

duty to correct students' surface-level discrepancies, but after reflection, she wondered if it helped.

14. Jane was a professor in the College of Education and Educational Technology and had taught in tertiary institutions for six years. She estimated that she had taught six to seven EAL students total. Three different times Jane spoke about how she did not feel confident teaching EAL students. Twice she expressed concern that there were some *secrets* to teaching EAL students, almost like a magic formula that she was missing but that someone might be able to provide to her.
15. Jillian had been teaching for 15 years on the tertiary level, with 12 years at Midland's College of Humanities and Social Sciences. Her program did not have many EAL students at the graduate or undergraduate level; she estimated a total of about 3%. As a graduate student, Jillian had worked in a WAC program, and still used what she learned.
16. Joe was a professor in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences. Joe felt he was not an EAL specialist, nor a language teacher, but he had studied overseas, took oral and written exams in two different languages, taught French as an undergraduate, and also taught EAL students in an intensive English program for about 15 years. He taught EAL students in both voluntary and paid positions while working on his doctoral dissertation and later as an adjunct professor, but never received formal academic training in TESOL. At Midland University, Joe taught "lots" of EAL students, mostly in large, introductory courses.
17. Karl had been a TA for nearly four semesters in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences. In the university, Karl had taught two EAL students. Though Karl had never received academic training to teach EAL students, he did receive practical training while

he taught English overseas for two years. His time overseas instilled empathy in him for his Midland University students, and when he felt they might be embarrassed to ask for help, so he reached out to them.

18. Kenny had taught in the College of Education and Educational Technology for six years, and he had also taught another two years when he was a graduate student. He thought about 10% of his Midland University students were EAL students. Kenny felt he had special insight into EAL students because he grew up speaking English as an additional language, so he was able to “see both sides of the fence” (FC94). For these reasons, Kenny spent extra time reading about the cultures of his students, taking an active role in trying to understand their backgrounds, something he felt was essential.
19. Kristen had taught in a specialized program in the College of Health and Human Services for nine years. During that time, she estimated she had taught less than 10 EAL students, and had very few difficulties teaching them. She claimed her EAL students always worked hard, and she believed their quality of work was at as good as native students’ work.
20. Loraine had taught in the College of Health and Human Services for 15 years, and before that she taught at a community college for a year. She taught in the same competitive program that Eva taught in. Loraine estimated that she taught about one to three EAL students in each of her classes. Loraine had lived abroad where she studied French for three years. She felt this gave her empathy for her EAL students.
21. Mike had taught a total of 14 years on the tertiary level, six of them as a graduate student. At the time of our interview, he was working in the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics. In all his years teaching, he stated that he had only taught four EAL

students who had identified themselves as such, though he confessed there may have been more of whom he was unaware of. Despite his lack of experience with EAL students, Mike believed that EAL students might need help with language issues, so he tried to adapt his teaching style to be all inclusive.

22. Natalie had been teaching for 14 years and at the time of our interview was working in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences. She said she had taught a small number of EAL students. When she first started teaching, she focused mostly on correcting grammar. Then, at some point in her career, Natalie described attending a workshop where an EAL specialist talked about the process EAL students go through when working in English. Natalie declared she had an epiphany at the moment and changed her pedagogy.

23. Philip was a professor in the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics and had taught in universities for 10 years. In all his years, Philip thought he had only taught about 25 EAL students, the majority of who were recent students. About two years before, Philip taught a group of 12 to 15 Chinese students in a large, non-writing intensive, introductory course of over 100 students. These students had a lot of difficulties and about half ended up withdrawing from the course. In addition, a quarter failed and a quarter passed with Cs and Ds. Philip expressed regret and felt he had not served the students well.

24. Robert was a seasoned veteran teacher with 21 years of experience. Robert had taught a number of EAL students many years ago while he was a graduate student, but he taught very few as a professor. Just a year-and-a-half before our interview, he had moved to the Midland University and was teaching in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences.

During that time, he estimated he had only taught four EAL students. Robert welcomed EAL students to his classes, and was discouraged he had not had the chance to teach many.

25. Robin had been teaching in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences for 31 years.

The department she was working in had a history of working with international students, and she thought about 20% of her students had been EAL students. For the majority of the time, she taught smaller classes of about 15 graduate students or upper-level undergraduate students. Teaching these courses allowed her to focus on listening to students and paying individual attention to them. She never lectured; instead, her classes were discussion based. She strove to foster a comfortable environment to allow students to speak out.

26. Sean had many years of teaching, but almost all of them in the private industry, training people in his profession for specific skills. At the time of our interview, he was a TA in the College of Health and Human Services, teaching only his second semester of accredited university courses. Though he did not have EAL students in his writing intensive course, he said he had three Chinese students and two Arabic speaking students in his entry level course. Sean said he did not make accommodations for the EAL students because he believed in a “level playing field” (FC18).

27. Shannon had taught for 10 years in high school, but when I interviewed her, she had only taught at the college level as an adjunct professor for a year-and-a-half. Shannon worked in a department that had a high number of international students, about 10% by her estimate. Hence, her typical semester included teaching about 15 EAL students. Shannon

was very worried about her status as an adjunct professor, fearing she might be dismissed at any time.

28. Sue was a TA and graduate student in the College of Education and Educational Technology. She had experience teaching EAL students on the secondary level and also at a tertiary technology school, where she taught one EAL student. As a TA, she had taught one more EAL student. Sue was very busy and complained she did not have a lot of time to help individual students, particularly EAL students.
29. Tammy had been teaching in universities for 37 years, with 22 of them spent in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences. She estimated she taught several hundred EAL students, though she posited that in recent years the percentage of EAL student in her classes had increased. Tammy said she often held a discussion about EAL students in her classes, pointing out to her domestic monolingual students that everyone has an accent and they should make an effort to understand their EAL classmates.
30. Yvonne was a graduate student who worked as a TA in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences. At the time of our interview, she had taught just over two years in universities, and had only taught one EAL student. However, Yvonne had worked in a writing center at a different university where she taught EAL students, though the writing center had not given her training to teach them.

Data Analysis

Because this study is essentially qualitative and exploratory, I chose to use the grounded theory method, which was created for such studies (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). However, this study utilizes a particular version of grounded theory. The original theory, developed by Glaser and Strauss (1967), had postpositivist undertones, seeking to uncover truths in an external reality

(Charmaz, 2011). However, Charmaz, a student of Glaser and Strauss, re-envisioned grounded theory using her version of constructivism. In Charmaz's constructivist grounded theory, truths are not discovered but instead theory is constructed based on the researcher's perceptions (Charmaz, 2000). This epistemological perspective is more consistent with my own, and so I used Charmaz's (2006) version of grounded theory as described in her book *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis*. This book guided my philosophical approach to the study, the design of the study, the analysis of the data, and the discussion of the findings. I often refer to this book in the following sections.

The Phases of Data Analysis

The data analysis took place in two phases. The first was done before interviews were finished. After meeting with a teacher, I transcribed audio recordings of our interview. Then I created initial line-by-line coding that I used to create focus codes inductively. Throughout this process, I wrote memos, which comprised my reflections of the data, and filtered data according to my original research question: What are teachers' perceptions of teaching EAL students?

The second phase happened after interviews were finished. In this phase, I finished making focus codes and used them to build theoretical codes inductively. In this stage I was able to redefine my first research question, moving from teachers' general perceptions to their particular ways of accommodating. Then I went back through my focus codes, and even some initial codes, and revised some of them to reflect my theoretical coding based on my revised research question.

This reiterative process ideally would have been done while I was conducting follow-up interviews. Then I could have tested and further investigated my coding. Unfortunately, my time and resources were limited, and so I could not conduct follow-up interviews.

Initial Line-by-Line Coding

After each interview, I transcribed it and then began the coding process. In this process, I went through the data line by line and coded for ideas. While writing these codes, I did my best to adhere to Charmaz's (2006) endorsement of Glaser's suggestions to use verbs with ing endings. Glaser felt using this verb-like construction instead of straightforward nouns moved coding beyond categorizing individuals and more toward describing processes.

In total, there were 6,870 lines of text, with an average of 20 words per line. From these I created 5,042 initial codes. Most of the lines that were not coded were content concerned with teachers' personal lives (e.g. where they were born, where they currently resided). I felt such information was important enough to transcribe, but not germane enough to include in the analysis. There were also other random lines that might have been meta narratives (e.g. [stops to answer the phone]), or fragments of sentences—perhaps just one or two words.

Since there were so many initial codes, listing them all would be impractical. However, to give the reader a sense of what they looked like, below is a sample of some that came from my interview with one participant, Philip:

- working with Chinese students;
- teaching a large class;
- teaching 12-15 Chinese in large class;
- being concerned about way Chinese operating;
- getting a list of rules translated to Chinese;
- making rules about using e-translators; and
- using standard dictionary not good for science.

These initial codes were used to make focus codes, which are listed in the tables in chapters Five, Six, and Seven. Initial codes are not listed hereafter.

Writing Memos

After I finished coding each interview, I wrote memos, which Charmaz (2006) described as freewriting, where notes are taken without worrying about form or grammatical accuracy. I began each memo with a general reflection of the interview, trying to describe factors like the time of day and the surroundings. I did this in adherence to Charmaz's constructivist version of grounded theory in which knowledge is not absolute but an interpretation; hence notes on context are relevant. After the introduction, I wrote a general reflection of what was discussed, and then I looked for common ideas or patterns in the initial coding, noting how often they occurred and what weight participants gave them. Below is a sample of a memo I wrote:

Philip said that he was not able to give the Chinese students enough time, implying his class was too big to offer individual help. This made him feel guilty. He said several times that he really wanted to do something, anything. The failure of his Chinese students obvious plagued him.

Theoretical Sampling

After each interview, I reviewed my initial codes and memos to determine which questions I would ask in subsequent interviews. This reciprocal process of analyzing data to purposely pursue different ideas is called *theoretical sampling*. This process allows a researcher to hone ideas, testing them and finding more information concerning them. In this way, the researcher is actively involved in guiding the data gathering process.

Focus Coding

The second major phase of coding is called focus coding and involves grouping initial line-by-line coding into common categories. From my 5,042 initial codes, I created 837 focus codes, about a third of which are included in Chapter Five. The other two-thirds concerned topics that were not developed well enough to include or were too divergent from my major theme, which I discuss below.

It should be noted that though these focus codes are more general concepts than the initial coding, each one is still drawn from a single individual. It is only at the next level, theoretical coding, where I combined focus codes to make general concepts not based on individuals.

Theoretical Coding

Theoretical coding is the third step of coding. Whereas a single focus code comes from one person, theoretical codes combine focus codes to make concepts no longer tied to individual participants. To create theoretical coding, I followed Charmaz's (2006) advice. I printed out all my focus codes, sat on the floor, and literally surrounded myself with coding. I looked for patterns, and started to group focus codes. There was an infinite amount of combinations, but one theme emerged as the most salient.

One category from the beginning of my study appeared more saliently than all the others. It had appeared in my memos with 18 of 30 teachers, and it kept reappearing as I created focus codes. I called this category *accommodating*, which essentially meant teachers' willingness to alter their pedagogies to help EAL students. This was in contrast to some teachers who decided to not accommodate EAL students. Together, the concept of accommodating and not accommodating EAL students was a major theme that encompassed all teachers to some extent and many of their actions. As I looked closer, I saw that there were conditions that seemed to

encourage or discourage accommodating. This is where I honed my original research question. from concerning teachers' general perceptions of teaching EAL students to how their specific circumstance and contexts impeded or enabled them to accommodate EAL students.

It was at this stage that I went back to my focus coding, and even initial line-by-line coding, to filter for data concerning accommodation. In some cases, I needed to revise coding to better reflect the concept of accommodation. Searching through all my focus codes, I determined those that were related to accommodating or not accommodating EAL students. Some focus codes concerned conditions that either encouraged or discouraged accommodating. Other focus codes concerned ways that teachers accommodated EAL students. I used these focus codes to create the following 27 theoretical codes:

1. EAL Students Do Not Need Accommodation
2. Perceiving Onus on EAL Students to Meet Standards and Address Issues
3. Teachers too Busy to Spend Time
4. Larger Classes Means Less One-on-One Time
5. Adding Diverse Perspectives
6. Feeling Empathy for EAL Students
7. Cultural Differences Can Bring Challenges to EAL Students
8. Accommodating Cultural Difference
9. Not Contributing to Classes
10. Facilitating Participation
11. Various Pedagogical Accommodations
12. More Written Texts Helps EAL Students and Others
13. Making Small Groups to Help in Large Classrooms

14. What are Sentence-Level Discrepancies?
15. Working with the Nitty Gritty
16. Doubting if Addressing Sentence-Level Errors Helps
17. Advocating One-on-One
18. Feeling Empathy for EAL Students Taking Tests
19. Giving Extra Time for Tests
20. Different Accommodations for EAL Student Testing
21. Grading EAL Students with Leniency
22. Writing Center Advantageous for EAL Students
23. Referring EAL Students to Writing Center for Language and Other Problems
24. Using the Writing Center as a Proxy for One-on-One
25. Wanting Training to Teach EAL Students
26. Thinking about Types of Training
27. Using Colleagues as a Resource for Teaching EAL Students

These theoretical codes represent the final tertiary stage of my analysis and the major themes related to teachers accommodating or not accommodating EAL students in writing courses. The theoretical codes are all represented as titles of tables in chapters Five, Six and Seven. The codes in each table are focus codes used to make the theoretical code. Next to each focus code is the pseudonym of the teachers from whom the focus code came from. Below is a partial sample of a table:

Table 2

Sample of Table

	Focus Code	Teacher
1	Allowing EAL students to record lessons.	Charlie
2	Allowing paper dictionaries on tests.	Henry
3	Asking colleagues about e-translators and they say fine.	Philip
4	Allowing e-translators in class.	Philip

This particular way of presenting data is unique as far as I know, developed by myself and my colleague Fang-Yu Liao. The other grounded theory studies I reviewed were much less detailed. In fact, in Charmaz's (1991) sociological study, presented in her book *Good Days Bad Days: The Self and Chronic Illness in Time*, coding is not specifically presented but only partially given in context. And even though Charmaz's (2006) touts researcher Jane Hood as "one of the very few authors whose grounded theory analysis and methodological decisions are both explicit" (p. 97). Hood (1983) only gives samples of her coding system in an appendix. Despite the lack of precedent, there are some advantages in presenting the coding in the table form that I have adapted. It offers transparency so readers may see where themes originated in the data. It also gives readers the opportunity to look over the data to make their own interpretations.

Limitations

One obvious limitation of the study is that most of the findings are from 30 interviews averaging only 36 minutes long. If I would have had time to conduct follow-up interviews, I could have pursued my theoretical codes more in greater depth. Unfortunately, my time and resources were limited. However, I plan on pursuing follow-up interviews at some point. I discuss this further in Chapter Eight.

Also, inherently interviews have issues of validity. Many factors can influence what people say, including the interviewer's questions, their attitudes, and even the weather. Ultimately, all studies have their limits, but hopefully this study is transparent enough that the reader can judge if it was able to produce findings helpful to the field.

Ethical Concerns

One ethical consideration was protecting teachers' identities. I felt this was necessary to encourage trustworthiness between research and participants. I addressed this by setting up meetings in secure places and keeping data in password protected files. I also sent faculty transcripts of the interviews and allowed them to make changes to their statements. Four teachers did change minor or even major parts of their statements, but, for the most part, they did not change their meaning, just their wording.

Another concern is more personal. I have been teaching EAL students for more than 15 years; my wife and children were EAL students at one time; and I also learned an additional language overseas. I empathize with EAL students and generally feel that they should be supported more than they currently are in North American universities. While these feelings are the impetus for this study, they can also cause a confirmation bias—a situation where I look for data to confirm my opinion instead of letting the data guide my opinion. To some degree, this is unavoidable, and I can never be the objective observer once promoted in the positivist perspective. However, if my bias causes me to ignore some data or overemphasize others, I may come to false conclusions, and this could actually be harmful to EAL students. For example, false conclusions may lead to resources being allocated inefficiently. Thus, with the help of my advisory board, I have striven to be true to my data. And part of this entails being transparent to the reader by making statements like this one.

CHAPTER FOUR

SURVEY RESULTS

Data gathering for this study began with a survey (Appendix A). The purpose of the survey was two-fold: to collect information about WAC faculty and to invite WAC faculty to participate in qualitative interviews. The survey was sent out in November of 2013 to the 240 teachers at a single, public, mid-sized, Midwestern university. The teachers were either teaching classes deemed writing intensive or were teaching in the English department. A total of 122 of the teachers completed the survey.

The survey consisted of 15 questions, though the first question asked for IRB consent, and the final question asked if the survey taker would be willing to be interviewed. Thus, there were essentially 13 content questions. The survey was intentionally short to increase the likelihood that teachers would reach the final question—the invitation to be interviewed. That is also why some questions were purposely vague. For example, one question asked, “In general, how do you feel about training to teach EAL students?” The word “training” is ill defined, and some teachers criticized it in their open-field responses. But I felt that defining it specifically would be cumbersome and might discourage teachers from continuing the survey, so I left it vague. Caveats aside, the survey provided demographic information of WAC faculty at Midland University as well as faculty members’ sentiments toward EAL students and training to teach EAL students.

In this section, data are presented for all the content questions, which include each item for each question. It should be noted that the questions in this section are not presented in the same order as they originally were, which can be seen in Appendix D. Instead, for presentation,

results are given in three categories: (a) Teachers' Pedagogical Experience, (b) Teachers' Experience with EAL students, and (c) Teachers' Attitudes toward EAL Students.

Teachers' Pedagogical Experience

Part of the intention of the survey was to gather information about teachers' experiences in academia in order to provide a general population description. The data under the first question (Q1) in Table 3 show that the majority of survey takers were veteran faculty. In fact, 51% of survey takers were tenured faculty, and only 7% were first time TAs or adjunct teachers. The rest were experienced TAs and adjunct teachers.

Table 3 also includes a second question (Q2) that was included to determine how many years faculty members had taught. The choices that survey takers were given sought to determine how many faculty members were still developing their pedagogies, and how many had time to establish theirs. I reasoned that a new teacher who had taught less than a year would still be establishing his or her pedagogy. I believed that teachers with one to three years of experience would have more developed, though still evolving, pedagogies. Teachers who had more than three years' experience I believed had established pedagogies that would not change dramatically. Table 3 shows that 72% of survey takers had taught for more than three years, while only 7% had just started teaching writing in college, giving further support that most survey takers were veteran faculty.

Beyond position and years of experience, I believe that if faculty had been EAL students themselves, then they would have very different perceptions of teaching EAL students. However, this was not the case for the vast majority of survey takers. The data under Q3 in Table 3 shows that 91% of survey takers had never been EAL students. In sum, then, the evidence generally

indicates that the survey takers were veteran faculty members who were experienced in teaching writing but had not been EAL students themselves.

Table 3

Demographic Information of Faculty Positions and Backgrounds

	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents
Q1: What is your Position?		
Tenured faculty	61	51
Tenure-track faculty	27	23
Teaching assistant (TA)	10	8
Adjunct faculty	14	12
For the first time, I am a teaching assistant (or part time temporary faculty) in the fall of 2013.	6	5
For the first time, I am an adjunct teacher in the fall of 2013.	2	2
Total	120 ^a	100
Q2: What point are you in your writing teaching career?		
I am just starting to teach this year.	2	2
I have taught before, but not college writing.	6	5
I have taught college writing for 1-3 years.	26	21
I have taught college writing for more than 3 years.	88	72
Total	122	100
Q3: Were you once an English as an additional language (EAL) student?		
Yes	10	8
No	111	91
Maybe	1	1
Total	122	100

Note. ^aTwo participants did not respond to this question.

Teachers' Experience with EAL Students

Besides determining teachers' pedagogical experience, the survey was designed to collect data about teachers' experience with EAL students, both in and out of academia, as well as teachers' experience and perceptions of training to teach EAL students.

Faculty members' levels of pedagogy for teaching EAL students roughly followed a bell curve (see Table 4). In summary, 59% of professors had some or more knowledge of teaching EAL students, while 42%³ had very limited or no knowledge.

Table 4

Faculty Levels of Pedagogy for Teaching EAL Students

Q4: How would you describe your level of pedagogy for teaching EAL students?		
Answer	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents
No knowledge	16	13
Very limited knowledge	34	28
Some knowledge	42	34
Knowledgeable	22	18
Very knowledgeable	8	7
I'm not sure	0	0
Total	122	100

Table 5 concerns the academic training teachers had received to teach EAL students. The categories listed in Table 5 are abbreviated for presentation. The original categories included examples of training, such as coursework, certifications, and workshops (See Appendix D). Selections included either one to 14 hours or 15 to 30 hours. Fifteen hours was selected as a boundary based on Park, Amevuvor, and Hanauer's (in press) study that indicated 15 course credits was the minimum amount of training needed for an endorsement to teach EAL students. Thus I reasoned that any teachers who had received less than 15 hours had been exposed to training but were not EAL specialists. I believed faculty members who had 15 to 30 hours were most likely specialists. And I believed those with more than 31 hours were specialists, most likely pursuing a graduate degree in some type of EAL studies. Based on these criteria, 22% of

³ Percentages do not always add up to 100% because individual percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number.

survey takers were EAL specialists, but overall, the majority (53%) had some training to teach EAL students.

Table 5

Faculty Training to Teach EAL Students

Q5: How much academic training have you had to teach EAL students?		
Answer	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents
0 hours	56	46
1-14 hours	38	31
15-30	16	13
31 or more hours	11	9
Total	121	100

Table 6 presents survey takers perceptions of training to teach EAL students. The results indicate that 55% of survey takers were either very positive or positive about training. While only 6% were negative or very negative about it.

Table 6

Faculty Perceptions About Training

Q6: In general, how do you feel about training to teach EAL students writing?		
Answer	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents
Very positive	21	18
Positive	43	37
Neutral	44	38
Negative	5	4
Very negative	2	2
Total	115	100

This survey item also contained an open field for teachers to submit comments about training. Fourteen chose to do so. Four teachers implied they did not think training was relevant since they taught very few or no EAL students, and another teacher was too busy for training. Conversely, two teachers clearly desired training, while another did not state he or she wanted

training, but implied it by stating, “My minor was TESOL in college, but that was almost 21 years ago. Therefore, I am assuming I am not up to date with new methodologies.” Another teacher supported the idea of training, and one offered insight into teaching EAL students. Two teachers criticized the survey question, claiming training needed to be better defined before they could answer the question. Finally, two teachers wanted to clarify their survey answers. All the comments are listed in Appendix D.

Results from Table 7 support those in Table 6. Table 7 concerns faculty members’ desire to receive more training. Seventy-one percent wanted more training, while 29% did not. Based on tables 5, 6, and 7, it appears that the majority of survey takers (55%) were positive about training to teach EAL students and wanted more (71%), while about half (53%) had already received training.

Table 7

Faculty Perceptions About Receiving More Training

Q7: Would you like more training to teach EAL student writers?		
Answer	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents
Yes, never had training.	39	34
No, never had training and do not want it.	20	17
Yes, I had training and would like more.	43	37
No, I had training and do not want more.	14	12
Total	116	100

Table 8 concerned teachers’ exposure to EAL students outside of academia. The items here are abbreviated to fit in the table. The original survey items included examples, such as “speaking to people who have English as an additional language,” “reading related material,” and “traveling abroad” (see Appendix D). The results indicate that 36% of teachers had 61 or

more hours of exposure to EAL students outside of academia, and a total of 58% had nine or more hours. Only 10% had no hours.

Table 8

Faculty Exposure to EAL Students Outside of Academia

Q8: How much exposure to EAL students have you had outside of academia?		
Answer	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents
0 hours	12	10
1-8 hours	39	33
9-20 hours	17	14
21-60 hours	9	8
61 or more hours	43	36
Total	120	100

Tables 9 and 10 give more focused evidence that survey takers had experience teaching EAL students. In Table 9, 43% had taught 26 or more EAL students and the same percentage had taught between two to 25 EAL students. Only 12% had never taught EAL students.

Table 9

How Many EAL Students Faculty Taught

Q9: How many EAL students have you taught?		
Answer	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents
None	14	12
1	3	3
2-5	25	21
6-25	26	22
26 or more	51	43
Total	119	100

However, it is possible that teachers had taught a high number of EAL students in just a few courses. To test for this possibility, the survey included an item asking teachers how many of their courses had EAL students in them. Table 10 presents these data. The majority of teachers,

or 53%, had taught four or more classes with EAL students, while only 15% had never taught a class with EAL students.

Table 10

How Many Courses with EAL Students Faculty Taught

Q10: How many of your courses have had EAL students in them?		
Answer	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents
None	18	15
1	14	12
2-3	24	20
4 or more	63	53
Total	119	100

Teachers' Attitudes toward EAL Students

In Table 11, it can be seen that 57% of survey takers were positive or very positive about teaching EAL students. Only 2% felt negatively and none felt very negatively.

Table 11

Faculty Perceptions of Teaching EAL Students

Q11: How do you feel about teaching EAL students?		
Answer	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents
Very negatively	0	0
Negatively	2	2
Neutral	48	41
Positive	45	38
Very positive	23	19
Total	118	100

Though survey takers were positive about teaching EAL students, 49% did not know how Midland University supported EAL students. In Table 12, while 23% felt the university supported EAL students well or very well, 13% felt the university did so poorly or very poorly.

Table 12

Faculty Perceptions of How Well Midland University Supports EAL Students

Q12: How well do you feel [Midland University] supports EAL students?		
Answer	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents
Very poorly	4	3
Poorly	12	10
Neither well nor poorly	18	15
Well	20	16
Very well	8	7
I don't know.	60	49
Total	122	100

The survey item of concern in Table 12 also contained an open-field for comments, and 12 teachers submitted comments. Of these, three were positive about Midland University's support for EAL students, mentioning the university had an intensive English program. However, three teachers felt the university did not give adequate support to EAL students, one even accusing the university for using EAL international students as a "cash cow." Also, four teachers clarified their survey answers. For example, one stated, "My experience teaching EAL students all occurred in a different country where I was an English teacher. I've heard [that the university] does a very good job, but I have no firsthand knowledge to this." And two teachers restated that they did not know how well the university supported EAL students. All the comments are listed in Appendix D.

Finally, the last content question on the survey was an open field for teachers to make further comments, and 26 chose to do so. Twelve teachers chose to clarify their selections in the survey. Four teachers were critical of teaching EAL students, including three who felt teaching EAL students took extra effort. One teacher was ambivalent about teaching EAL students, stating, "I enjoy ESL students when they are motivated and desire to learn. The students who

expect special treatment instead of doing the work upset me.” However, another two teachers praised EAL students. One stated, “I feel our EAL students at [Midland] turn in assignments that are just as good, if not better (in quality) than their peers.” Finally, one teacher was critical of Midland University for accepting EAL students whose language level was not adequate.

Also in open-field comments, there were three teachers who were positive about receiving training to teach EAL students (see Appendix D). One commented, “I believe we should get additional support, as well as faculty that are educated in best practices and pedagogy to help students learn more effectively as ESL students.” Another qualified his or her desire by stating, “Actually, I would be ok with a bit more training. I'm just not sure when I could fit it in.” One teacher offered advice for teaching EAL students. Another two teachers praised the study: One stated that, “This is an important survey on an exigent topic. Thank you for allowing me to participate with my feedback;” and the other commented, “I'm really glad to see this research being conducted, the field of teaching education (in general) needs a deeper understanding of teacher and student perspectives in EAL education.”

Summary of Survey Findings

The survey results show that survey takers were tenured or tenure-track faculty members (74%) who had taught writing for more than three years (72%) and that the vast majority (91%) had never been EAL students. In academia, 86% of teachers had taught two or more EAL students and 85% had taught one or more courses that included EAL students. Outside of academia, 90% of survey takers had at least some exposure to EAL students.

Of the survey takers, 52% had received some training to teach EAL students, and 46% had not received any. Overall, 55% were positive or very positive toward training to teach EAL students, and 71% felt positive about receiving more training. Open-field comments indicate that

three teachers looked forward to training, while four felt it was not necessary since they taught so few EAL students. Fifty-nine percent of survey takers had some or more knowledge of teaching EAL students, while 41% had very limited knowledge or no knowledge at all.

Overall, 57% of teachers were positive or very positive about teaching EAL students, while 41% were neutral, and only 2% were negative. However, 49% did not know how well Midland University supported EAL students, and only 23% felt the university supported EAL students well or very well, while 13% felt it supported EAL students poorly or very poorly.

In sum, the teachers who took the survey were seasoned faculty who had teaching experience with EAL students and exposure to them outside the classroom. Most had some training and knowledge about teaching EAL students, and most were positive about teaching EAL students and receiving more training to teach EAL students, though open-field comments are a reminder that individual teachers have both positive and negative feelings about teaching EAL students. Forty-nine percent, though, did not know how well their university supported EAL students, and only 23% felt the university did well or very well. Based on these findings, it appears that Midland University is a positive place for EAL students, but perhaps Midland University could do a better job publicizing how it supports its EAL students. Another conclusion is that the faculty members sampled at Midland University were amenable towards receiving more training to teach EAL students, and yet, at the time of the study, Midland University did not regularly offer such training. The implications, then, are that if Midland University offered more training for faculty to teach EAL students, many faculty members would be receptive to it.

CHAPTER FIVE

TEACHERS ACCOMMODATING AND NOT ACCOMMODATING EAL STUDENTS

In this chapter, I present and discuss the data directly concerning my first research question: What conditions impede or enable teachers to accommodate EAL students? Here accommodating means when teachers meet the needs of EAL students by adjusting their pedagogies or related matters, such as their personal schedules. In some of these cases, teachers perceive that they have an onus to meet EAL students' needs. When teachers do not accommodate EAL students, they do not adjust their pedagogies or related matters to meet the needs of EAL students. In some of these cases, EAL students are obligated to meet the teachers' standards.

For teachers, certain factors in their context could enable or discourage accommodating. In this study, context meant academic situations, which included the courses, programs, or fields they worked in. Context also included factors regulated by university policy, such as class size. Finally, context included teachers' personal histories, such as their experiences studying additional languages. Contextual factors sometimes inhibited or discouraged teachers from accommodating EAL students. Contextual factors might also encourage or enable teachers to accommodate EAL students. All of these factors are discussed in this chapter.

This chapter is divided into themes that are comprised of one or more theoretical codes. The theoretical codes are stated as the titles of tables. Inside each table are listed the focus codes that were used to create a particular theoretical code. Listed in a column next to each focus code is the pseudonym of the teachers from whom the focus code was derived from. In another column are the numbers of the focus codes, which are used for citation throughout this study.

When focus code citations are made, the focus code number is designated with the acronym FC followed by the focus code number, e.g. (FC149).

Below each table are the explanations for each focus code. The explanations consist of a quote, which exemplifies the focus code, and an explanation of the context of the quote.

Together the tables and the explanations make it possible for the reader to see original data that the findings are based on, thus providing transparency to this study. The tables and explanations can be read on their own. However, readers might also just use them as references where they can look up focus codes. If readers choose the latter, they can still read summaries of the tables and explanations in the discussion sections.

Discussion sections follow tables and explanations. In these sections, I summarize data from the preceding tables and explanations. Then I make conclusions of and implications from the data, bringing in research from the other studies. These conclusions are summarized when I address the relevant research question at the end of the chapter. I should note that in the discussion sections, I discuss most of the focus codes listed, but not all of them. I thought I might eliminate those that were not discussed, but presenting them all gives the reader more opportunity to make her or his own conclusion. I should also note that, in my IRB, I stated I would not link teachers to their programs or departments. So, in the findings below, I only give descriptions of teachers' academic fields and do not explicitly state them.

EAL Students Do Not Need Accommodating

The majority of this chapter is focused on how teachers accommodate or do not accommodate EAL students. This implies that EAL students need to be accommodated; however, this is not always the case. Some teachers spoke of EAL students who did not need to be accommodated because they were accomplished students who were able to compete successfully

with their monolingual classmates. I want to recognize these accomplished EAL students and avoid giving the impression that all EAL students need accommodating, so I purposefully begin this chapter by discussing EAL students who did not need accommodating. In Table 13, the first five focus codes (FC1-6) concern teachers' perceptions of individual EAL students succeeding. Focus codes seven to nine represent teachers' comments that EAL students are as good as their domestic monolingual counterparts. Focus codes 10-13 concern teachers who felt EAL student were better than domestic monolingual students in different ways. And the last two focus codes (FC14-15) refer to EAL students outperforming domestic monolingual students in surface-level language.

Table 13

EAL Students Do Not Need Accommodation

	Focus Code	Teacher
1	EAL students succeeding beyond domestic students who admire her.	Kristen
2	Having multiple perspectives gives clearer understanding.	Henry
3	EAL student had no problems in MA program.	Josh
4	Recalling resident EAL student with very high level.	Yvonne
5	Recalling EAL students who did not need writing assistance.	Elizabeth
6	Judging EAL students to be good.	Kenny
7	Teaching some EAL students with writing on par to domestic students.	Brian
8	Students "flexing both language muscles" learn fast.	Holly
9	Having no specific negative experience with EAL students.	Gary
10	Rating EAL students slightly above average.	Charlie
11	EAL students spending more time on papers than domestic students.	Kristen
12	EAL students using less slang means better writing.	Kenny
13	Being impressed by EAL students' quality of writing.	Jillian
14	Suggesting EAL students have "handle on" mechanics, not natives.	Jillian
15	Teaching an EAL student with grammar better than natives.	Karl

1. EAL students succeeding beyond domestic students who admire her: Kristen taught an EAL student who actually excelled beyond her classmates. Kristen expounded,

Her [the EAL student's] projects are phenomenal. The native students are jealous.

And they joke around and tell her. They have a good time. 'How do you do all

that?’ This class would be with color like hand rendering and drafting. Like some of those projects we have out in the hallway. Hers was phenomenal.

2. Having multiple perspectives gives clearer understanding: Henry taught an EAL student who at first was concerned that she would not be able to compete in a United States university, but actually had no problems. Henry explained,

I’ve got a young woman in class this semester who expressed very early on her concern about well I haven’t had that much experience here and I’m worried. This is brand new territory for me. I’m worried about whether I will have the proper grounding. My response was let’s talk and tell me things that you do not feel like you’re understanding then let’s chat. She comes up after class to talk about these things. I know she sought out tutoring from our peer tutor. And her performance in the class is strong. On the exams I’ve given, her grades have been upper B, lower A range. Very often I’ll have those experiences. Then there are the experiences of the opposite end of the spectrum that are not so good.

3. EAL student had no problems in MA program: Josh taught a very disciplined EAL student who was focused on achieving his goals and was doing well as an MA student. Josh purported,

The one [an EAL student] was in the military. The one that’s in the M.A. program. He was really regimented and it was sort of I am going to learn this. I know what I’ve got to do. Here’s my mission. Here’s my goals. Here’s where I want to go. And he was talking to me as a junior, maybe even as a sophomore, because I’m his adviser, he was talking to me about what do I got to do to get into the M.A. program? I’m doing French right now, and it’s not doing anything for me. I want

to switch over to [Josh's department]. So he had his goals set really early in life. I don't think it was really a language issue, it was more of this is what I really want to do in my life and I know being able to write sufficiently and talk sufficiently in English, which he's probably better than I because they learn the Queen's English and we learn [local] slang.

4. Recalling resident EAL student with very high level: Yvonne taught an EAL resident student who had no problem succeeding.

I had one Russian student. Was she Russian or Ukrainian? Ukrainian. She was a Ukrainian student at [a previous institute] who I taught. But she had been in the States for awhile. She married, had children and she was coming to [the previous institute] to get her undergraduate degree, but she was very proficient with English and she did very well in my class. But she was Ukrainian.

5. Recalling EAL students who did not need writing assistance: While discussing EAL students' issues, Elizabeth stopped and pointed out,

But not every EAL student needs help. Some of them are incredibly strong writers. We did have a major graduate maybe three years back. She was an excellent writer. She was a non-traditional student. I think she was from Indonesia. She wound up winning our [department] award that we give to one student who is graduating each year. Based on her strength as a scholar, and she was a model [department] major. They don't all need additional assistance.

6. Judging EAL students to be good: Kenny noted that EAL PhD students in his program did quite well and recalled one in particular. He declared,

I have not experienced any problems. I don't know if I have been lucky. But we think the international students, especially at the PhD level—the doctoral level—they're good. And that facilitates things. The last semester I had a student from Brazil, but she did very well. She was quite acculturated.

7. Teaching some EAL students with writing on par to domestic students: At the previous institute Brian taught at in Florida, Brian confessed that it was difficult to tell how many EAL students he had because most of them were fluent in English. He asserted,

Florida has a large Hispanic population, so there's a lot of people from South Florida that come to Florida State. They're very good English speakers. It's as though they learned both languages at the same time. Coming from South Florida you'd expect that. Growing up in a Spanish community speaking Spanish and English back and forth. And that was how most of those students were. So their writing had similar issues as to anybody else who had English as their only language.

8. Students "flexing both language muscles" learn fast: Holly had previously taught at an institution near the Mexican border. She felt her EAL students were actually better writers because they were able to use more than one language. Holly asserted,

The mechanics that I've had with my Spanish speaking students tend to be idiomatic, which are much more easy to correct. And those generally, a note will go on the first one [assignment draft], and usually with the first one that's where I actually invoke the harsher penalties so they will actually go look and say wait a second and look at the notes. Generally speaking those students, because they are used to flexing both language muscles, will take that correction more readily.

9. Having no specific negative experience with EAL students: Gary taught a writing intensive introductory science course and described his assignments as very regimented. When I asked Gary if he had any difficulties teaching EAL students, he said, “No, there hasn’t been any issues specific to them.” Then he added, “I can’t think of any, actually. Usually the students that catch my attention are the students that fail the class. To my knowledge, I can’t remember any EAL students specifically that I remember failing.”

10. Rating EAL students slightly above average: Charlie believed in general the EAL students he had taught were better than his domestic monolingual students.

I’d have to go back through my records and see, but generally speaking, I’d rate them slightly above average. In terms of the overall course average, they tend to be much more serious in my experience. Not 100%. I remember a couple of British students a couple years ago who were blowing off their time in America. But generally I’ve been impressed by the seriousness they put to it.

11. EAL students spending more time on papers than domestic students: Kristen believed the EAL students she had taught turned in quality written work that was better than domestic monolingual students’ papers. She reported,

I think they [EAL students] put a lot more time into it so it’s a lot more polished at the end. Things that the “native” speaking, whatever we want to call it, students, they take it for granted and they just throw it together at the end and hand it in.

12. EAL students using less slang means better writing: Kenny felt that since EAL students learn academic English, they use less slang and write better than domestic monolingual students. He contested,

So the kids [EAL students] actually speak so called good English. So there is no slang. At least it was in my experience. And I saw this also in the scripts, especially in the undergraduate level. The kids that I had, for the most part, they were actually better than the majority of the kids who were actually natives of the English language. Maybe because of that. But again, there were some errors in grammar, which is actually expected.

13. Being impressed by EAL students' quality of writing: Jillian felt EAL students might be more conscious of the quality of their writing and spend more time on it. She advanced,

Some folks are very self-conscious about their writing. They take extra steps to go to the writing center. So very often I'm impressed by the good quality of the writing and wish all our students had such fine English skills.

14. Suggesting EAL students have "handle on" mechanics, not natives: Since EAL students usually study English formally, Jillian felt that they might have a better understanding of linguistic structures than their domestic monolingual counterparts. She noted,

Often EAL students have a really strong handle on mechanics. Unlike a lot of American kids who are native English speakers who may not. They may have a really hard time finding mistakes. They just write like they text or talk and don't really get it beyond that. But there may be a very strong understanding of structure and things like that among students who have studied English as a language and learned to write in a language because they had to spend some time thinking about and learning about rules.

15. Teaching an EAL student with grammar better than natives: Karl attested to having an EAL student he that felt had much better grammar than his domestic monolingual

students. Karl claimed, “I have one right now, a student from Norway, who’s concerned about his English but when it comes to grammar he knows grammar better than most of my American students.”

Discussion on EAL Students Do Not Need Accommodation

In EAL related studies, often the focus is on problems EAL students have. However, many EAL students have very few problems and do not need any special accommodation. In this study, the data above provide evidence that some EAL students do not need to be accommodated because they are academically and linguistically equal to or more adept than their domestic monolingual classmates. In some cases, teachers could not see any difference between EAL students and their classmates. Gary, for example, had few issues with EAL students’ writing in his large introductory courses. In fact, he could not recall any specific problems (FC9). Similarly, Brian had taught a high percentage of EAL students, but they were so linguistically accomplished that he could not discern EAL students’ writing assignments from domestic monolingual ones’ (FC7). In other cases, teachers generally rated EAL students better than their classmates. For example, Charlie felt that the EAL students he had taught were “slightly above average” (FC10). Likewise, Holly thought EAL students had inherent advantages because using more than one language made them linguistically stronger (FC8).

Some teachers believed that EAL students had a specific advantage in writing. One sentiment was that EAL students may know that their writing skills are lacking, and so they may put extra effort into writing. Kristen stated this the most explicitly:

I think they [EAL students] put a lot more time into it so it’s a lot more polished at the end. Things that the “native” speaking, whatever we want to call it, students, they take it for granted and they just throw it together at the end and hand it in. (FC11)

Similarly, Jillian believed EAL students were more “conscious about their writing” and took “extra steps to go to the writing center” (FC13). In sum, both Kristen and Jillian believed EAL students tried harder.

Another sentiment was that EAL students were more familiar with the conventions and structures of English because they had studied them in formal settings. Jillian put forth,

[T]here may be a very strong understanding of structure and things like that among students who have studied English as a language and learned to write in a language

because they had to spend some time thinking about and learning about rules. (FC14)

Another related teachers’ sentiment was that EAL students who learned English primarily through formal studies would not have interference from provincial English. Kenny exemplified this when he purported that his EAL students were more adept at “so called good English” (FC12).

EAL Students Need to Meet Certain Standards

This section is the first of three that concern context that discouraged teachers from accommodating EAL students. In this section, data are presented concerning contexts where teachers believed that EAL students had an obligation to meet a teacher’s, a field’s, or a university’s standards. Thus, no accommodation was needed.

In Table 14, the first three teachers exemplify this subcategory, explaining that the contexts of their fields do not allow for much accommodation and students must meet the field’s standards. The remaining focus codes come from contexts exemplified by teachers’ remarks that EAL students, on different occasions or to some degree, have an onus to abide by standards and seek help on their own accord.

Table 14

Perceiving Onus on EAL Students to Meet Standards and Address Issues

Focus Code	Teacher
16 Need strong background to work in dangerous field.	Sean
17 Making mistakes reduces credibility in some situations.	Sean
18 Insisting on level playing field.	Sean
19 Not willing to accommodate—just refer them to resources.	Sean
20 Dismissing onus—must communicate in English in this major.	Sean
21 Refusing to give exceptions to EAL students for using smart phones.	Sean
22 Switching the onus from professor to EAL students.	Eva
23 Expecting EAL student to be “up to snuff” like other students.	Eva
24 Claiming program is very demanding, no EAL exceptions.	Eva
25 Claiming to know EAL students’ language is higher than let on.	Eva
26 Not wanting to be easy on EAL students.	Eva
27 Program focusing on qualifying test and prepare for career.	Lorraine
28 Rescinding extra test time, not fair to natives.	Lorraine
29 Allowing EAL students more time could be litigious.	Lorraine
30 Some EAL students succeeding because of extra time.	Lorraine
31 Colleague puts all onus on EAL students.	Karl
32 Reach out to EAL students, but they did come to America to study.	Karl
33 EAL students come to US for US culture, not to talk about L1 culture.	Dennis
34 Expecting Standard English in university genre.	Natalie
35 Assuming EAL students know resources available for them.	Brian
36 Putting onus on EAL students to state they are having problems.	Mike
37 Asserting graduate program not for teaching grammar.	Adam
38 EAL students seeking help, but professors not giving it to them.	Henry
39 Feeling ambivalent; teacher’s or students’ onus.	Sue

16. Need strong background to work in dangerous field: Sean was concerned that his EAL students needed to be able to communicate accurately in English because many of the positions in Sean’s field involved working in dangerous situations. He explained, “They really do need to have a background [in English] because they’ll be dealing with [litigious actions] and other issues where there’s a safety factor.”

17. Making mistakes reduces credibility in some situations: Sean felt that students should pay attention to surface-level structures because mistakes could affect the writer’s credibility in the field. Sean asserted,

I had a grading rubric that actually talked about punctuation and grammar and spelling because it comes across as being professional or not. I'm talking about actual reports. So this student is going to an organization, say looking at maybe communication or the program and writing a report, an executive summary that would go to the president of the cooperation. And I made it perfectly clear on the draft and as we went along if they would need work on their grammar, punctuation, sentence, paragraph structure, that they needed to because it affects your credibility.

18. Insisting on level playing field: Sean made no accommodations for EAL students in his university classes. He promulgated, "That's just my philosophy. It's a level playing field."
19. Not willing to accommodate—just refer them to resources: Sean was not willing to give extra help to EAL students who were having problems. He claimed, "If they were struggling, I would suggest to them that there are resources within the university that I'm sure would be able to help them."
20. Dismissing onus—must communicate in English in this major: Sean indicated that EAL students in the United States were expected to learn Standard English. He explained,

The expectation is that as a [field] professional you have to communicate to someone else in the workplace and if English is their first language, just like the expectation if I were to take a [professional] job in China, I'm pretty sure the expectation would be that I would be, or say Central America, that I would learn the native language to the point that I would be able to effectively communicate the ideas.

21. Refusing to give exceptions to EAL students for using smart phones: Three Chinese students in Sean's class asked if they could use their smart phones to translate words during class and tests, but Sean declined their requests, thinking they might pay more attention to the phones than to him. He explained,

In the very beginning, the first thing they asked me was if they could use their Google translator smart phone in class and also for the quizzes, and I said no. My rationale was that I had told everyone in the beginning of class that everybody has a smart device, don't Wikipedia what I'm saying. Give me the benefit of the doubt that I'll make my points so please just set your smart phone off to the side and take everything off the desk when there's a quiz.

22. Switching the onus from professor to EAL students: Eva was not sympathetic to an EAL student who told Eva his English language skill level was low and insinuated he be given special treatment. Eva felt EAL students in the university had met language requirements and should not be given extra latitudes. She declared,

I said you're barking up the wrong tree young man. I know the regs [regulations] for you coming here, and I know what you're expected to do. You will come to class. You will turn in what the other students do. You had to pass an English proficiency test to get admitted into the university.

23. Expecting EAL student to be "up to snuff" like other students: Eva said she expects EAL students to write using acceptable Standard English. She explained, "They [all students] do written [specific field] plans that they have to do in, you know, in English. It has to be up to snuff with the rest, and I expect the same out of them [EAL students]."

24. Claiming program is very demanding, no EAL exceptions: Eva spoke about a Nigerian EAL student she had taught, and whom she felt was trying to “shortcut” his work. The Nigerian student ended up failing and dropping out of the program. Eva explained,
- No one skates through [the program]. Whether English is your primary language or your secondary language, you either do it right or you don’t finish. And that’s what caught him up I think. [pause] It was harder for him. I do give him that.
25. EAL student thinking he’s special because he has language issue: Eva had trouble with a particular EAL student who was not doing his work. She remarked, “And so I, you know, I’m not sure if he thinks he’s special because he has this issue [being an EAL student] and he can just get away with whatever.”
26. Not wanting to be easy on EAL students: Eva stressed that students in her program had to pass a national qualifying exam to enter their professions, and EAL students were not given any accommodation for their linguistic differences. Eva stressed, “English as a second language does not give them the right to petition for accommodations.” To prepare students for the test, Eva refused to make accommodations in her classes. And so when an EAL student asked for extra time on an in-class test, Eva refused. She cogitated, “If he [the EAL student] had had a disability then he could have petitioned for extra time, he may have done better. But it’s [being EAL] not a disability and it’s that fine line.”
27. Program focuses on success rate of qualifying exam: The program Loraine taught in was focused on helping students pass a national exam necessary for entry to their profession. The program prided itself on helping a high percentage of its students pass the exam. She touted, “We have been above 95% for the last six years in a row.” However, the test makes no accommodations for EAL students.

28. Rescinding extra test time, not fair to natives: Loraine taught in a program where students had to pass a national qualifying exam to enter as professionals. For a short time, program faculty members decided to allow EAL students extra time on in-class practice tests, but after a few years, they rescinded the policy. Loraine explicated,

Then we recognized that was a disservice to the students because we were not preparing them for the test where English as a second language is not a disability, and they were not going to be granted extra time. And we also thought that it disadvantaged our students where English was their primary language because they were not getting extra time.

29. Allowing EAL students more time could be litigious: For a short time, EAL students in Loraine's program were given extra time to take in-class tests, but the practice ended after only a few years. Loraine explained, "It could get us into litigious areas."

30. Some EAL students succeeding because of extra time: For a two- or three-year period, Loraine's program allowed EAL students extra time on in-class tests, but cancelled the policy. When asked if not having the extra time was a hindrance to EAL students, Loraine answered, "I would suggest yes. By the time you look at our graduating class, we don't seem to have that many [EAL students] graduating."

31. Colleague puts all onus on EAL students: Karl described one of his colleagues who, at a faculty meeting, expressed unwillingness to make accommodations for EAL students, especially concerning reaching out to them to see if they needed help. The colleague felt if EAL students had problems, it was their responsibility to come to him during office hours. Karl reported, "He didn't want to make any concessions. He didn't want to meet

anywhere outside his office hours. I think at one point he said well if they don't come see me during my office hours, fuck em."

32. Reach out to EAL students, but they did come to America to study: Though Karl advocated reaching out to help EAL students even before they asked for help, he also pointed out,

They came to America to study and in my mind you teach, with some understanding that there are some cultural differences, you need to be aware of those; but, I would still want to teach it as though I were teaching Americans because that's the atmosphere they came for.

33. EAL students come to US for US culture, not to talk about L1 culture: The first EAL university students that Dennis taught were three Chinese students. Dennis thought they would appreciate talking about their own culture, so he set them up in a small group focused on Chinese literature. But the Chinese students were resistant. Dennis concluded,

They didn't come here to read Chinese literature. They came here to experience another culture. And if none of the Americans want to read the Chinese literature, why force them to do that? Why not integrate the Chinese people to American culture?

34. Expecting Standard English in university genre: Natalie explained that she gives students a chance to write narratives and use their own voices no matter what English they use, "whether it's African American English Vernacular or their own language translated into English with however their errors might show up." However, she felt that there were genres that required strict Standard English. She gave an example of a conference catalogue she had on her desk. "I would expect it is Standard Written English. That's

how you can approach that.” Students, she expounded, have similar situations where they too must use Standard English.

35. Assuming EAL students know resources available for them: Brian assumed that if EAL students needed additional support outside of the classroom, they would know where to find it and thus he did not feel obligated to be familiar with available resources. He reasoned,

I guess an assumption I have made was that international students receive that knowledge [to get help] and they know the supports available to them in order to do that. So I’m assuming they are going to take some independence in that area.

36. Putting onus on EAL students to state they are having problems: Mike said sometimes EAL students would come up to him after class and ask questions about his lesson content, but he did not proactively reach out to them. He repined, “Other than that [EAL students asking questions], I would have no idea that someone was not following me, or needed a little extra clarification. I would have no idea.”

37. Asserting graduate program not for teaching grammar: Adam stressed that while he worked with students’ content, he did not have the time to work with EAL students’ surface-level discrepancies. He insisted, “I don’t have time. I can point out these are writing difficulties, but I can’t go over them. I deal with the perceptual and the theoretical and the content base, the course content based issues.”

38. EAL students seeking help, but professors not giving it to them: Henry recalled EAL students who sought help from professors but did not get all they needed and subsequently failed courses. When discussing EAL students failing courses, Henry disclosed,

I think it's [EAL students failing courses] because they're facing some challenges in the class that they're not able to overcome successfully and I may not have the time to devote to them that they need. Maybe that's a lesson that they've learned by their larger experience at the university, that I can go and seek out this help.

I'll get it to a point but it won't take me as far as I need to go.

39. Feeling ambivalent; teacher's or students' onus: Sue noted EAL students' language discrepancies. She felt a desire to help EAL students' address them, but that she felt she was too busy. She professed,

I can tell them specific words not to use. I can say change all your contractions. I can walk them through turning two sentences into a compound sentence with a semicolon. But I can't do that with every paper every time. It's just overwhelming.

Discussion on EAL Students Need to Meet Certain Standards

In certain fields, there are strict standards that must be met by students, and teachers in these fields are reluctant to change these standards to accommodate students. In particular, this applied to programs that were highly competitive and graduated students into potentially dangerous fields. In such a context, Sean believed his students needed to meet certain standards for safety issues (FC16). Part of these standards included being able to produce linguistically accurate texts (FC17, FC20), which could be crucial when, for example, professionals need to write reports concerning litigious situations (FC16). Sean also believed that in a competitive program, no student should be given an advantage, but they all should work on a "level playing field" (FC18). For this reason, Sean seemed reluctant to accommodate EAL students. One time, for example, three Chinese students asked if they could use their cell phones to translate during class and tests, but Sean refused (FC21). If EAL students struggled, Sean did not offer extra

assistance. Instead, he attested that he would refer them to seek help through resources within the university, though he did not specify which ones (FC19).

Eva worked in a different program, but one that also trained students to enter a profession that dealt in dangerous areas and was also very competitive. In fact, in her program, students were required to pass a national exam in order to enter their profession. Part of the program's reputation was based on the percentage of students who passed the exam, so it was essential that teachers eliminate weaker students before they graduated and took the exam (FC26). For these reasons, Eva insisted that all students, including EAL students, had to meet certain standards. She promulgated, "No one skates through [the program]. Whether English is your primary language or your secondary language, you either do it right or you don't finish" (FC24).

At times, Eva adamantly opposed giving accommodations to EAL students because she believed that this was treating them like they were "special" students (FC25). One time, an EAL student insinuated that since English was his additional language, he felt Eva should make amends for him. Eva retorted,

I said you're barking up the wrong tree young man. I know the regs [regulations] for you coming here, and I know what you're expected to do. You will come to class. You will turn in what the other students do. You had to pass an English proficiency test to get admitted into the university. (FC22)

Loraine worked in the same program as Eva, and she faced the same situations, but her attitude was different. When discussing the national qualifying exam, Loraine (FC29) agreed that there were no exceptions for EAL students, but she also explained that several years back faculty voted to allow any student who claimed to speak English as an additional language extra time for practice class tests (FC27). After only a few years, program faculty decided to end the policy

because faculty members felt it did not prepare EAL students for the qualifying exam, and further, they feared litigation from monolingual students who might construe the policy as giving EAL students an unfair advantage (FC28).

It is worth noting that Loraine believed the trial period of extended testing time allowed at least one EAL student to succeed (FC30). She referred to a student who struggled with language issues, and she believed without the extra time he would not have been able to pass his classes. Instead, he worked diligently, improved his language skills, graduated, passed the qualifying exam, and found an administrative position at a local institution. After the student graduated, faculty stopped extending test time, and, as a result, Loraine believed that fewer EAL students were successfully completing the program (FC30).

Sean, Eva and Loraine worked in programs that are very competitive, include high stakes testing, and graduate students into professions which entail working in dangerous areas. In such cases, teachers might feel that EAL students need to meet standards and might interpret accommodation as giving them unfair advantage over their classmates. Ultimately, teachers might also feel accommodating students would not prepare them for working in their fields, which could lead to dangerous situations or litigation.

Research cited in Chapter Two provided similar evidence. Zawacki and Habib (2014), described some instructors who saw themselves as gatekeepers. Their concern was that if they passed EAL students who had weak language skills, the students might not only do poorly in subsequent courses but in their careers as well. In some situations, doing poorly in the profession could be very costly, for example in healthcare. Alster (2004) maintained that in nursing “No delete key is available to undo a medication error” (p. 172). Leki’s (2003, 2007) study participant Yang found this out in her nursing intern program when she misunderstood a doctor’s

instructions. As a result, she was forced to change her specialty and did not graduate as soon as she wanted to.

Based on this evidence, EAL specialists should take field context in mind when they critique faculty or make recommendations for them. While some EAL related studies may be moving towards a more flexible approach to language (e.g., translanguaging), using such a lens to critique nursing writing faculty should be done cautiously. In addition, making recommendations needs to be done with context in mind. This is not to say that innovations in language teaching would not work. Lorraine gave evidence that extending test times allowed some EAL students to succeed (FC27). However, if new approaches to working with EAL students are introduced, they must be done so with respect to the field.

Teachers too Busy to Accommodate EAL Students Individually

Some teachers believed that if they could spend more time with EAL students, they could accommodate their needs, although they were too busy to do so. This section presents two different tables that pose two different themes dealing with this issue. Table 15 represents contexts in which teachers felt too busy to spend time with individual students. Table 16 concerns teachers who felt their classes were too big, and thus, they did not have time for individual students. The focus codes in Table 15 start with Sue who was struggling to spend time with EAL students. The codes that follow are from various teachers feeling very busy and not able to meet individually with students.

Table 15

Teachers too Busy to Spend Time

	Focus Code	Teacher
40	Deducing problem is lack of time.	Sue
41	Regretting one-on-one time not taken.	Sue
42	Struggling to justify not help students.	Sue
43	Being forced to have less one-on-one.	Aaron
44	Being busy and having many students means no one-on-one.	Shannon
45	Feeling overwhelmed by work.	Shannon
46	Suggesting no time to give individual help.	Brian

40. Deducing problem is lack of time: Sue’s approach to working with an EAL student who was struggling with an assignment was to go step-by-step and in “very, very small pieces.” However, this required individual attention, and she professed, “But the time element is always a problem. So you try to assign something for homework. You try to do all sorts of things but it really can become problematic.”
41. Regretting one-on-one time not taken: Sue had an EAL student who was struggling, but she felt too busy to help him. She confessed, “It sounds awful but it’s the truth. I didn’t have time to sit with him and edit every piece he had written.”
42. Struggling to justify not help students: Sue said she wanted to give one-on-one attention to one of her EAL students who was struggling but she did not have the time. She disclosed, “There are so many other things to focus on as an English teacher. When you only have one student [an EAL student] out of a hundred, that’s the problem. It’s not where your focus goes.”
43. Being forced to have less one-on-one: Aaron complained that a few years back, the university had taken away an introductory course credit hour that had been designated as time to work individually with students. He lamented, “When they took that away, most

of us were shrieking with outrage because it just undermines. If you're not able to build those skills effectively, what do you think the [advanced class] environments are going to look like?"

44. Being busy and having many students means no one-on-one: When I asked Shannon if she had time to work individually with students, she professed that it happened "rarely" and explained, "Like I said, I have 150 students. I have 30 some advisees. I advise two clubs." Then she added, "And I'm on about five committees."
45. Feeling overwhelmed by work: Shannon was an adjunct professor teaching as many as five courses a semester. She was working on a yearly contract and had little job security. She said, "It's just weird here because every semester the sky is falling, and every semester is my last semester. I'm stuck in this Twilight Zone."
46. Suggesting no time to give individual help: Brian was considering how he might help EAL students, but he repined,
- I can't support everybody at that level. I can do some things. I can work with the content. I can do some editing. In my writing class I do more of that. But in my other classes, I only have so many hours per day.

Larger Classes Mean Less One-on-One Time

Continuing this theme, Table 16 begins with Aaron's general comments, who thought that raising class size takes away one-on-one time, and proceeds to Esther, who felt raising cap size lowered the quality of education. Most of the following focus codes pertain to teachers' complaints about class cap increases and not having enough time to work closely with students. However, the last two focus codes are variants of the subcategory theme: The penultimate code

concerns Jillian’s comments about the importance of individual feedback, and the last focus code describes Robin wondering how teachers can work in large courses.

Table 16

Larger Classes Means Less One-on-One Time

	Focus Code	Teacher
47	Raising class caps takes away one-on-one.	Aaron
48	Noticing a gradual increase in class caps.	Esther
49	Believing larger class size lowers education quality.	Esther
50	Bigger classes means giving more timed tests.	Esther
51	Being too busy with too many students to teach.	Henry
52	Teaching 45 students, hard to keep track of individuals.	Dennis
53	Complaining of increased caps.	Charlie
54	Complaining that large classes are impersonal.	Holly
55	Complaining that caps are getting bigger.	Holly
56	Finding it hard to approach EAL students in large classes.	Elizabeth
57	Feeling EAL students are dumped in large 101 classes without help.	Philip
58	Not tracking individual progress because too many students.	Gary
59	Teaching many multilingual EAL students in large courses.	Brian
60	Insisting individual feedback necessary for all students in all class size.	Jillian
61	Questioning how professors can know EAL students in big classes.	Robin

47. Raising class caps takes away one-on-one: Aaron felt that increasing his class caps

decreased the one-on-one time he had with students. He revealed,

It also comes down to how many students you’re teaching. When you increase the class size and you increase the course load, and you take away the credit, what do you have left? As an instructor, you have the time basically to prep the class, teach the class, and grade the material as they’re coming in. As far as the individualize instruction? Maybe there are people far more capable than I am, but I have found it to be extremely challenging. I’ve had some semesters where I have almost had 150 students.

48. Noticing a gradual increase in class caps: Esther said the student cap on class enrollment had gradually increased over the years. She reflected,

It's been gradual. When I first came to [the university], [her program] 101 classes were about 45 students. And now, like I said, my class was 69. There's some that are 75. There's some that are 100. And there's even a couple of sections for 200. There was a time when I knew all the students in my classes. I do know some for a number of reasons, but I don't know everybody in the class.

49. Believing larger class size lowers education quality: Esther believed that as caps increased, the quality of education decreased. She said,

I think that the quality [of education] decreases, and that's what several people in my department talk about when there's any discussion of education and what we're doing and the classes we're teaching and how many people are in our classes, they never, ever say things about quality.

50. Bigger classes means giving more timed tests: Esther could no longer give essay exams because her class enrollment had increased, and she did not have time to check all the answers. She complained, "But with the university for increasing the number of students in classes, it's becoming increasingly, for me, impossible to have essay questions."

51. Being too busy with too many students to teach: Henry complained that his class caps had increased and he was becoming too busy. He advanced,

If you're teaching two sections of 111, you conceivably have 120 students on top of the 25 students for sections you have in your upper-division courses. So you're looking at, just in a normal semester in normal circumstances, over 200 students. And your upper division students are going to be writing papers. And there just aren't enough hours in the day.

Consequently, Henry was giving less writing and more multiple choice and timed tests.

52. Teaching 45 students, hard to keep track of individuals: Dennis felt that when he was teaching 45 students, he did not have time to keep track of individual EAL students. He posited, “There are 45 students in the class. So it’s hard to keep track of individual students like that [EAL students].”
53. Complaining of increased caps: Charlie said his classes have increased gradually. He contended, “It [cap increase] was across the board. For instance, our [program] 101s used to be capped at 45 students. They’re now 60 plus.” Because of the increases, Charlie could not assign as much writing because he could not take the time to look at individual papers. He repined,
- I used to, for instance, have short papers that I assigned and I just can’t do that anymore because of the volume. You go from 90 students to 120 because you typically teach two sections. You can’t do it anymore.
54. Complaining that large classes are impersonal: Holly complained that her class size was so big that she could not even take attendance. She exhorted, “One of the challenges in a class that size is that sometimes when you teach four sections of this and none of us take attendance because you would spend all your time taking attendance.” Because she had so many students, Holly felt she could not give individual attention. She said, “Any of those situations [teaching large classes] are really hard to give personalized attention.”
55. Complaining that caps are getting bigger: Holly said that class cap increases had happened at Midland University as well as the previous university where she worked. She stated, “Even when I was teaching history courses at the previous institution, those classes were suddenly being capped at 50 instead of the 26 when I was hired there in that

tenure track position four years previous to that.” Holly felt like the increases were all across the nation. She postulated, “It’s pretty endemic in public institutions right now.”

56. Finding it hard to approach EAL students in large classes: Elizabeth felt that it was more difficult to approach EAL students in larger classes. She asserted,

It’s difficult because when you’ve got a large class, it’s hard to single out people.

You don’t want to say, I see that you are foreign, you should come to my office this week so we can talk about your learning style. I don’t know if that’s always appropriate or appealing for everybody.

57. Feeling EAL students are dumped in large 101 classes without help: Philip noted that difficulties he had with EAL students occurred in a large introductory course. He bewailed, “It was a large classroom. It’s very frustrating to have such large classes.” He felt EAL students in large classes did not get a lot of support. He asserted that the university was, “just dumping them in an English only classroom environment that’s large.”

58. Not tracking individual progress because too many students: Gary did not have time to track students’ individual progress because he had too many students and grading papers took up a lot of his time. He revealed, “I don’t know [if EAL students improved] because I don’t follow the same students throughout the semester because of the sheer number of students—it’s hard to keep track of the students from the beginning to the end individually.”

59. Teaching many multilingual EAL students in large courses: Brian said that at a previous university where he taught, classes were very large, and he could not get to know individual students well. He reflected,

In [the previous university] I taught large sections, so I taught 95 students, so it was hard to know how many students I had in those classes that were English as a second language because we didn't get to know each other very well. It was large lecture style classrooms.

60. Insisting individual feedback necessary for all students in all class size: Jillian taught some very large classes. She reported, "Our introductory classes we would have around 70. But sometimes combined sections can be pretty big." Still she believed she needed to give individual feedback to students' writing. She posited, "If you're including writing in your course, you should be giving feedback. Otherwise there's very little point."
61. Questioning how professors can know EAL students in big classes: Robin taught mostly upper division courses with small enrollment caps. She felt empathy for professors trying to connect with EAL students in a large class. She ruminated, "If you had a traditional class and you had a majority of international students sitting in front of you, you have to work really hard to make sure you were doing things that were necessary to keep them on track."

Discussion on Teachers too Busy to Accommodate EAL Students

In the first theme presented in this section (Table 15), there were contexts in which teachers felt too busy to spend individual time with students. As a doctoral student teaching part time, Sue felt overwhelmed with her workload (FC40). Sue expressed regret that she could not work individually with EAL students. Ultimately, she felt EAL students were a minority, and she had other problems to deal with (FC41). She conceded, "When you only have one student [an EAL student] out of a hundred, that's the problem. It's not where your focus goes" (FC42).

As an adjunct professor, Aaron had started working at Midland University while he was still writing his dissertation (FC43). Over the three years he had been teaching, he said that the university had cut introductory course credits that were designated as time for teachers to spend one-on-one with students. Aaron complained that he could not give students the individual time they needed to be prepared for future classes (FC43).

Also an adjunct professor, Shannon complained that she was overwhelmed with duties and obligations outside of the classroom (FC44). She faced added pressure due to her a year-to-year contract and described her job insecurity as such: “Every semester the sky is falling and every semester is my last semester” (FC45). New tenure-track faculty member Brian thought that he could help his students individually address some concerns in their assignments. But in non-writing intensive classes, he could do very little. He bemoaned, “I only have so many hours per day” (FC46).

This lack of time to help students seemed particularly true for certain teachers in certain contexts. Two of the four teachers referred to above were adjunct faculty, one was a teaching assistant, and the other was a new faculty member who had just started teaching three months before. There is plenty of evidence that adjunct faculty members can feel overworked and underpaid (Park, 2004; Scott, 2009; White & Nonnamaker, 2011) and that TAs can be burdened to succeed as students as well as employees (e.g. Cho, Kim, & Deckert, 2011; Myers, 2010). It is reasonable that new tenure-track faculty might also feel overwhelmed with new duties, as Brian said he was. In these conditions, teachers might want to help EAL students, but might have little or no time to do so (e.g. FC46).

This notion is brought up in the literature but not fully articulated. In Ferris et al.’s (2011) study, participants ranged from tenured professors who taught no more than two courses per term

to an adjunct professor who taught “six writing courses on four different college campuses and described holding student conferences in her parked car” (p. 222). However, Ferris et al. never linked faculty’s professional status to their perceptions of working with EAL students. Matsuda, Saenkhum and Accardi (2013) and Ives et al. (2014) also included an array of participants from TAs to tenured faculty, but they did not link professional status to perceptions either.

However, adjunct professors, TAs and new assistant professors have many matters to navigate, and one could assume that they would be too preoccupied to be able to invest much time in accommodating EAL students. The result is a sense of guilt raised by professors like Sue (FC42), with no time to make changes. In addition, new and temporary faculty members also might not have had time to create supporting networks that could show them how to accommodate EAL students. Furthermore, they might lack knowledge of resources that would help them to work with EAL students. Thus, these new teachers might want to work with EAL students but might not have the means to do so. Finally, TAs and adjunct faculty might feel that their work is only temporary and, therefore, might not want to spend time finding help to accommodate EAL students. EAL specialists working with faculty in these contexts could take these matters into consideration and reach out to new and temporary faculty members. They might offer to meet them at their convenience for support and access to resources.

Complicating matters further, new faculty, adjunct faculty and TAs often teach introductory courses, which are often the largest courses. Teaching a large number of students can also affect the way teachers work with students, and this is the second related theme in this section. Table 16 represents teachers’ sentiments that their class sizes were too big to allow them time to even take attendance (FC54), let alone to devote time to individual students (FC51, FC52). Several teachers who had taught at Midland University for some time complained that

there was a substantial increase in class caps about five years prior. They blamed this increase for taking away time that they might have spent on EAL students. Aaron for example, expounded,

When you increase the class size and you increase the course load, and you take away the credit, what do you have left? As an instructor, you have the time basically to prep the class, teach the class, and grade the material as they're coming in. As far as the individualize instruction? Maybe there are people far more capable than I am, but I have found it to be extremely challenging. (FC47)

Some teachers felt the increase in cap size had negative impacts. Esther estimated her class caps had risen from 45 to 69 and sometimes even to 100 or 200 students, making it impossible for her to know all of her students (FC48). Esther noted that she and some of her colleagues felt that this had decreased the quality of education (FC49). Philip felt that difficulties he had with a group of EAL students were partially to blame on teaching them in a large class where he could not give them much personal attention (FC57). He felt Midland University was not serving EAL students well by putting them in such situations. He lamented that the university was "just dumping them [EAL students] in an English only classroom environment that's large" (FC59).

Two teachers expounded that large class sizes made it much more difficult to keep track of students. Gary said he marked students' grammatical errors, but was unable to determine if this practice led to improvement because he had too many students to track individual progress (FC58). Dennis felt that with more than 60 students in his class he could not observe individual progress, particularly for EAL students (FC52).

In very large classes, teachers may not even be able to determine who is an EAL student. In the previous university he worked at, Brian felt he had many EAL students. However, his classes were too large to get to know students, and so he did not know about their backgrounds (FC59). Robin taught mostly small, upper-division courses, but she pondered that teachers with large classes would have a difficult time keeping track of their EAL students to make sure that they did not fall behind (FC61). Robin surmised that in a large introductory course, she would be proactive and ask which students were EAL students on the first day of class in order to get to know them (FC61). While this seems like a practical suggestion, it may not serve EAL students well. As Elizabeth asserted,

It's difficult because when you've got a large class, it's hard to single out people. You don't want to say, I see that you are foreign. You should come to my office this week so we can talk about your learning style. I don't know if that's always appropriate or appealing for everybody. (FC56)

Holly noted that the problems Midland University teachers experienced from cap increases were also true at the previous university where she taught. Holly believed that cap increases were a trend at all public universities (FC55).

In the previous section, it was suggested that teachers see personal time with EAL students as valuable, but certain faculty members were also very busy. In this section a similar conclusion could be drawn. However, class size depends on university policy. A very straightforward way to address this issue would be for universities to decrease class size. However, if this cannot happen, some teachers have created their own solutions. One of these solutions is dividing classes up into small groups, which I discuss in Chapter Six.

Desiring Diversity Motivates Accommodation

The previous sections concerned situations where teachers believed that they could not accommodate EAL students. In contrast, this section concerns situations where teachers strove to accommodate EAL students. In these situations, teachers believed that by accommodating EAL students, the students would be able to provide global perspectives that would otherwise come only secondhand.

In Table 17 the first five focus codes (FC62-66) are examples of how an individual EAL student added pertinent knowledge on specific global situations. Starting with focus code 67, the emphasis shifts to how EAL students can benefit native students. This continues until focus code 79. Focus codes 80 to 84 concern general positive benefits teachers felt EAL students can provide. Focus codes 85 and 86 indicate that EAL students' perspectives are sometimes at odds with teachers'. Focus codes 87 to 88 concern teachers' desires to have more EAL students in their academic areas.

Table 17

Adding Diverse Perspectives

	Focus Code	Professor
62	Loving EAL students for their contributions in class.	Josh
63	EAL student making the conversation poignant.	Henry
64	EAL student adding timely perspective.	Henry
65	EAL student bringing cultural perspective to class.	Charlie
66	EAL student adding interesting cultural perspective.	Brian
67	Valuing EAL students' input on academic subject to help domestic students.	Jane
68	Having EAL students in class exposes domestic students to diversity.	Harriet
69	Experiencing diversity "good thing" for US students.	Adam
70	Preparing students for the world with EAL students in class.	Esther
71	Experiencing multiculturalism in class.	Adam
72	EAL students helping give global perspective.	Jane
73	EAL student providing opinion on abroad happening.	Josh
74	EAL student adding "additional dimension" to a class.	Henry
75	Wanting EAL students in class because of their diverse experience.	Mark
76	Making diverse background subject for class.	Adam
77	Adding diversity is an eye-opener for both sides.	Jillian
78	EAL students sharing "little snapshots from their cultures."	Jillian
79	Valuing diversity EAL students bring to class.	Elizabeth
80	EAL students writing about home countries is wonderful.	Harriet
81	Learning about EAL students' cultures in class speeches.	Tammy
82	Learning about cultures is "cool."	Eva
83	EAL student giving cultural opinion in papers.	Eva
84	EAL students bringing in unexpected cultural perceptions.	Adam
85	Colleague requesting EAL TA for opinion in comparative class.	Josh
86	Thinking program needs to be global and EAL students can help.	Kristen
87	Wanting more EAL student diversity in his field.	Philip
88	EAL student asking to get into class because they can bring something to it.	Elizabeth

62. Loving EAL students for their contributions in class: In class, when Josh was discussing terrorist attacks, a Japanese student was able to give a personal perspective about the sarin gas attacks in a Tokyo subway. Josh exhorted, "There was an actual attack on a Tokyo subway. He [the Japanese student] was 12 years old. So he brought all that experience with him from that. I love him in the classroom."

63. EAL student making the conversation poignant: Henry said a Palestinian student in his class was able to give an authentic perspective on Mideastern politics. Henry espoused,

We moved from the consideration of a specific idea to some larger connections to a kind of a meta-connection with the whole situation in Palestine with particular focus on young Palestinians and their attitudes towards these issues that really extended well beyond their [domestic students'] experience.

64. EAL student adding timely perspective: In class, Henry was discussing Palestine and Israeli relations when a Palestinian student offered her perspective. He recounted, "Her presence was extraordinarily important because at the time it was the time of Intifada and she brought a perspective to the conversation about the situation in the Middle East, the situation between the Israelis and the Palestinians."

65. EAL student bringing cultural perspective to class: Charlie gave a specific example about how an African student brought her authentic and pertinent perspective to a class discussion. Charlie was talking about Chinese-African relations and told his students that Nigerians were complaining about Chinese products, but he did not know why, so he asked his Nigerian student:

I said, frankly enlighten me, and she said Nigerians are the world's pickiest consumers and had a long story about how Nigerians surprisingly expect their consumer goods to last (laughing). Silly people, instead of the disposable mentality that we have as Americans. So it really did enlighten the conversation in that case.

66. EAL student adding interesting cultural perspective: Brian taught an African student who had issues with writing language skills. However, Brian said that the African student was still able to contribute diverse opinions to class discussions:

I think that one of the things I liked about having him in class was he was able to share on a few occasions some cultural differences. He talked about gender differences and how they are so different in Africa. Homosexuality, things like that were really interesting pieces that he brought to the class.

67. Valuing EAL students' input on academic subject to help domestic students: In one of Jane's classes she taught an African student who shared his perspective during discussions. Jane recounted, "I remember I had a student named [student's name]. He was from Niger. He spoke five languages. He was just amazing. But to have him in the classroom, I totally exploited him." She felt the Nigerian student's perspectives benefited domestic monolingual students. She contended, "For our students, our American students to hear how different [field practice] is done in different countries is such a rich learning experience in itself."

68. Having EAL students in class exposes domestic students to diversity: Harriet had students from China share their subject-relevant experiences, bringing in new field perspectives. Harriet valued EAL students' contributions. She touted,

I think it's a win-win for everybody. I think it's great for those students to come over, and I think it's excellent for our students just to be exposed to the cultural differences and understand and have that diversity. Many of our students will never be able to travel there.

69. Experiencing diversity "good thing" for US students: Adam felt EAL students'

perspectives made domestic monolingual students' aware of their own perspectives. He encouraged this realization and described it this way:

I think you try to draw out that 'Oh my God, it isn't that way in Saudi Arabia, the way we are doing it here in the United States.' And you get perspectives of people who are international, who 'Oh my God, it really is different.' It's good for our students in the U.S. That's a good thing for them.

70. Preparing students for the world with EAL students in class: Esther believed that an

increase in international students would bring diversity and help prepare domestic monolingual students to work in a global environment. She theorized, "I think we are preparing students for the world."

71. Experiencing multiculturalism in class: Adam taught mostly small graduate courses that

typically contained about one-third EAL students. He felt that this gave that students opportunities to discuss different cultural perspectives. He asserted, "In a program like ours where you have a third international students typically in your classes, in every class your task is creating a micro culture where you can talk to each other."

72. EAL students helping give global perspective: Jane had only taught about 10 EAL

students but thought having more EAL students in her classes would benefit her domestic monolingual students. She explained, "I would really love it because where else are students going to get that opportunity at that age to interact with someone their age and interact with someone from another culture? I think it would be great."

73. EAL student providing opinion on abroad happening: Josh was teaching citizens' rights in his class, and his Turkish students spoke about the lack of search and seizure laws in their country. Josh remarked,

And a lot of our students haven't been overseas, so it's the first time they've ever heard of what do you mean you can throw me up and tell me to get out of my car and you can hit me because I insulted you or whatever.

74. EAL student adding "additional dimension" to a class: Henry attested that EAL students were able to add more to a class. He explained, "I think that the presence of international students in the courses adds an additional dimension and a richness to the discussion that I don't think conversations about current events or reading about these situations in books really add."

75. Wanting EAL students in class because of their diverse experience: Mark had not taught many EAL students but welcomed them to his class, hoping their diverse experiences would help domestic monolingual students see new possibilities. He put forth,

I was hoping to leverage those abilities [EAL students' abilities] and to frame their work—articulate their work—in terms of academic program, their experiences in their academic program because it's a different program than the writing track in the [program he teaches in].

76. Adding diversity is an eye-opener for both sides: Jillian believed that being exposed to diverse opinions inherently aided both domestic monolingual and EAL students. She explained,

The more diversity of experience and viewpoints that folks can be exposed to, the richer our understanding is. People bring with them very different cultural

patterns and experiences. It's an eye opener for students on both sides of that equation.

77. Making diverse background subject for class: Adam described how EAL students in his class can often have different educational backgrounds that are sometimes superior to domestic monolingual students' backgrounds:

For instance, the Jordanian students, particularly from [their previous university], which you probably know about, well, they come over here and they would be so theoretically sophisticated, and I'm teaching the intro to theory class and they would blow the American, the U.S., students out of their minds.

78. EAL students sharing "little snapshots from their cultures:" Jillian said in discussions she asked EAL students for their perspectives. She noted, "They'll sort of pick up on this and start sharing examples, being eager to share little snapshots from their cultures that they can contribute to make contrast."

79. Valuing diversity EAL students bring to class: Elizabeth believed that her EAL students gave valuable input to one particular class she taught. She purported, "They [EAL students] really enrich the class because the class is focused on culture and diversity." She added, "Students who are EAL students are really able to bring a number of questions, a perspective, and stories and experiences to the classroom that really make my students think about things."

80. EAL students writing about home countries is wonderful: Harriet said that EAL students will pick topics from their first cultures to write about, which she supported, stating, "And if they want to do their own country, that's wonderful." She added that she appreciated learning about their cultures.

81. Learning about EAL students' cultures in class speeches: Tammy required students to give presentations in class and many EAL students chose to talk about their first cultures, something Tammy supported. She affirmed, "Yeah, with the international students, I like it, that they will have an educational speech and they will usually pick something from their culture. I said that's wonderful. Please tell us."
82. Learning about cultures is "cool:" Eva taught EAL students who told stories from their first culture, both about the class subject and just of general interest. When commenting on an EAL student sharing his holiday traditions, she proclaimed, "But the cultural piece was really cool, to ask them about their culture."
83. EAL student giving cultural opinion in papers: Eva talked about a student who wrote about illegal organ trade in his home country, something she did not feel very comfortable with. She contended, "His thoughts were a little different. He had written something on like organ donation, and didn't see a problem with the black market because in his country there would be a big one." She added, "It definitely had a cultural piece that was different than what ours would be." It should be noted that the student expressed this opinion in a paper, not in classroom discussion.
84. EAL students bringing in unexpected cultural perceptions: Adam had assigned Karl Marx for his students to read, but his Chinese students had an unexpected cultural discomfort with the material because it reminded them of the Cultural Revolution. Adam revealed, "Because what they associate with Karl Marx, that their life had been destroyed by being taken from their family to the communes out in the country. It was traumatic and they had experienced traumatic things and so they were getting grief now at 50."

85. Colleague requesting EAL TA for opinion in comparative class: Josh's colleague taught a class comparing systems in different countries and requested to have EAL TAs. Josh noted, "And he always asks for two international students and they actually come into his [class], and they'll say how do we do this in Korea, or how do we do in Turkey or China."
86. Thinking program needs to be global and EAL students can help: Kristen felt her program lacked cultural perspectives that EAL students might provide. She declared, "We need to work on globalization with our program and our objectives as we look toward the future. Changes we need to make. We could definitely use it [EAL perspective] on our end too."
87. Wanting more EAL student diversity in his program: Philip had no specific reason why, but stated that he thought it would be good to have more EAL students in the program where he taught. He disclosed, "We would love to have more diversity, more students of color, more international students, but we often don't end up with that." Later he contemplated, "It would be nice to have more diversity and EAL students."
88. EAL student asking to get into class because they can bring something to it: An African student wanted to enroll in Elizabeth's course that was reserved for majors only. The African student, who was a non-major, argued he could bring diverse opinions to the class, and so Elizabeth let him in. Elizabeth reported, "He did an excellent job" and said that this had happened on other occasions. She relayed, "So some people introduce themselves saying I can bring something to this class, please let me in."

Discussion on Desiring Diversity Motivates Accommodation

In this study, the term accommodation in different situations is a major theme. Perhaps this unintentionally insinuates that EAL students are a burden that must take additional time and

effort to work with. However, in some contexts, EAL students are seen as an asset that is coveted. In some situations, teachers felt EAL students shared interesting perspective in class (FC78-82). However, in other situations, EAL students actually added content knowledge to classes. In these situations, teachers taught courses dealing with global issues, and international EAL students sometimes brought in firsthand experiences that made subject matters much more accessible for their classmates (FC62-76). This is particularly illustrated in focus code 74, where Henry explained that a Palestinian student in his class was able to provide her perspective on the Mideast while the class was discussing the issue.

Several teachers felt EAL students' diverse perspectives helped domestic monolingual students in a variety of ways. Specifically, Josh pointed out that domestic monolingual students might not have traveled much (FC62), and Harriet thought that they might never do so, but having international EAL classmates could provide domestic monolingual students a chance to experience global perspectives firsthand (FC68). As Henry pointed out, this EAL student perspective adds a dimension books cannot (FC74). Being exposed to international EAL perspectives gives contrast to domestic monolingual students' own perceptions, and, as Jillian pointed out, "The more diversity of experience and viewpoints that folks can be exposed to, the richer our understanding is" (FC77). Ultimately, experiencing international perspectives can help prepare EAL students for a new global world (FC70). For these reasons, some teachers desired EAL students in their classes (FC85-88). In fact, Kristen felt her program lacked a global perspective that she felt EAL students could provide (FC86).

However, two focus codes give a reminder that not all contributions are well received or expected. Eva discussed a student who in a paper described the human organ black market, which the student condoned (FC83). Eva felt uncomfortable with the student's opinion but

reluctantly accepted it. On the opposite side of the lectern, Adam's lessons on Marx were unexpectedly ill received by his Chinese students because they associated the founder of Communism with their painful memories of the Chinese Cultural Revolution (FC84).

This study provides evidence that there are teachers who value EAL students' diverse opinions, and there are teachers who desire to teach EAL students in their classes. Thus there is motivation for teachers to accommodate EAL students. These attitudes are promoted in certain classes. The teachers who felt that EAL students' diverse opinions could add valuable knowledge to a class all taught in the humanities and social sciences. Because of IRB restrictions, I am not able to link specific academic programs with teachers, but I can list the departments: Anthropology, Childhood Development and Family Relations, Criminology, English, Political Science, Psychology, and Sociology. Classes in these departments highlighted human perceptions, and teachers valued diverse opinions. Conversely, teachers in physical sciences and mathematics did not discuss contextual knowledge that EAL students could bring to their classes.

Other studies have pointed out that EAL students can be a positive force in classes (Johns, 2001; Sieber, 2004). However, this is not often discussed. Perhaps this is understandable. The field of TESOL is naturally trying to grapple with the perceived problems of teaching EAL students because, inherently, problems of misunderstood perspectives are issues that need to be addressed. And yet why shouldn't the field promote cultural diversity and the benefits it provides? Of course one should be cautious when thinking about any student as an asset. This attitude can lead to exploitation and unreasonable expectations. These matters are discussed in Chapter Six (see Not Contributing to Classes). And yet, if teachers actually value EAL international students in their classrooms for their diversity, it might be better for EAL related fields to focus on

cultivating this respect rather than only teach how to abate diversity. Such a direction is taken by translingualists, such as Canagarajah (2013).

Motivated by Empathy to Accommodate EAL Students

In the previous section, it was noted that in some classes EAL students were valued for the potential diversity they brought to classes. Thus teachers of those classes had an incentive to try to accommodate EAL students. This section concerns teachers whose personal context incentivized them to accommodate EAL students. Some teachers had experience studying an additional language abroad and felt empathy or admiration for their EAL students. Table 18 contains focus codes of teachers who had studied an additional language overseas and felt empathy for their EAL students. The first focus code (FC89) represents a teacher who felt she could not have done as well as her EAL students. The next three focus codes (FC90-92) represent a teacher who wanted to help EAL students the way that people had helped him when he was abroad. The next six focus codes (FC93-99) are teachers' perspectives of being insiders' and knowing what it is like to be an additional language student. Focus codes 97-99 are Charlie's advice that other teachers reflect on their own language learning experience. Focus code 100 describes a teacher who studied abroad but did not feel empathy for EAL students until later. And the final focus code (FC101) comes from a teacher who did not study an additional language abroad, but expressed sentiments similar to those who had. Besides these codes, there are focus codes in other tables that represent teachers' feelings of empathy (e.g. those in Table 19), but in order to avoid repeating codes, I did not place them in this table.

Table 18

Feeling Empathy for EAL Students

	Focus Code	Teacher
89	Empathizing she could not do what EAL students do.	Jane
90	Feeling empathy for being misunderstood.	Karl
91	Trying to reach out to help EAL student.	Karl
92	Empathy causing desire to help EAL students.	Karl
93	Learning from EAL students when they write about their countries.	Harriet
94	Being ex-EAL student allows him to see "both sides of the fence."	Kenny
95	Knowing how to work with international students.	Kenny
96	Takes extra time to give feedback and grade EAL students.	Kenny
97	Offering extra help to EAL students.	Charlie
98	EAL having trouble with grammar, citations, word limit.	Charlie
99	Advising colleagues to empathize with language learning.	Charlie
100	Empathy from learning Hebrew.	Natalie
101	Being impressed by EAL students' accomplishments.	Jillian

89. Empathizing she could not do what EAL students do: I asked Jane if any of her EAL

students struggled, and she replied, "I studied French for six years and I couldn't imagine dropping into a French university and even making it, so I can't say struggle because they do extremely well."

90. Feeling empathy for being misunderstood: Karl had lived in two different countries abroad and picked up some of the language, but only a limited amount. He explained,

Yeah, I learned so I could direct a cab to where I was going. I knew when a cab was ripping me off. I could haggle prices. I could order in a restaurant. I could order food. That was a big, big treat. Shopping, bars and restaurant. But if you said how are you, I wouldn't understand what you were saying.

91. Trying to reach out to help EAL student: From Karl's experiences overseas, he felt that he understood why his EAL students might hesitate to speak to him, and so he purposely reached out to them. He surmised,

But I think with my boss if I had questions, I was likely to go to, especially my first year, the foreign teachers or the Korean teachers instead of one of the bosses because there were cultural things I thought I should know, even though I don't know how I would have known them. But I didn't want to embarrass myself by going and asking. I just figured there had to be some of that for some students, so I try to reach out to my students.

92. Empathy causing desire to help EAL students: Based on his experiences living abroad, Karl felt that EAL students probably needed extra help. He put forth,

I lived in Germany for a year as an exchange student and Korea for two-and-a-half so, I've lived abroad enough to have experiences where I know that foreign students need a little extra help some time. Just that they come see me makes you feel a little bit more welcome. Again, that's how I see it.

93. Learning from EAL students when they write about their countries: Harriet's study abroad in Italy gave her insight on how she could help her EAL students. She explained,

I also went to Italy and studied [a professional] Curriculum. And so I might ask [my EAL students], you pick the curriculum, you pick what you're most interested in, and then write a paper on preschool education in another country, different curricula that are being used, working with families, how are families integrated into education. What's the role of families in education in that country? And if they want to do their own country, that's wonderful. I always say yeah that's fine because I'm gonna learn as much as they are.

94. Being ex-EAL student allows him to see "both sides of the fence:" Kenny was once an EAL student in a United States college, and he felt his experience gave him an advantage teaching EAL students. He asserted,

I was an international student, so English is a second language. I know exactly what comes with this. I was actually, in fact, on both sides of the fence as an international student taking writing intensive courses and I was born in a different country and I'm not a U.S. citizen yet. In a way, I have seen the phenomenon of both sides of the fence.

95. Knowing how to work with international students: Kenny thought his experience as a teacher and an EAL student helped him work better with his own EAL students. He posited,

I have exposure to international students, that's for sure. There's no question there. I don't know if I was lucky. Maybe because I know the population and how to deal with the population, or just the method of teaching that addresses folks with different learning styles and different backgrounds. It has been a blessing.

96. Takes extra time to give feedback and grade EAL: Kenny believed his education experiences in his home country gave him insight into other EAL students' writing habits. He alleged,

American journals are based on the idea, coming from the foundation, you have to write inductive in order to be able to submit a manuscript. The deductive logic of writing, it doesn't really work that way. So it takes a little longer from that standpoint for folks to adapt to an inductive way of writing. It's the same for [people from my country], and I was one of them.

97. Offering extra help to EAL students: Charlie thought that his experiences studying in Germany made him more lenient when grading EAL students' work. He explicated,

I will admit that with EAL students and with their writing, I did not judge them to the same standards as native speakers. I fully acknowledged that if I were writing in German or in Japanese I wouldn't write as well as this, so I always gave them the benefit of the doubt.

98. EAL having trouble with grammar, citations, word limit: Charlie recalled trying to write papers while studying in Germany and believed his EAL students must go through similar experiences. He purported,

Most of them had a tough time getting to the minimum word limits. You could tell that this was a struggle. I sympathize a great deal. I remember trying to write in German, and I was out of gas (laughing) at about 250 words and this was supposed to be 500.

99. Advising colleagues to empathize with language learning: When I asked Charlie what advice he might give other faculty members teaching EAL students, he posited,

Yeah, the first one I always tell them is think about what language you learned in college and try thinking about sitting through a lecture in that language. If that's a scary process, think of the students you are dealing with. If their response is well I never learned a language in college, then my response to that is what college did you go to, and why is it you call it a bachelors degree? So, put yourself in their shoes.

100. Empathy from learning Hebrew: Even though Natalie studied Hebrew abroad, she did not feel empathetic towards EAL students until much later in her career:

I sort of learned Hebrew. I went to Israel for six months for study abroad. My classes were in English (laughing), so it's not like I had to take a class in Hebrew. I did take Hebrew class, where I learned the language. But if I had to take a class in Hebrew, it would have been a disaster. I would have been writing worse than any of these students. So, I had no empathy, and I think it took me a long time to develop that.

101. Being impressed by EAL students' accomplishments: Jillian had not studied a language abroad, but the sentiments she purveyed were very close to teachers who had. She espoused,

I'm always trying to put myself in their position, and wow, trying to take a course in another language, in a different place, it just boggles my mind. And I'm so impressed with the students who do that. I'm almost intimidated; I'm certainly humbled by that. If they are willing to make that effort and put themselves out there take those risks, then they're certainly deserving of whatever support I can give them in meeting their goals. So yeah, sometimes it is extra work, but there's a lot of students who require you to work more in different ways.

Discussion on Motivated by Empathy to Accommodate EAL Students

Empathy is understanding someone by actually feeling the way she or he feels. It is often the result of people having had similar experiences in similar situations, which was the case for teachers who felt empathetic toward international EAL students because they had also studied abroad in an additional language. These teachers also believed that they had particular insight into international EAL students' experiences. Karl, for example, had studied two additional languages abroad, each on a different continent. While living in Korea, Karl felt that there were

cultural matters he should be familiar with but that he didn't understand. Consequently, he was sometimes embarrassed to ask about such matters. These experiences inspired him to reach out to his EAL students, who he assumed might have similar feelings (FC91-92).

Other teachers' experiences gave them an insider's perspective, and they were able to understand EAL students better (FC93-96). Kenny had actually once been an EAL university student. He said he was taught to write deductively in his home country, but in North America, he had to learn to write inductively. Kenny explained,

American journals are based on the idea, coming from the foundation, you have to write inductive in order to be able to submit a manuscript. The deductive logic of writing, it doesn't really work that way. So it takes a little longer from that standpoint for folks to adapt to an inductive way of writing. It's the same for [people from my country], and I was one of them. (FC96)

This experience not only instilled empathy in Kenny for EAL students in a similar predicament, but allowed him to recognize what was happening and how to address the issue.

Charlie drew on his experiences studying overseas in order to adapt his pedagogy to accommodate EAL students (FC97-99). Charlie remembered studying in Germany and struggling to understand teachers during oral lectures. However, if a teacher wrote a key word on the chalkboard, Charlie was able to contextualize the teacher's speech. For this reason, Charlie regularly presented lessons in his own classes with accompanying PowerPoint slides that included written texts (FC167). Charlie recommended that other teachers draw on their language learning experiences. He suggested,

Yeah, the first one I always tell them [other teachers] is think about what language you learned in college and try thinking about sitting through a lecture in that language. If

that's a scary process, think of the students you are dealing with. If their response is well I never learned a language in college, then my response to that is what college did you go to, and why is it you call it a bachelors degree? So, put yourself in their shoes. (FC99)

However, experience studying an additional language abroad did not guarantee empathy, at least not immediately. In Natalie's case, studying in Israel for six months did not help her when she first started teaching (FC100). It was only years later that Natalie gained insight into EAL students' experiences (FC299). However, it should be noted that Natalie had not studied in an additional language.

Finally, teachers who did not study abroad can still feel empathy towards EAL students' situations. Such is the case with Jillian, who attested,

I'm always trying to put myself in their position and wow, trying to take a course in another language, in a different place, it just boggles my mind. And I'm so impressed with the students who do that. I'm almost intimidated. I'm certainly humbled by that. If they are willing to make that effort and put themselves out there take those risks, then they're certainly deserving of whatever support I can give them in meeting their goals. So yeah, sometimes it is extra work, but there's a lot of students who require you to work more in different ways. (FC101)

Though certain experiences could promote empathy, Jillian gives evidence that teachers can gain an understanding by imagining what it is like to be an EAL student. Even Natalie eventually gained empathy when she listened to a lecture by an EAL specialist who explained how EAL students experience language learning (FC299). Thus, teachers can also gain an understanding and appreciations for EAL students' learning processes without studying abroad. This is important because obviously not all teachers can travel abroad and study another

language. But there are other ways that they may gain an understanding of EAL students and also gain empathy. For example, when describing faculty training workshops, Cox (2014) stated that “One of the most valuable strategies for creating empathy is to put the faculty member in the L2 writer’s shoes” (p. 205), citing Leki as an inspiration for the exercise. This approach of instilling empathy was also used in some K-12 preservice training programs that were specifically designed to emulate EAL students’ experiences (FERENCE & Bell, 2004; Marx, 2001; Pappamihel, 2007). Enabling empathy is discussed further in Chapter Eight.

Addressing the Research Question

The data and discussions in this chapter allow me to address my first research question: What conditions impede or enable teachers to accommodate EAL students? This question emerged as I examined my data and memos. I noticed that certain contexts seemed to positively and negatively affect teachers’ ability to accommodate their EAL students. In this section, I describe these factors in three major themes. Then, based on these themes, I propose the idea that various contexts influence the way teachers accommodate EAL students.

Academic Field Context

There are certain contextual factors that are generally out of teachers’ direct influence but that affect how they might accommodate EAL students. Some of these factors are related to teachers’ academic fields. Eva, Loraine, and Sean all worked in competitive programs where students graduate and work in potentially dangerous fields (FC16-30). In such programs, students are expected to meet certain standards, and the onus is on them to adapt, not for teachers to adapt their pedagogies to the students. In such contexts, accommodating a single student could be seen as unfair to their classmates (FC18, FC24) or even as cause for a law suit (FC28).

Accommodating might also allow students to enter into a professional field unprepared to face dangerous situations (FC16).

Zawacki and Habib's (2014) study produced similar results, providing evidence of teachers who felt they were gatekeepers, obligated to ensure that unqualified students did not move on to other classes or professionally careers in the field. This gatekeeping role was illustrated in Leki's study (2003, 2007) where an EAL nursing student misunderstood a doctor's directions for giving medicine, for which the doctor recommended that she fail her internship. As a result, the student had to change her specialty. In these cases, teachers are not just viewing students' performance in their classes, but in the greater community of the profession. However, in other professional communities, EAL students' experiences are valued.

In other field contexts, there is an inherent desire for EAL students' input, especially from international EAL students. This is particularly true in classes which highlight opinions of global matters. In such classes, EAL students can add personal insight into situations (FC62-76). For example, a Palestinian student can give a firsthand perspective on contemporary Mideast news (FC63-64). This adds an authentic globalism that could not be had by books alone (FC74).

In this study, all of the teachers who valued EAL students' input in this way taught in the humanities or social sciences. In such situations, accommodating seems natural. Since ideas are emphasized, it is easier to make accommodation for EAL students, such as overlooking surface-level language discrepancies (FC245), not grading or grading less on surface-level discrepancies (FC232-245), extending testing time (FC222), and/or modifying exams, for example making them oral instead of written (FC221).

Other researchers have also pointed out the advantages EAL students can bring to classes. As a cultural anthropologist, Sieber (2004) pointed out that EAL students' experience with

multiculturalism gives them a natural aptitude in her courses. Johns (2001) suggested faculty to take advantage of EAL students' strengths in multilingualism and multiculturalism that can add to courses. In sum, instead of a deficit perspective, EAL students are seen as talented in certain fields and courses and can bring unique content to courses.

Academic Professional Context

In other contexts, some factors that are generally out of teachers' direct influence are contingent on teachers' surroundings and professional status. One particular situation is teachers' class sizes. At Midland University, caps for classes had been raised about five years previously. Having additional students inherently meant teachers had less time to spend with individuals, something some teachers felt was essential to help EAL students (FC47-61). Though teachers tried different strategies to cope with increased class caps, they still lamented the cap increases (FC167-174).

In other situations, teachers said their status and experience influenced the way they taught. In particular, new faculty, adjunct faculty, and TAs complained that they were overwhelmed by their responsibilities and felt too busy to devote time to EAL students (FC40-46). In addition, adjunct faculty complained that they lacked security, which distracted them from their work (FC45).

In studies by Matsuda, Saenkhum, and Accardi (2013) and Ives et al. (2014), the researchers noted teachers' various situations, but, for the most part, did not link these situations directly to teachers' pedagogical practices. However, Ferris et al. (2011) did note that some teachers may have been too busy to be able to spend time responding to EAL students' writing. As they stated, "whereas some of the attitudes and practices expressed and described by our volunteers [i.e. study participants] might seem troubling, they may well be symptomatic of larger

institutional problems rather than flaws of character or competence in the individual instructors” (p. 223).

Personal Context: Empathy as a Motivator to Accommodate

In teachers’ personal situations, there were factors that affected accommodation. In particular, studying an additional language abroad appeared to help teachers feel empathetic toward EAL students. This empathy gave Loraine, who had studied French abroad, an appreciation for international EAL students. She explicated,

I understand where they are coming from. I also have an appreciation for the fact that if somebody can learn my language. I know I’ve attempted to learn their language and would be much more handicapped than they are in this world. (FC108)

Other teachers felt that their experiences allowed them insight and a better pedagogical understanding of EAL students. Kenny, for example, had actually been an EAL student, which he believed enabled him to see “both sides of the fence” (FC94). Kenny had grown up using a different rhetorical writing style than that used in North America. Thus, what some of his colleagues might deem poor student writing, Kenny might recognize as actually a different style (FC96).

Other teachers used their experiences abroad to anticipate EAL students’ needs and to try to address them. For example, Karl remembered that when he lived in Korea he felt too embarrassed to ask for help, so he reached out to his EAL students and tried to anticipate their needs (FC90-92). Another example was Charlie, who recalled how when he listened to teachers lecturing in German, even just one written word could contextualize matters and help him understand content. Thus, Charlie consciously included written words in his lessons (FC167-168). Joe had earned a degree overseas and remembered how difficult it was to take tests, so he

altered his tests to accommodate EAL students (FC214-216). He even claimed in some classes he would run an equivalent of a parallel course designed just for EAL students (FC120).

Though empathy may be a strong motivator, it may not seem very useful for providing assistance to faculty members teaching EAL students—the underlying impetus of this study. After all, it is not very practical to send teachers overseas to study additional languages. However, there is evidence that empathy might be gained in more practical ways. These are discussed in Chapter Seven.

Chapter Conclusion

In this chapter, the main conclusion is that context affects how teachers accommodate EAL students. Some contexts discourage teachers from accommodating EAL students, while others encourage them to make accommodations. By considering context, EAL specialists might be better able to work with faculty. For example, some fields might stress the importance of linguistic accuracy. In such cases, specialists should stop and think before giving advice, such as suggestions that surface-errors should be ignored. I am not advocating that surface-level errors should become the center of a curriculum, as they were back in the days of grammar-translation. Instead, EAL specialists can work with faculty to find a time and place to address surface-level errors, something that Matsuda (2006, 2012) has repeatedly stressed.

In other contexts, teachers' personal situations can influence how they accommodate EAL students. By considering these contexts, EAL specialists might have a better sense of whom they should reach out to help and how they might help them. For example, new faculty, adjunct faculty, and TAs could be busy and lack experience, so EAL specialists can find a way to contact these teachers and ask if they need assistance. In addition, teachers who have gained empathy for EAL students might serve as a model for EAL specialists' training. This has already been used

by Cox (2014) who, in workshops, asks faculty to put themselves in EAL students' shoes and imagine what it is like to work in an additional language.

The conclusions made in this chapter go beyond recording what teachers do when they work with EAL students. Instead, they are ways of understanding teachers' contexts to make sense of their actions. In other studies, sometimes researchers have conducted research so that they could compare teachers' actions to EAL specialists' recommendations. And sometimes researchers find teachers' pedagogical approaches to be lacking. Ferris et al. (2011), for example, noted that for 30 years, composition researchers have been highlighting that teachers should focus on content and not surface errors; however, "this advice has not necessarily been adopted by at least some classroom practitioners" (p. 224). Perhaps it is time to have a conversation with these teachers, find out why they did not accept specialists' advice, and work with them to come up with solutions.

CHAPTER SIX

HOW TEACHERS ACCOMMODATE EAL STUDENTS

Chapter Five concerned contextual factors which motivated teachers to accommodate or not accommodate EAL students in writing classes. In this chapter, the focus turns to what teachers do when they accommodate EAL students. To do this, I follow the same pattern as the previous chapter: Data are introduced, presented, and then discussed. Data are broken into broad themes that start with teachers actively working to accommodate EAL students, then move to teachers being lenient when assessing EAL students, and finally end with teachers outsourcing help to the writing center. The themes are (a) working one-on-one, (b) accommodating for testing, (c) grading leniently, and (d) working with the writing center.

At the end of the chapter, my conclusions allow me to address the second research question: How do faculty members' perceptions of teaching EAL students compare to the recommendations of specialists in EAL related fields? I address this in two ways that appeared in the literature: (a) how teachers work with EAL students' surface-level discrepancies, and (b) how teachers take responsibility for teaching EAL students.

Before I present the data, I would like to explain problematic terms. This chapter begins with accommodation for cultural differences and for linguistic differences. These two areas are not always easy to distinguish. For example, should slang be considered a cultural or linguistic phenomenon? In reality, it is both, and separating the two concepts is more of a sliding scale than a distinct border. However, there is merit in using these two concepts separately. For example, it allows one to differentiate from teachers working with plagiarism and teachers correcting students' grammatical errors.

Addressing Cultural Differences

For some EAL students, especially international students, cultural differences can be an obstacle to succeeding in North American universities. Sometimes teachers who wish to accommodate EAL students sympathize with EAL students' cultural struggles, and sometimes teachers actively try to abate negative cultural impacts.

This section starts with data in Table 19 that concern teachers' observations about when cultural differences have caused EAL students difficulties. Then Table 20 concerns how teachers addressed EAL cultural differences to abate negative impact. Together, these tables identify difficulties and possible solutions.

Cultural Differences Can Bring Challenges to EAL Students

Table 19 presents some ways that EAL students differ culturally from monolingual students from the U.S. and how these differences can cause difficulties for EAL students. Focus codes in Table 19 are arranged from teachers' specific encounters with EAL students' cultural difficulties (FC102-104) to teachers' more general perceptions (FC105-107). The final focus code (FC108) actually comes from Loraine's comments on linguistic difficulties she faced when learning an additional language abroad. Because she also remarked on cultural barriers, I included her comments in this table.

Table 19

Cultural Differences Can Bring Challenges to EAL Students

	Focus Code	Teacher
102	Witnessing cultural misunderstandings.	Holly
103	Encountering cultural norms not so normal for EAL students.	Joe
104	Thinking EAL students respect teachers but not vice versa.	Harriet
105	Professors not understanding EAL students may misinterpret cultures.	Kenny
106	Stating teacher-student power relations different in cultures.	Kenny
107	Cultural differences just don't "click."	Jillian
108	Living overseas studying language gives empathy for EAL students.	Loraine

102. Witnessing cultural misunderstandings: One time in her class, Holly left the room while her colleague conducted student course evaluations. Afterwards Holly's colleague was complaining that a student he had asked to pass out evaluations was ignoring him.

Holly guessed that student was an EAL student. She recounted,

And I cringed when he told me about that because just by his gesture I knew where in the room this person was located and I knew out of 120 students I was 90% sure I knew exactly who he was talking about. She's a foreign language student. I'm sure her hesitation had to do with the layers of both culture and language.

Holly imagined what the EAL student must have been thinking:

I think she understood her process, her role in filling out the evaluation, but I think there was that hesitancy of here's an unknown person in a power position who's not given me clear instruction. I'm filling out something that feels a lot like an exam. I'm not sure if I'm supposed to get up out of my seat or not.

103. Encountering cultural norms not so normal for EAL students: Joe felt it was important not to take cultural concepts for granted when teaching EAL students—something he learned firsthand when teaching a large lecture class. Joe was aware he had EAL students in his class, so while he was lecturing about the Pope christening Charlemagne on Christmas, he painstakingly described who the Pope was. However, he had inadvertently taken his own cultural norms for granted. He recounted,

After class, a group of Chinese students came up to me and asked 'What's this Christmas you're talking about?' I had explained who the pope was to the class, but I had just assumed that everyone had heard of Christmas.

104. Thinking EAL students respect teachers but not vice versa: As a student adviser, Harriet worked with a Chinese student who was having trouble registering for courses and could not find any teacher, or anyone else, to help her. Harriet sympathized,
- And they [EAL students] look up to teachers. You probably know that. All of those [Asian countries], and even the European countries, a teacher is a high status position. Well here we're not. So they really see that person as respected.
- Harriet felt that since EAL students respected teachers more, they expected teachers to help them more. She remarked, "They have a respect but I think they often feel that the teachers don't respect the students. You're just one of many, and they don't try to spend individual time."
105. Professors not understanding EAL students may misinterpret cultures: Kenny felt that some teachers might misinterpret EAL students who traditionally give small gifts to their teachers. He theorized, "When most professors who are not exposed to an international population, they think well they're trying to bribe me by giving me gifts. Or why are you trying to give me coffee? Do you want something in return? It's not really the case."
106. Stating teacher-student power relations different in cultures: Kenny had studied various education systems around the world and felt that one main difference was the approach to power taken by teachers and students in different contexts. He posited, "One of the things that I immediately think when you ask that question [the difference studying in the U.S.] is that it's a question of power." He claimed many EAL students are more reverent towards teachers than United States students are. He stated, "When talking

about Confucianism for kids that come from the East and have a deep appreciation of the professor, how the kids actually behave in that environment.”

107. Cultural differences just don’t “click.” Jillian was discussing the difficulties EAL students have with plagiarism. She claimed it was more than just misunderstanding a concept. It had to do with altering cultural beliefs. She considered,

The reason I say that is that it’s different. Almost like a lack of understanding, a difficulty in grasping the concept. It’s not just like oh yeah I can do it in some places and trying to get someone to try to articulate back after you’ve explained it to someone why it’s important, it just never clicks in.

Jillian felt the United States concept of plagiarism is inherently linked to capitalism—particularly, the concept that ideas can be owned—and it is a concept that is estranged from those in cultures not as rooted in capitalism.

108. Living overseas studying language gives empathy for EAL students: Loraine had studied French while living abroad and felt empathy for the challenge EAL students face. She remarked, “I understand where they are coming from. I also have an appreciation for the fact that if somebody can learn my language. I know I’ve attempted to learn their language and would be much more handicapped than they are in this world.”

Accommodating Cultural Difference

The focus codes in Table 20 begin with different actions and approaches that teachers advocated as means to help EAL students with cultural issues (FC109-120). Then focus codes 121 and 122 represent teachers’ advice to EAL students. The final four focus codes are related comments, including Harriet’s feelings of reward for helping an EAL student (FC123-126).

Table 20

Accommodating Cultural Difference

	Focus Code	Teacher
109	Listening to EAL students to know where they are coming from.	Kenny
110	Reading about cultures gives understanding of them.	Kenny
111	Researching EAL students to know how to teach them.	Kenny
112	Telling professors understand before judging.	Kenny
113	Not understanding EAL students risks them failing.	Kenny
114	Understanding international students' backgrounds to assess needs.	Kenny
115	Taking time to listen to EAL students to establish trust.	Kenny
116	Suggesting taking more time to get to know EAL students.	Robin
117	Advocating being proactive with EAL students more than domestic students.	Karl
118	Trying to reach out to help EAL students.	Philip
119	Running a parallel course for EAL students.	Joe
120	Advocating teaching professors to be sensitive to EAL students' needs.	Henry
121	Advocating tailored teaching to different nationalities.	Karl
122	Allowing EAL students to speak their possible alternative perspectives.	Joe
123	Respecting US standards as well as international backgrounds.	Kenny
124	Judging EAL students' issues not language but cultural acculturation.	Dennis
125	Rewarded by feeling appreciated helping EAL student.	Harriet

109. Listening to EAL students to know where they are coming from: Kenny thought

teachers should not only do their best to communicate with EAL students, but also

should go one step further and try to understand their perspectives. He espoused,

I think a way to make international students who are shy to write more is to gain their confidence in a way that helps them to understand. And go one step further and make it evident to them that you are on their side. I have found this to be very helpful. Not just like the listening skills but understanding where they are coming from.

110. Reading about cultures gives understanding of them: Kenny felt one way to better

understand EAL students was to read about their cultures. He stated, "I try to read about

different cultures if I can." He gave specific examples of how this approach helped him

understand EAL students

111. Researching EAL students to know how to teach them: Kenny was talking about a teacher who felt threatened by the idea of teaching EAL students. He ruminated,

So before making any judgment about somebody from a different culture, and maybe believing that somebody is threatening, maybe the best thing to do is to get an understanding before coming up with those opinions. I don't think it would be a bad idea to go to major newspapers and read a little bit about what's happening in their country.

112. Telling professors understand before judging: Kenny felt that professors should not judge EAL students prematurely but instead should first make efforts to understand their cultural backgrounds, which could also promote trust. He explained, "Once you understand the person at their level and where they are coming from, why they are making these decisions, the level of trust gets higher. Folks trust you."

113. Not understanding EAL students risks them failing: Kenny was insistent that teachers have an obligation to spend time to understand cultural differences EAL students have to better accommodate them. He contended,

I think what's imperative to happen is before taking any stance or making any important decisions that we look at the reasons for why things are happening. If we take that route, maybe we are going to reduce the chance that an international student maybe will drop the class, when in reality, maybe they didn't have to drop. Maybe it wasn't because their English wasn't so called "good enough." Maybe it was because the professor didn't give enough feedback on what actually matters. So the guidance that the kids get, in my opinion, is heavily based on how much time and effort the professors give to help the student succeed. I think this even

applies to national students. But with international students comes the variable of culture.

114. Understanding international students' backgrounds to assess needs: Kenny stressed that EAL students are culturally and linguistically different than domestic monolingual students. However, he stressed professors needed to spend time getting to know EAL students' cultural backgrounds to know how to teach them. He exhorted,

Whenever you have an international student who is far from home, who is probably homesick, it's unlikely that the level of English of most of those folks is up to par to ace a college class. I don't see any other way to gain the confidence of an international student, especially in a class that is writing intensive, if you don't take one step further and understand where they are coming from and listen and try to come up with a better way to assess what the student actually needs. I just cannot imagine teaching, not just a writing intensive class but any class, where you're teaching a kid from another country, without understanding where they are coming from.

115. Taking time to listen to EAL students to establish trust: Kenny talked about a specific Chinese student he worked with to gain her trust and better help her.

Her [the Chinese student's] English wasn't really the best English, but because of our rapport that she trusts me. I took the time to sit down and actually understand where she was coming from and listen to what she had to say and understand her culture.

116. Suggesting taking more time to get to know EAL students: When I asked Robin what she would do if she was faced with teaching an introductory class with 15 EAL students, she replied,

I'd be proactive and say if you were going to always have 15 every semester, the first day of class I'd say we have some international students and I'd like to know who you are and tell me about yourself so we can make this a success. And I'd take the time right then and there and say I'd like to get to know you.

117. Advocating being proactive with EAL students more than domestic students: Karl advocated helping EAL students even before they asked for help. He stated,

I think, just like an awareness that language is a barrier as large as a disability in many ways, so saying you can record this [lecture] if you need to, kind of being proactive. I think, in my mind, for EAL students you need to be more proactive than with someone else.

118. Trying to reach out to help EAL students: Philip realized a cohort of Chinese students in one of his introductory classes was having trouble, and he reached out to help them. He reported, "I tried to reach out to their cohort. I had some one-on-one conversations with some of them."

119. Running a parallel course for EAL students: Joe believed that he needed to customize his classes for EAL students, spending extra effort to adapt courses for them. He contended, "I basically run a parallel course with the ESL students. Depending on the students' familiarity and language background, I'll use different approaches and improvise and learn new ones as I go along."

120. Advocating teaching professors to be sensitive to EAL students' needs: Henry believed professors needed to be sensitive to EAL students' cultural needs. He purported,

I certainly think that being sensitive to the needs of the international student is key.

I think I've come to the conclusion that there are a few kind of generics that students from different parts of the world have different sets of needs, and a sensitivity to what some of those needs are would be very important because you pick it up very experientially as you begin having experiences with them. I find that Western European students have very different kinds of experience than students from the Pacific Rim or students from the Middle East. I have a sense that language structure, these Western European language groups are fairly similar, so you see kind of similar structure there, but they are very different than the Middle East, and they're very different from the Pacific Rim. I have a sense that moving into a Roman alphabet from kanji characters is difficult for those students.

121. Advocating tailored teaching to different nationalities: Karl believed that it was important for teachers to have some understanding of different cultures in order to teach EAL students. He maintained, "You have to tailor your teaching if you have a Korean and you have to tailor something different if you have someone from Africa or whatever."

122. Allowing EAL students to speak their possible alternative perspectives: Joe advised, when making an exam, teachers should understand that EAL students might not interpret questions the same as domestic students and thus should be given an opportunity to express their ideas in their own way. He reasoned,

Your way of thinking can be very different because of cultural reasons that depend on the way they formed their mind in a different academic environment.

So, an open-ended question like “What would you like to tell me that you haven’t already done?” offers ESL learners the opportunity to fill in spaces.

123. Respecting US standards as well as international backgrounds: Though Kenny respected EAL students’ first cultures, he said even if they have a cultural issue with classes, he did not advocate changing curriculum. He asserted, “Now that does not mean that we would change our class totally because of a kid from another culture. Absolutely not. I think that would be a big mistake.”
124. Judging EAL students’ issues not language but cultural acculturation: Dennis was discussing a secondary class of mostly EAL Mexican students he had taught and thought part of the challenges of immigrating to the United States was acculturation. He claimed, “These problems [that EAL students have] are not just having to do with people learning a language; the problems are about cultural acculturation and culture dialogue in the process of schooling.”
125. Rewarded by feeling appreciated helping EAL student: In her role as student adviser, Harriet worked with a Chinese student who was having trouble registering for classes. Harriet spent extra time to work with the student, but felt rewarded by the appreciation the student expressed. Harriet remarked,
- She told me if I ever came to China, that her father would honor me because I was her...something she said, teacher. And I thought that was very nice. And we did correspond, and this has been several years ago. We corresponded for a while back and forth after she got there, back home.

Discussion on Cultural Challenges and Accommodating Cultural Difference

EAL students' cultural differences can be subtle; so subtle that in some cases teachers might not even be aware of them (FC102). Other differences can be very obvious. For example, during one class lecture Joe was aware he had EAL students in his class, so when he introduced a historical account of the pope christening Charlemagne on Christmas, he took pains to carefully explain who the Pope was (FC103). However, after class, a group of Chinese students asked Joe what Christmas was. In this case, Joe was able to explain the meaning of Christmas and resolve the students' misunderstandings. However, in other incidences, cultural concepts can be very deeply imbedded—part of a person's identity—and not easily addressed.

Cultural difference can occur because of deeply held beliefs. As Dennis pointed out, "These problems [that EAL students have] are not just having to do with people learning a language; the problems are about cultural acculturation and culture dialogue in the process of schooling" (FC124). One of these beliefs was explained by Jillian who noted that the United States concept of plagiarism is rooted in the capitalistic concept that ideas can be owned and profited from. Simply explaining plagiarism, Jillian contended, is not enough for it to "click in" and become part of a student's habitus (FC107).

Other beliefs are more personal. When Harriet was a student advisor, a Chinese student emailed her and told her that she was feeling frustrated with the class registration process and thought that no one wanted to help her. Harriet believed Asian students might feel respect for U.S. teachers but that respect might not be reciprocated, and the Asian student interpreted the lack of attention she received as disrespect (FC104). Kenny made similar remarks, stating there can be a much bigger power difference in Asian cultures where students are expected to show

reverence to teachers (FC106), sometimes by giving them small gifts. However, North American teachers could interpret this as bribery and refuse them (FC105).

While comments like these exemplify teachers trying to understand EAL students from a cultural level, they also can be interpreted as essentialist. This can happen anytime generalizations are made about societies, such as that Asian people have more respect for teachers. Henry even made the claim that “there are a few kinds of generics that students from different parts of the world have different sets of needs (FC120).” One has to question what use such generalizations are and what problems they may cause. On one hand, if a teacher was aware that Asian students might have particular problems, the teacher could anticipate their needs. However, applying cultural generalization to individuals is problematic. Generalizations are narrow descriptions of certain cultural traits in certain contexts. Individuals, however, are complex and they can change identities moment to moment (Shuck, 2010). Expecting individuals to act according to a generalization of their society can be very limiting to the individual. It might even coerce them into acting according to that stereotype (Harklau, 2000; Ortmeier-Hooper, 2010). While generalizations may offer guidelines on individuals’ potential behavior, they are not inevitable nor are they the only type of behavior an individual may exhibit. Still, some teachers believed learning about cultures could help them work with EAL students.

Kenny felt strongly that in order to accommodate EAL students’ cultural differences, teachers should spend time and effort to learn about their cultures (FC111). He advocated the sentiment that teachers should read about EAL students’ cultures and, in class, listen closely to what EAL students say (FC109-110). Without such understanding, Kenny felt teachers risked failing EAL students (FC113). It should be noted, however, that Kenny ultimately believed it would be a “big mistake” to change a class too much just to adapt to an EAL student (FC123).

Besides Kenny, several other teachers advocated reaching out to EAL students and making accommodations for their cultural differences (FC117-120). Karl advocated proactively in teaching EAL students, reaching out to help them even before they asked for help (FC117). Joe claimed he ran a “parallel course” for EAL students, using custom approaches to teach them differently than their classmates (FC119). In fact, Joe modified tests to include more open-ended questions that gave EAL students a chance to explain what they knew, not test them on what they did not know (FC122).

Accommodating for culture may seem like a burdensome task, but Harriet attested it was rewarding. She reported that when she helped an Asian student who was having cultural difficulties, she felt she had made a real difference in the student’s life. Harriet remarked, “She told me if I ever came to China, that her father would honor me because I was her teacher. And I thought that was very nice” (FC125).

Other research has shown that EAL students may face a barrage of negative feelings from cultural differences. Among these negative feelings are a loss of culture capital (Park, 2012, 2013), a sense of self-depreciation (Kanno & Varghese, 2010), a loss of identity or “voice” (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006), frustration from not being able to express themselves (Friedrich, 2006), loneliness and isolation (Hanauer, 2010), shame (Leki, 2007) and the frustration of being misunderstood (Zamel, 1995).

Despite how impactful cultural differences can be, teachers might not even be aware of them (FC102). However, some teachers did feel empathy, often because they too had studied abroad (FC90, 98, 108). It is worth noting that of the 12 teachers from whom focus codes in this section were derived, six had studied an additional language abroad (i.e. Harriet, Henry, Joe, Karl, Kenny, and Loraine) and they accounted for 19 of the 24 focus codes. Kenny, who was

once a university EAL student, accounted for 10 of the codes. Thus, the evidence indicates that the context of study abroad instills empathy for EAL students, something also noted in the previous chapter.

For some teachers, actualizing their empathy into praxis entailed spending extra effort to work with EAL students. Multiple times Kenny advocated the idea that teachers could spend time and effort to address EAL students' cultural backgrounds (FC109-115). In fact, after I turned my recorder off, Kenny said that teachers should spend four to five hours a week researching their EAL students' backgrounds. In other focus codes, Joe (FC119) and Karl (FC117) also advocated teachers spend extra time and effort attempting to understand EAL students. This presents a problem. Above I presented evidence that some teachers felt too busy to spend time with individual students (Table 15). Thus, they may not be responsive if asked to spend four to five hours a week researching an EAL student's background. This issue is revisited below (see Discussion on Advocating One-on-One).

However, it is more than just time and effort that Kenny and other teachers advocate. In fact, Kenny was asking for teachers to change their roles. He was advocating for teachers to adapt their pedagogies to meet their students' needs instead of asking students to meet teachers' academic requirements. Furthermore, Kenny wanted teachers to take on the role of learner while EAL students take on the role of experts. Joe stated similar sentiments when he purported, "The point is that if we faculty can learn from them [EAL students], then we need to open ourselves up to the possibility of being amazed" (FC147). This is an attitude, it would seem, anyone could adapt.

Encouraging EAL Students to Contribute to Classes

Continuing the theme in the previous section, this section also deals with teachers accommodating EAL students who may have cultural differences. However, in addition, this section also corresponds with the section in the previous chapter that was entitled Desiring Diversity Motivates Accommodation. That section focused on teachers in contexts where they valued EAL students' input, especially those with global experiences such as living in different cultures. And yet even when they valued these perspectives, some teachers had difficulty encouraging EAL students to speak up in discussions. This problem is taken up here in Table 21. Then some solutions are posed in Table 22, most of which involve creating an atmosphere conducive to discussion.

Not Contributing to Classes

In the previous chapter, I noted that in classes focused on global perspectives, EAL students could be seen as an asset because they can provide diverse points of view. But there was also a warning that viewing students as assets should be done with caution because it could lead to exploitation and unreasonable expectations. This theme is taken up here in Table 21, which concerns teachers who hoped EAL students would contribute to class discussions, but the students refrained from doing so. In Table 21, focus codes 126 to 133 are all concerned with occasions when teachers hoped EAL students would contribute more than they did. In the final two codes (FC132-133), Esther contemplates why EAL students might not want to speak up about their first cultures.

Table 21

Not Contributing to Classes

	Focus Code	Teacher
126	Not always being successful using EAL students as resource.	Elizabeth
127	Wanting EAL students' perspective but backing off not to embarrass.	Kristen
128	Wanting more EAL students' perspectives than students willing to give.	Brian
129	Wanting more perspective from EAL student, but student was soft spoken.	Brian
130	Failing to ask EAL students to teach their L1 culture.	Dennis
131	Not wanting to put shy Asians on the spot to speak.	Jane
132	EAL student stating language weak, not wanting discussions.	Esther
133	Guessing EAL students might worry classmates reject their ideas.	Esther

126. Not always being successful using EAL students as resource: Though Elizabeth valued EAL students' contributions to discussions, she admitted, "I'm not always successful with this. I'll have some EAL students who don't ever speak in my class." On one occasion during class, Elizabeth called on a Saudi student to give her opinion on a subject. The student declined and after class told Elizabeth that she did not feel comfortable discussing some of the class material. Elizabeth reported, "She came up to me and said, 'I really don't want you to call on me.' I said well, if you do the work, come, ask questions when you have questions, I'm not going to make you feel uncomfortable." In this particular situation, the class was large, about 50 students, and participation was not essential. Elizabeth was not sure what would have happened if the class was smaller and participation in discussions was crucial for students. It was a situation that had never arisen before for her.
127. Wanting EAL students' perspective but backing off not to embarrass: During class, Kristen was discussing places where there is a severe lack of drinking water and thought it was something her domestic monolingual students could not completely fathom. One of her students was from a country that had a shortage of drinking water

and Kristen wanted to ask for her perspective, but decided not to ask. “This [drinking water] is a luxury where she grew up. But she’s never pointed that out personally to the students [her classmates], so that’s where I just kind of back off because I don’t want to embarrass her.”

128. Wanting more EAL students’ perspectives than students willing to give: Brian had a few Muslim students in his class, which had a “global cultural focus” to it. He had hoped the Muslim students would contribute their perspectives, but, he reported, “They didn’t as much as I had hoped they would. I had to draw out those conversations.” In another class he had a similar experience with a Chinese student. He lamented, “I encouraged her to speak up, but some people from some cultures don’t speak out in large groups and in a class of 50 students I think sometimes they don’t speak out as much in the course.” Then he added, “Maybe because it’s a language thing.”
129. Wanting more perspective from EAL student, but student was soft spoken: Brian taught an African student who was reluctant to speak up in class. Brian professed,
- I wanted to hear more from him in class. There was no class participation component, but I wanted to hear more from him in class, so I would have to try to draw information out and listen very carefully. He was also soft spoken in class.
130. Failing to ask EAL students to teach their L1 culture: Dennis had never taught EAL university students, so when he found that he had three Chinese students in his class, he thought they might lead a small group in discussing Chinese literature. However, his domestic monolingual students were reluctant to join the group and the Chinese students had little interest leading it. Dennis had to take over the group himself. He

bemoaned, “I ended up lecturing a lot because the literature, Confucius and Lo Tze and Sidhartha, were too hard for them, and so I was failure.”

131. Not wanting to put shy Asians on the spot to speak: Jane taught an African student who was happy to speak up in class, but some of her Asian students were reluctant to speak up, even when she approached them individually. She reflected,

Some of the Asian students are quiet, though. Very, very quiet and I would pull them aside and ask them, ‘Would you mind sharing things in class?’ I didn’t want to put them on the spot when they’re not comfortable with the language.

132. EAL student stating language weak, not wanting discussions: Esther said several times that EAL students may be self-conscious about language “issues” they might have and thus would not want to contribute to discussions. Esther noted that she had EAL students approach her and ask not to be called on in class. She put forth, “Sometimes they don’t want to participate in discussions because they feel their English isn’t up to par with the other students.”

133. Guessing EAL students might worry classmates reject their ideas: Esther felt EAL students might not want to speak up in class because they might fear that their classmates would judge their first culture perspectives negatively. Esther maintained,

Some students will talk about just [being] ill at ease having other individuals judge them. And I think there are times they are concerned about being judged based on their country of origin. Especially if their values and practices are different from what is considered mainstream American values and practices. So they might be concerned about putting it out there and their whole group being

judged harshly or negatively as a result of something they say. So I think they're very mindful of representing their group.

Facilitating Participation

In some contexts, some teachers realized the value of EAL students adding to class discussions, and so the teachers did their best to facilitate such participation. Most of the time, this approach involved respecting EAL students' right not to contribute, but instead creating a supportive atmosphere if they ever chose to do so.

In Table 22, Focus codes 134 to 137 concern teachers' notions that EAL students' have a right not to speak. Focus code 138 to 141 are teachers' attitudes that encourage EAL students to speak in class. Focus codes 142 to 144 show how teachers bring EAL students' perspectives through proxy. Focus code 146 has to do with EAL students' language discrepancies. In the final two codes (146, 147), Joe stresses that teachers must be open to not just allowing EAL students to contribute to class, but to learn from them.

Table 22

Facilitating Participation

Focus Code	Teacher
134 Not putting EAL student on the spot.	Elizabeth
135 Judging EAL students' body language means they don't want to talk.	Charlie
136 Not expecting EAL student to be spokesperson for their government.	Charlie
137 Judging serendipity often most effective for speaking.	Henry
138 Being sensitive of EAL students being intimidated by surroundings.	Robin
139 Creating a protective environment for discussion.	Robin
140 Respecting if EAL student doesn't want to self-identify.	Mike
141 Striving to be inclusive of all voices.	Esther
142 Using journal writing to connect to EAL students.	Esther
143 Using reading material to bring in students' voices.	Esther
144 Giving proxy voice for EAL students in discussion.	Karl
145 Allowing EAL students to use their English.	Joe
146 Letting EAL students lead you to find something new.	Joe
147 Opening up to the possibility of being amazed by EAL students.	Joe

134. Not putting EAL students on the spot: Elizabeth stressed that Midland University was predominately White, and minority students might feel intimidated, so she refrained from pressuring minority EAL students to speak in class. She asserted, “It’s really important not to put those students on the spot. I never do that.”
135. Judging EAL students’ body language means they don’t want to talk: Charlie said it is sometimes visibly apparent that some students do not want to speak in class. He remarked, “I’ve had several Japanese students who I can tell by the body language and the eye contact that they just don’t want to deal with that, so I just don’t push them.”
136. Not expecting EAL student to be spokesperson for their government: Charlie believed it was very important not to put EAL students “on the spot” and force them to act as spokesperson for their government. He said,
- So for instance, just today, I was talking about international agreements on whaling. I have a Japanese student sitting in the middle and that last thing I want to do is say and your government is hunting whales unapologetically. You have to kind of step back from that. You don’t want to put the students in a position as the spokesperson for their government because often times they don’t know what their government’s policy is or they may disagree with it or they may agree with it and they don’t want to say it.
137. Judging serendipity often most effective for speaking: During scheduled student presentations in Henry’s class, a Palestinian student in the audience spoke up about Israeli-Palestinian relationships. Henry watched as the gravity of the class shifted from the student giving the presentation to the Palestinian student. Henry recalled,

I remember stepping back and watching in some awe as this thing occurred in front of me. In many ways it occurred in spite of me not because of me. And that's what I find out often about my most effective teaching is that they [EAL contributions] occur serendipitously. And when they occur, it's a most exciting moment.

138. Being sensitive of EAL students being intimidated by surroundings: Robin felt that because she grew up close to an EAL speaker, she was more sensitive to EAL students' needs. She deduced, "But I think I had that sensitivity very early on. I know you have to exercise that same kind of sensitivity if somebody is intimidated because of everyone around them." Consequently, Robin said she tried to create a protective environment for all students, so they would feel comfortable speaking in class.
139. Creating a protective environment for discussion: Robin felt that to encourage EAL students, or domestic monolingual students, she needed to create an environment conducive for discussion. She proclaimed, "You create an environment where they are protected. They feel comfortable they're not going to be criticized."
140. Respecting if EAL student doesn't want to self-identify: When I asked Mike how many EAL students he had taught, he replied,

I have had four. Well, I had four that made it known to me because unlike students who have some sort of learning disability that is marked as so by the university where I'd get a letter before the semester starts, an EAL or ESL student wouldn't have to come identify themselves to me in order for me to actually even know. If the student doesn't want me to know that, then I don't have to know that.

141. Striving to be inclusive of all voices: In context to a conversation about being sensitive to homosexual students, Esther said, “I’m always thinking of who’s the audience when I’m teaching, and I try to be as inclusive as possible to see that all voices are heard.” Later, she said this inclusiveness included EAL students.
142. Using journal writing to connect to EAL students: Teaching very large introductory courses, Esther said that it was difficult to connect personally with EAL students, but she found she could do so through students’ journal writing. She gave an example of a Chinese student who did not speak up during a lecture about Chinese divorce laws, but later wrote about her own parents’ divorce in her journal. Esther reflected, “When we were talking about divorce, she was silent and didn’t say anything. She wrote about it in her journal.” Esther read the entry and then purposely brought the matter back up in class to address the Chinese students’ concerns. She explicated, “So if a student is silent for whatever reason, I try to bring her voice to class letting other students know, let’s look at women in a global way, not just [location of university], or even in the United States.” In this way, Esther spoke in proxy for students.
143. Using reading material to bring in students’ voices: In large introductory courses, Esther said that it was difficult for EAL students to add to discussions, but Esther would read the students’ journal entries and then chose class reading material to either address students’ concerns or give them a voice. She remarked, “I think that, although some students might feel uncomfortable sharing their voices, their voices are still brought in by readings.”
144. Giving proxy voice for EAL students in discussion: Karl taught an African EAL student who was very reluctant to speak up in class, so Karl met with him one-on-one. Then

during class, Karl would speak in proxy for the African student. Karl stated, “If he had particularly good ideas or questions, I would say X student said this or he asked this, what do you think about this?” In this way, Karl felt he was contributing the African student’s perspective to class.

145. Allowing EAL students to use their English: Joe believed it was important for teachers to look past EAL students’ language discrepancies and concentrate on their ideas. He reasoned,

If you don’t speak their language, you are missing unless you allow them to express through their own language and through the mediation of English—their English. You can discover things that you’ve never known before. And American students would never have the opportunity to hear.

146. Letting EAL students lead you to find something new: Joe emphasized a student-centered classroom and felt that students can teach teachers. He contended,

With ESL students, let them lead you. When you’re not connecting with them, that’s not a problem. That’s an opportunity. You can now explore something in a way you might not have conceived of because it seems obvious only to you.

147. Opening up to the possibility of being amazed by EAL students: Joe believed teachers can actually learn from EAL students, but only if they are able to open their minds to the possibility. He declared, “The point is that if we faculty can learn from them, then we need to open ourselves up to the possibility of being amazed.”

Discussion on Encouraging EAL Students to Contribute to Classes

Even if teachers in some contexts value EAL international students’ diverse opinions, EAL international students do not always want to voice their opinions, especially out loud in

class discussions. Brian was teaching a class that was deemed globally focused, and he was looking forward to hearing from his EAL international students. Unfortunately, they did not contribute much to the class, and when they did, he had to “draw out those conversations” (FC126-127). Elizabeth asked a Saudi woman to express her opinion during class. The Saudi student was very reluctant, and after the class, she told Elizabeth that she was not comfortable with the class material and asked not to be called on again (FC126). Dennis asked three of his Chinese students to lead a discussion on Chinese poetry. However, the students were not interested, and Dennis ended up leading the group. He called the episode a “failure” (FC130).

Brian (FC128) and Esther (FC132) both postulated that EAL international students might be reluctant to speak because they were not confident in their English language ability, but Esther thought there might also be cultural reasons. Esther put forth that EAL international students might fear their classmates would judge them for their cultural values and practices. This might even lead to other students stereotyping EAL international students’ countries of origins (FC133).

Ideas such as these caused some teachers to feel that EAL students should not be looked at as a resource, but as students with rights to be respected and not to be pressured to speak (FC134-140). Several times, Charlie said that he wanted to ask EAL students for their opinion on contemporary matters, such as asking a Japanese student about his country’s whaling industry. Still, Charlie refrained, stating,

You don’t want to put the students in a position as the spokesperson for their government because often times they don’t know what their government policy is or they may disagree with it or they may agree with it and they don’t want to say it. (FC136)

Robin was sensitive to EAL students' predicaments and the fact that they might feel intimidated by their classmates. In order to promote EAL students' input, Robin fostered a protective environment, patiently waiting for EAL students to speak (FC138-139). Henry felt a similar need for patience, claiming that EAL students' input in class often occurred serendipitously and it was necessary to be open to allowing it to happen (FC137). In addition to patience, Joe purported that teachers need to be linguistically tolerant. He felt that teachers need to look past language discrepancies and listen to EAL students in "their English" to understand their contributions (FC145).

Even if EAL students were reluctant to speak out in class, Esther felt that she could bring their voices into class by proxy. Through journal writing, Esther felt that she could learn EAL students' opinions and then bring them up in class during her lecture or by including germane reading material in class assignments (FC141-143). Karl also spoke in proxy for his EAL student who was too shy to speak up in class. Karl met with the student weekly and then would bring up their discussions during class, actually naming the student and restating his opinions (FC144).

Welcoming EAL students' contribution not only benefits domestic monolingual students but can also benefit teachers. Joe declared that if teachers are willing to open up themselves, they too can learn from EAL students' diverse opinions and "the possibility of being amazed" (FC146-1487). Again, Joe is reframing the classroom structure by shifting the onus from the students to adapt to the curriculum to teachers learning from students.

Teachers Pedagogical Accommodations for EAL Students

In contrast to the previous theme, matters in this section might be generalized as more mundane classroom varieties of accommodations, for example, EAL students wanting to use a dictionary during testing. This theme is first presented in Table 23 as a variety of practical

classroom practices. Then Table 24 concerns the practice of providing extra written text. Finally, Table 25 presents teachers' perceptions that in large classes EAL students can be accommodated by breaking the classes into smaller groups.

Various Pedagogical Accommodations

In the classroom, teachers often accommodate EAL students' lack of language skills in very practical ways. In Table 23, the first four codes (FC148-151) are all accommodations suggested by EAL students. Focus codes 152-157 are accommodations that arose from teachers' reflections on their own use of language and how they could alter it to better serve EAL students. Focus codes 158-162 concern assigning tutors to help EAL students in proxy of teachers. The final three focus codes are teachers' suggestions, not practiced pedagogy.

Table 23

Various Pedagogical Accommodations

Focus Code	Teacher
148 Allowing EAL students to record lessons.	Charlie
149 Allowing paper dictionaries on tests.	Henry
150 Asking colleagues about e-translators and they say fine.	Philip
151 Allowing e-translators in class.	Philip
152 Using EAL students' familiar examples to help them connect.	Kenny
153 Going slowly for EAL students and checking to see if okay.	Kristen
154 Having a discussion that we all have accents put EAL students at ease.	Tammy
155 Becoming aware of your own language and slang.	Eva
156 Abating use of slang and annunciating more.	Jane
157 Getting tutors to help students.	Henry
158 Volunteering her graduate students to work as tutors.	Robin
159 Recommending more graduate students to help tutor for EAL students.	Robin
160 Suggesting EAL student language based sections courses.	Joe
161 Suggesting a letter telling professors will have EAL students like disability.	Mike
162 Thinking school needs to provide EAL L1 resources.	Philip

148. Allowing EAL students to record lessons: Charlie recounted when one EAL student asked if he could record Charlie's lessons. Charlie reported, "He asked to record all my presentations. I have no problem with that."

149. Allowing paper dictionaries on tests: Henry had no objections allowing EAL, or any other students, to use paper dictionaries during tests: “I’ve been frequently asked that during the examination whether an English and whatever the language dictionary can be used. My answer is always yes.”
150. Asking colleagues about e-translators and they say fine: Philip was approached by some Chinese students who wanted to use electronic translators during exams. Though he set some guidelines, he did allow students to use them. He remarked the other professors felt similarly. He said, “I would say they try to be similarly accommodating. I’ve had conversations with colleagues about use with a translator, an electronic translator. And I think most of them would say that’s fine.”
151. Allowing e-translators in class: In a large introductory course, Philip taught a cohort of about 14 Chinese students. Some of the students wanted to use e-translators during testing. Philip recalled, “In a couple of instances they [the students] approached me, and one wanted to know if they could use the translator device. I had no problem with that.”
152. Using EAL students’ familiar examples to help them connect: Kenny felt he could help EAL students when he lectured by incorporating examples from EAL students’ backgrounds. He proclaimed,
- I had three students from Saudi Arabia. So we’re talking about the examples on how to come up with a new educational system for the Middle East, and I said think about King Faisal University, which is a university that they understand. I try to frame in a way that has some terminology that they understand. So for an example of a consultant for a company, maybe they can serve as a consultant for

Aramco, the Saudi oil company. That gives perspective. But I think this is just good teaching. If we cannot help the student to make the connection between what they know and what they want to go to, maybe we're failing as professors in the first place.

153. Going slowly for EAL students and checking to see if okay: With EAL students in her class, Kristen tried to speak slower and check with them often to make sure they were following her. She professed, "I always had to make sure I wasn't going too fast when I taught. And I checked in with them to see if they were doing okay, if they were overwhelmed."

154. Having a discussion that we all have accents put EAL students at ease: Tammy was teaching a class that emphasized presentations, and her domestic monolingual students were criticizing her EAL students' accents because they were hard to understand. So Tammy had a class discussion about how no one is accent free. She proclaimed, "We've got people from Taiwan or Saudi Arabia or Korea or, recently, Serbia. And yeah, you all speak with an accent, but do we speak with an accent to you? So everybody needs to slow down." She said that after her initial talk, she made the discussion on accents standard for her classes.

155. Becoming aware of your own language and slang: When Eva taught one of her first EAL students, she had to become aware that she was using slang and try to use more Standard English to help her EAL students. She asserted,

And I struggled to, and it was the written language, that English language. Trying to understand the nuance. You know we say things in slang, and even when you

write a test, you try not to. But from someone who is coming from it at the *This isn't my first language*, when we use our slang, they [EAL students] don't get it.

156. Abating use of slang and annunciating more: While teaching EAL students, Jane became aware of her own language biases. She disclosed, "I'm more aware of the colloquialisms I use. I speak Pittsburghese something terrible, and I have this trailing off that I do. I'm trying to be more aware of that."

157. Getting tutors to help students: Henry felt one way to help EAL students was to offer tutoring help from someone in the field. Henry explained,

This semester we actually had one of our upper division students seek us out and ask if there was anything she could do for us as volunteer work so we said yeah, how would you like to be a tutor for [some classes]? And she said sure. So we immediately put her over at the offices. She has specified office hours two days a week. Plus she's made her email and telephone information available to students.

158. Volunteering her graduate students to work as tutors: Robin said that in the program where she teaches, there are graduate students available to help tutor undergraduates with difficulties, which worked well with EAL students who were struggling:

We have the luxury of graduate assistance and often they have time to commit. Sometimes I'll say I would like to have a graduate student work with this individual, and they have always been very open to doing that. So that's kind of a backup system we have.

159. Recommending more graduate students to help tutor for EAL students: Robin felt that there should be more graduate students to tutor EAL students, especially if Midland University increased the number of EAL students on campus. She suggested, "If you

were going to have a lot of students from another country, then there ought to be somebody designated to work with them.”

160. Suggesting EAL student language based sections courses: Joe had even proposed that his program should create classes to be taught in EAL students’ native languages. He opined, “I’ve even suggested to [Midland’s intensive English program] that we might think about having sections that are language based for ESL students in undergraduate classes. I think it might even interest the students.”

161. Suggesting a letter telling professors will have EAL students like disability: Mike was pondering what might help him teach EAL students and came up with this solution:

I don’t think it would be good to make this [teaching EAL students] part of disability services because that’s the wrong connotation, but if there was some place like that with someone who could say we’re going to send out letter notifying your professors that you’re coming. And just to give them a short to do and what not to do. That would be really helpful.

162. Thinking school needs to provide EAL L1 resources: Philip thought it was important that Midland University provide some first language resources for students. He suggested,

I think it would be best if [the university] provided them with some resources, even if it’s just a small library of books in their language, so they can struggle with the information, write the characters in their own language, and then write the English next to that and practice that.

More Written Texts Help EAL Students and Others

One specific way teachers accommodated EAL students linguistically was to use more written text. Though only four teachers brought this up, I felt this theme was prominent enough to warrant its own table. All focus codes in Table 24 are teachers' perceptions that written text helps EAL students, except the last code which is Charlie's empathy for appreciating written text based on his study of German in Germany.

Table 24

More Written Texts Helps EAL Students and Others

Focus Code	Teacher
163 Writing down details for assignments.	Tammy
164 Giving written assignments to help EAL students and all students.	Karl
165 Knowing EAL students are in class makes him write more.	Mike
166 Giving written word for EAL students provides context to oral.	Charlie
167 Knowing written word works from German experience.	Charlie

163. Writing down details for assignments: Based on a suggestion by a colleague, Tammy started to give oral and written details for each of her assignments and found that it helped her EAL students, as well as her domestic monolingual students.

I adjusted for non-native speakers by including more written as well as oral stuff, but I find it is very useful for any student in my class. While it was something that ruled by what I saw was a particular need, it ended up being just a good thing for everybody in my class.

164. Giving written assignments to help EAL students and all students: Karl said one way to help EAL students was to put more class material in writing. He remarked,

That is one thing I've started doing that I think would work very well for EAL students, making sure there's something in writing because a lot of times EAL

students have become very efficient at reading and writing but speaking and listening is quite difficult.

165. Knowing EAL students are in class makes him write more: When Mike knew he had EAL students in his class, he would purposely alter his lessons to use more written text. For example, he might write key words on his whiteboard during lessons. He stated, “I write a little bit more when I know that’s [EAL students attending] happening in class.”
166. Giving written word for EAL students provides context to oral: Charlie felt it was very important to give written text to supplement oral texts, so he had PowerPoint presentations to accompany his lectures. He described a written cue as giving context to a lip reader. In his own words:

I also try to make use of PowerPoint. Part of that is EAL students often times are looking for the written word to correspond with the oral word and once that link is made their comprehension increases substantially, just as lip reading, for instance, needs that. Once you cue in on what the topic is, the lip reading starts taking off. But until you cue the topic, oftentimes lip readers have a tough time understanding what is it that you’re talking about, particularly if some of the terms aren’t common. So having a PowerPoint presentation with the written word to supplement the oral, I think helps.

167. Knowing written word works from German experience: Charlie felt a written word can really give EAL students context in oral lectures, and he based this off his own experience studying in German abroad. He recounted,

I've been trying to listen to that lecture in German and God I really need a word.

Ah there it is. And now I'm cueing in on particular ideas. But also knowing that

English as a second language is an issue out there in the classroom.

Making Small Groups to Help in Large Classrooms

In the previous chapter, some teachers expressed their disdain for an increase in the cap size that happened at Midland University about five years previously (Table 16). Some teachers contended that it meant that they had less time to spend with students (FC51-52, 56, 58,61), including EAL students. Some teachers felt that it even caused a decrease in the overall quality of education (FC49, 54, 57).

Despite resistance to large class sizes, some teachers found ways of addressing the situations by dividing classes into smaller groups. Table 25 starts with general perceptions of making small groups in large classes to help students. Then the focus codes move to more specific reasons why small groups help.

Table 25

Making Small Groups to Help in Large Classrooms

	Focus Code	Teacher
168	Making small groups to help in big classes.	Karl
169	Making groups in large classes to connect students.	Joe
170	Bringing in groups of EAL students for tutoring.	Joe
171	Making small groups to work with large classes.	Dennis
172	Breaking class into small groups might help EAL students speak up.	Esther
173	EAL students writing in groups without particular issues.	Loraine
174	Discouraging EAL students to be in same group for group work.	Shannon
175	No one in group work wants writing to fall on EAL students.	Shannon

168. Making small groups to help in big classes: Karl taught mostly small classes. When I asked him how he would work with EAL students in large courses, he replied,

You'd need to make small groups. You couldn't do it in the class, but you'd have to get some small group activity outside of class. I do a group writing project in my 101s. I could see something like that helping, where they get that collegiality, some sort of a smaller community. Maybe they could meet as a group with you. That would be tough.

169. Making groups in large classes to connect students: Joe said that when working with large classes, he made small groups of students. He explained, "I've learned to organize students in these large classes into teams. There's a team leader who has to report to me once a week." This he felt worked especially well with EAL students. He proclaimed, "This communication-intensive approach helps the ESL students because they are really lost sitting in such a large class."
170. Bringing in groups of EAL students for tutoring: In large classes, Joe broke students up into small groups, and with EAL students, he sometimes grouped them by first language. He revealed, "There's team Chinese. The Chinese students work together and that's very helpful for them and for me. I can usually connect with four or five of them really well and they can connect with their teammates."
171. Making small groups to work with large classes: Dennis considered his class caps of 45 students too large to make personal connections, so he divided classes into small groups and required them to meet outside of class. He felt that this was particularly helpful for EAL students. He attested,

These groups have gotten incredibly close to each other. They talk about things that oftentimes they don't talk about with their friends. They talk about spiritual concerns. They talk about problems they're having with their girlfriends and

boyfriends that they can't talk about with their other friends because it would be like gossiping. It is like group therapy that they do on their own. It's hard to be in a strange country, and they need a tutor that they can make a friend with and go to.

I think they need somebody who knows them and they feel more at home with.

172. Breaking class into small groups might help EAL students speak up: Esther felt that one way to bring EAL perspectives into classes was to divide students up into random small groups. She said, "I think although students might not be comfortable talking in front of the whole group, they're usually comfortable talking in a small group. So students will develop some kind of connection with each other by doing that."
173. EAL students writing in groups without particular issues: Loraine required students to work in small groups to complete a five to eight page paper and had never had a problem with EAL students working with domestic monolingual students. She noted, "I have not had anybody come up to me and say that they don't want this person because they are an EAL speaker. I have had people come up to me and say I don't want so and so because she doesn't carry her load, but they [EAL students] are their [domestic students] contemporaries with no disparities there."
174. Discouraging EAL students to be in same group for group work: Shannon assigned a group project in one of her classes and purposely divided EAL students into different groups with the intention that they would not have to write for the group. She reasoned,
- For the analytical project, I always mix them up. I don't strongly discourage them. If I have five foreign students, I push them out to other groups so they can't be in a group. And I know where their writing falls and it won't fall on them.

175. No one in group work wants writing to fall on EAL students: When Shannon made small groups, she noted that EAL students seldom did the writing for their groups. She stated, “Nobody wants to leave it up to them and they don’t want that to fall on them.” Her implication was that EAL students had problems writing.

Discussion on Pedagogical Accommodations

When teachers accommodated EAL students, often their methods were simple and practical. The most straightforward linguistic accommodations happened when EAL students made requests and teachers honored them. For example, an EAL student asked Charlie if he could record Charlie’s lessons and Charlie complied (FC148). Another example was when Henry had no objections to letting EAL students use paper dictionaries in class, even during exams (FC149). However, some requests, even ones that appeared to be straightforward, were problematic.

When Philip agreed to allow students to use electronic dictionaries during testing, the situations quickly became complicated. Philip was teaching in a large introductory course and had a cohort of about 15 Chinese students who would share electronic translators during tests. This aroused the suspicion of domestic monolingual students who thought the Chinese students were cheating. To address the problem, Philip wrote a list of rules about using electronic translators and even had the rules translated into Chinese, but his action caused the Chinese students to stop using electronic translators—though Philip was never sure why. Philip had not taught many EAL students and did not have any resources or knowledgeable colleagues to consult. He was trying to make accommodations by himself but unfortunately his action did not have the effect that he desired (FC150-151).

In some cases, teachers made accommodations without requests. For example, several teachers tried to alter their language use to better suit EAL students (FC152-156). Jane tried to abate her use of slang and annunciate her words more clearly to help her EAL students, something she said she had learned from teaching a student who had a hearing disability (FC156). Eva also made an effort to curtail her use of slang, claiming, “You know we say things in slang, and even when you write a test, you try not to. But from someone who is coming from it at the *this isn’t my first language*, when we use our slang, they [EAL students] don’t get it” (FC155).

Teachers also mentioned accommodating EAL students by sending them to a tutor. Henry’s department had a tutor that teachers could send EAL students to (FC157). Robin also sent EAL students to a tutor in her department, and she thought that the university could find more tutors to help other EAL students (FC158-159). Referring students to a tutor is essentially finding a proxy to help students. This was something a number of teachers mentioned doing with the university’s writing center, and I discuss this at length below.

Beyond enacted pedagogical practices, teachers thought making institutional policy changes might help EAL students. Philip thought Midland University should provide EAL students with reference books in their native language (FC162), and Joe suggested EAL students be taught courses in their native languages (FC160). Mike made a very interesting suggestion to help teachers accommodate EAL students. He noted that the university’s disabilities office notified teachers when a disabled student enrolled in a teachers’ class (FC161). The service was only provided if the disabled student consented, but, when a notification was sent, it gave the teacher a chance to adjust her or his course. Mike purported that if he was aware he had an EAL student in his class, he would purposely utilize more written text (FC161).

Using more written text was a technique used by three other teachers. (FC163-167).

Charlie was very explicit on why written text could help EAL students. He compared EAL students in a classroom to lip readers who were trying to follow a conversation without context.

Charlie explained,

Part of that is EAL students often times are looking for the written word to correspond with the oral word and once that link is made, their comprehension increases substantially, just as lip reading, for instance, needs that. Once you cue in on what the topic is, the lip reading starts taking off. But until you cue the topic, often times lip readers have a tough time understanding what is it that you're talking about, particularly if some of the terms aren't common. (FC166)

Years before, Tammy's colleague had suggested that Tammy use more written instructions in her writing prompts to help her EAL students understand assignments. Tammy took her colleague's advice and felt it not only helped her EAL students but her monolingual students as well, so she made the discussion part of her general practice (FC163). In this way, Tammy was using a method prescribed for EAL students that benefited all students.

In a matter brought up in the previous chapter, increased class sizes had created classes so big that some teachers believed that they could not serve individual students well. Some teachers felt that dividing classes into small groups could help students, particularly EAL students, in a variety of ways. Dennis regularly assigned students to small groups and required them to meet outside of class time. Dennis attested that in these small groups, students were able to make personal connections, something he believed was important for EAL students. He put forth, "It's hard to be in a strange country and they need a tutor that they can make a friend with and go to. I think they need somebody who knows them and they feel more at home with" (FC171).

Joe divided his large introductory courses into *teams*, partly to help EAL students (FC169). Joe proclaimed, “This communication-intensive approach helps the ESL students because they are really lost sitting in such a large class.” Joe even had a *team Chinese* that was composed only of Chinese students. He felt having a common first language helped the Chinese students support each other, and he met with the group privately (FC170).

Though some teachers believed that putting EAL students into smaller groups would help them connect with other students, Shannon had different motives. She regularly gave group assignments that entailed a writing component. She was careful to divide EAL students into different groups with the specific intention that they would be partnered with domestic monolingual students who could take up the writing task (FC174). Shannon said that EAL students almost never did the writing task. Shannon feared that EAL students’ writing level was low, and she perceived her actions as helping them (FC175).

It is prudent to ask if dividing classes into small groups actually helps students, and in particular, EAL students. Some teachers seem to think it did, and, unless universities such as Midland University change policy and make smaller classes, it might be one of the few options teachers have. However, it would be too presumptuous to assume that all student groups would work well or make the close connections Dennis described (FC171). Ultimately, it is some teachers’ stopgap measure to working with classes that are too large.

Suggestions such as dividing large classes into smaller groups are not novel. In fact, in this section, most of the accommodations teachers utilized or suggested can be found in various ESL pedagogical guides. However, often these guides are based on the authors’ anecdotal experiences, and they raise questions that research could address. For example, do dictionaries help EAL students during tests or are they distracting? Is it better to group EAL students with

like first languages, or should they be encouraged to work in mixed monolingual/multilingual groups? When teachers adjust their oral deliveries, for example abating the use of slang, do EAL students benefit, or are they denied exposure to authentic language? While theories like Reid's (2006) eye/ear learners support the use of written text, what kind of written text is best used? When should a text be provided? Research that addresses questions like these could help practices to become even more effective.

One approach that is of particular interest was taken by Jane (FC155) and Eva (FC156) who adapted their language for EAL students. They did so after they realized that they were using slang, which is, essentially, Nonstandard English. Thus, they became aware that their own English contained discrepancies just like EAL students have. This enabled them to experience empathy like the teachers discussed in Chapter Five. Perhaps a similar effect might be brought about with other teachers. Teachers could be challenged to investigate their language usage and see how their use of idioms, slang, and cultural references differs from Standard English. Then they might better understand their EAL students' positions. Another intriguing idea is Mike's suggestion that teachers be sent a letter similar to the one teachers receive when they teach students with disabilities. This voluntary action could benefit both the EAL student and teacher. It would also be an opportunity for an EAL specialist to introduce herself or himself to the teacher and provide information about resources.

These suggestions, then, represent a cornucopia of ideas that EAL specialists could research and pass on to the greater writing faculty community. Since they already have grassroots support, they may have a stronger chance of being adapted. If adapted, EAL specialists might ask teachers which methods worked in which situation, and in this way, a dialogue could begin.

Teachers' Views and Ways of Accommodating EAL Students' Surface Discrepancies

Above I noted that EAL students' cultural differences might be hidden from teachers; however, surface discrepancies, such as missed conjugations, can be so conspicuous that they almost demand attention. This is especially true if they are made in written texts, which are static and open to prolonged examination. This is even more obvious if discrepancies are deemed *mistakes*, e.g., features that go against Standard English conventions.

In this study, I refer to these features as surface features and, when they are considered not to be acceptable Standard English, I call them surface discrepancies. By using the word *surface*, I hope to separate such features from overall writing form or rhetoric, and by using the word *discrepancy*, I hope to avoid the implied judgments of terms such as *mistakes* or *errors*. I admit that the term is limited. It implies that such errors are just *local* and not as significant as ones that may be deemed *global*. However, surface-level discrepancies can impact meaning (Ives et al., 2014), as I noted in Chapter Two, and perhaps dividing discrepancies into “local” and “global” (Harris & Silva, 1993) is no longer useful (Rafoth, 2015). However, participants in this study used the concept of surface-level discrepancies, and so I will too.

This section is comprised of three related themes. The first, Table 26, defines what these perceived errors are and what teachers call them. The second, Table 27, concerns approaches to working with these surface-level discrepancies. The third, Table 28, is centered on teachers' doubts that correcting surface-level discrepancies actually helps EAL students.

What Are Sentence-Level Discrepancies?

When describing surface-level discrepancies, there isn't any common blanket term in English. For this reason, the teachers I interviewed sometimes made up their own terminology. Examining this terminology gives insight into how teachers perceived EAL surface-level

discrepancies. In Table 26, focus codes 176 to 178 represent various ways that teachers described these discrepancies. Focus codes 179-182 show teachers' theoretical ideas of what these discrepancies are.

Table 26

What are Sentence-Level Discrepancies?

Focus Code	Teacher
176 Describing EAL students' writing style as "choppy."	Eva
177 Describing language discrepancies as "flip flopped."	Kristen
178 Describing EAL students' writing as "not crisp work."	Philip
179 Mideast students missing "little words: a, the."	Loraine
180 EAL students make "kind of weird" mistakes.	Tammy
181 Linking good semantics to good grammar.	Adam
182 Making grammar mistakes has many causes.	Mark

176. Describing EAL students' writing style as "choppy:" When describing an EAL student's writing, Eva said, "It was choppy, but yeah. I knew where it was headed."
177. Describing language discrepancies as "flip flopped:" Kristen noted discrepancies in an EAL students' writing and described them this way: "I'm just thinking in a basic sentence, maybe switching things around. Maybe verbs. I could always understand what they were trying to say, but maybe the sentence was flip-flopped."
178. Describing EAL students' writing as "not crisp work:" Philip taught a Malaysian graduate student and helped him with his writing, Philip commented, "His writing was not crisp work. Absolutely. He needed to work on that."
179. Mideast students missing "little words: a, the:" Loraine thought students from the Mideast had specific difficulties in writing. She postulated, "They tend to forget the little words: *a*, *the*, those kinds of things. So, we're always having to put that in."
180. EAL students make "kind of weird" mistakes: When describing how Tammy knew writing was written by an EAL student, she said, "Mostly because of the traditional

things we see that are kind of weird, not having a great handle on particular meanings of words, or the old thing about the articles, just some of that you just kind of go that's a little strange from a native speaker's viewpoint."

181. Linking good semantics to good grammar: Adam did not separate surface-level discrepancies with semantics but felt that the two were inherently linked. He explained, "Well, there is no such thing as grammar because there is a sense that grammar is semantics and it all goes together." He thought poor grammar was indicative of poor understanding. He reasoned,

If the semantics are brilliant, and the logic and meaning is crystal clear, there is almost no way you can have jumbled rant. You don't get brilliant ideas in incoherent grammar anymore than if I'm talking to you I have to use the grammar to make sense. Therefore, the grammar is semantics to me and they're having trouble conceptualizing it.

182. Making grammar mistakes has many causes: Mark felt that sometimes grammar mistakes were indicative of more systemic issues. He posited, "If there is a comma instead of a semicolon, that might have to do with a cognitive issue about their relationship of ideas in a whole set of ideas, a thought process about something. Sometimes there's linkages there."

Working With the Nitty-Gritty

Teachers had different perceptions of addressing surface-level errors, which I refer to hereafter as the *nitty-gritty*, borrowing Aaron's phrase (FC192). Table 27 presents focus codes that describe these perceptions and approaches. Focus codes 183-187 concern teachers' beliefs that they need to teach the nitty-gritty part of language. Focus codes 188-191 concern how

teachers approach teaching on this micro-level. The final three focus codes (FC192-194) exemplify a perception that language must be taught in steps, from the micro to the macro.

Table 27

Working With the Nitty Gritty

Focus Code	Teacher
183 Noting grammar problems with EAL students.	Shannon
184 Pointing out language features to help EAL students.	Mike
185 Feeling like she must teach grammar and how to fix it.	Holly
186 Pointing out spelling, verb, and synonym problems for EAL students.	Charlie
187 Focusing on surface-level language.	Eva
188 Circling errors and inserting correct usage.	Gary
189 Circling errors and giving correct answers.	Gary
190 Scrutinizing style, surface-level discrepancies for EAL students' sake.	Eva
191 Helping by marking up and passing back and forth.	Philip
192 Going step by step in the nitty-gritty to help students write.	Aaron
193 Approaching micro steps as grammar.	Sue
194 Teaching writing in steps.	Sue

183. Noting grammar problems with EAL students: Kristen believed the EAL students she taught worked harder than domestic monolingual students but had minor sentence-level discrepancies. “Sometimes there’s a little bit with grammar,” she mentioned, adding, “I’ve never really seen a large struggle.”

184. Pointing out language features to help EAL students: Mike’s field was very technical, and sentence-level features could be very critical in understanding material. He thought that to help EAL students, but also domestic monolingual students, he should point out when sentence-level features made a critical difference. He described his process in this way:

You’ve got this sentence written on the board. Go with a different colored marker and circle the important word. Or make a note in the margins. Do this when order does matter, rather than just going order matters, or writing *do this* when order

matters, so writing full sentences with little highlights instead of little phrases could help a lot.

185. Feeling like she must teach grammar and how to fix it: Though Holly said that she feels a compulsion to address sentence-level features, she purposely reads students' paper on a computer monitor because she feels it helps her resist marking surface-level discrepancies. When assignments are on paper, she said she had a hard time resisting "red-lining" them. She confessed, "I find that if I have paper in front of me I will [red-line them]." Though Holly did say that she makes an effort to read EAL students' papers for content, she feels obligated to address their surface-level discrepancies for professional reasons. She explained, "At the end of the day they have to learn the sentence structure, the basic narrative structure, some place I do a disservice to them and to their other teachers that yes I can comprehend their argument but their syntax needs improvement."
186. Pointing out spelling, verb, and synonym problems for EAL students: Charlie described sentence-level errors he felt EAL students had trouble with: "Well for instance the classic is the highly inflected nature of English verbs, which often times are so very different." He also said, "Spelling is obviously another. English is a language that was assembled by a committee that didn't get along (laughing). The result is you have some very different words that often times mean the same thing."
187. Focusing on surface-level language: Eva described how all of her students went through a drafting process, and the penultimate step was when she proofread their assignments. She described her process in this way:

I go through it and they care not for my red ink and all my no that's not appropriate. And no that's not a proper sentence structure. Where's you APA? That's plagiarism. You can't use someone else's work. So I red ink it pretty good and hand it back to them. And then they turn it in for a final time.

188. Circling errors and inserting correct usage: Gary said that when he encounters errors he tries to correct them. He noted,

I circle it [an error] and I try to draw arrows to where words go. If spelling is incorrect, I cross it out. Maybe at the beginning I put in correct spelling, but often I just write spelling next to it, so at least they know that's wrong.

However, Gary said as time goes on, he has less time to mark errors and no time to check and see if such practice led to improvement in students' writing.

189. Circling errors and giving correct answers: Gary was once an EAL student, and so he felt a particular obligation to mark EAL students' mistakes.

I think I definitely empathize and that's one of the reasons why I try to actively at least circle something and point out what's wrong just because I don't want that state to progress later on. I think that comes back to my own background. I would hope that other people would correct me, especially when I was young.

190. Scrutinizing style, surface-level discrepancies for EAL students' sake: Eva felt that she had been lenient grading the first EAL student she had taught. This was something she regretted and, in retrospect, she felt that she needed to be stricter for all of her EAL students' sakes. She surmised,

I would want to make sure that they understood better and see what proper APA and how to compose sentences. For them to move forward and stay in the US it

isn't always going to fly that someone is going to say, Oh, that's okay. You're something special. You're different. That's okay, we'll let that fly.

191. Helping by marking up and passing back and forth: To help an African student with writing discrepancies, Philip marked his paper and passed it back. When describing what he did, he said, "Well, just mark ups, edit documents, pass them back and forth, but not a lot. Not as much as I would like. The time becomes limiting."

192. Going step by step in the nitty-gritty to help students write: Aaron believed that to help EAL students struggling with writing, first he needed to start with surface-level structures. He put forth,

You have to start with the building blocks and you take those elemental things first and once you feel like a student is on solid ground and can write a grammatically correct sentence, at this point, okay let's start looking at your thesis statement.

Aaron described this basic level as "nitty-gritty." He said, "It really almost came down to that really nitty-gritty kind of elemental level first and just building the blocks until we could get it to its full form."

193. Approaching micro steps as grammar: On one of Sue's rubrics, she graded 20% of an assignment on surface-level structures, which she felt all students should learn in her class or already have known. She listed the items:

There's 20 points out of 100 for grammar, mechanics, and title, and format. The specifics are here. So spelling and grammar, capitalization errors, fragments, run-ons, comma errors, parallel structure, these are items that more than likely are either very, very basic and they should know, or that I've covered in class.

194. Teaching writing in steps: Sue approached writing as a process and described it as building from small tasks into a full paper. When asked how she approached a problematic EAL student's paper, she said,

The same way I approach a paper with any struggling student. And it's just in very, very small pieces. Very, very objective types of little steps that they can apply on their own. That they can organize. I always have them get a binder. I have them color code things. I have them do one small step at a time.

Doubting If Addressing Sentence-Level Errors Helps

Though some teachers in Table 27 above gave evidence that they perceived addressing surface-level discrepancies as essential for language teaching, other teachers doubted that it helped. Focus codes 195-198 all are examples of this skepticism. However, Eva's thoughts in focus code 195 need an explanation. Eva did not state addressing surface-level errors was fruitless, but she felt correcting an EAL student's errors might have made him too reliant on the teacher.

Table 28

Doubting if Addressing Sentence-Level Errors Helps

Focus Code	Teacher
195 Wondering if teaching sentence-level beneficial or not.	Eva
196 Citing research that too much error marking no help.	Jillian
197 Advising to relax nitpicky grammar—won't change in your class.	Tammy
198 Being unsure how to help EAL students with writing.	Jane
199 Understanding EAL students led to not just circling their errors.	Natalie

195. Wondering if teaching sentence-level beneficial or not: Eva discussed marking errors on students' papers, but she expressed doubt as to whether it always helped. She thought maybe students would become too reliant on her help and not improve independently. She described working with an EAL student in this way:

He listened to what I told him to do and I helped correct some of that sentence structure. Whether that was a benefit or not, I don't know. It may have been a handicap. Maybe someone else wasn't going to do that for him.

196. Citing research that too much error marking no help: Jillian had worked in a WAC program and had read about giving feedback. She declared, "The research suggests that doesn't serve students very well because they are just overwhelmed by the feedback." However, she also confessed she had trouble not marking all errors. She said, "I just don't do very well limiting myself. I know what I should do, but I'm compelled to do otherwise."
197. Advising to relax nitpicky grammar—won't change in your class: When asked what advice Tammy would give her colleagues when considering surface-level discrepancies, she recommended, "Relax a little bit on the nitpicky grammar stuff. They're never going to get that stuff straight. Or they will, but not in your class, not this semester."
198. Being unsure how to help EAL students with writing: Jane worked to correct EAL students' papers, but she was unsure if she was helping them. She repined,
- I wasn't sure how to help them. I was editing their papers just like I would edit our students, but I did tend to wonder, do they even understand what I'm doing here to their drafts? They're really just going back and turning it into what I corrected it to. So, I don't know if I did well or not.
199. Understanding EAL students led to not just circling their errors: Natalie confessed that as an adjunct professor she dreaded reviewing EAL students' papers because she thought it meant correcting a lot of surface-level errors. However, she said she has learned to focus on meaning and repeated discrepancies.

I thought, okay, this student, I can see is missing a lot of articles, so I recognize that this is a pattern, so instead of marking them all, I'm going to read the paper holistically, comment on the paper's ideas, and then the students I will either go through and discuss articles or I will make a comment overall about articles, or I will suggest that he or she go to the writing center to discuss articles.

Discussion on Teachers' Views and Ways of Accommodating EAL Students' Surface Discrepancies

Surface-level discrepancies can be so blatant and irksome that some teachers almost need to address them. In fact, Holly professed that she purposely reviewed student papers on her computer screen to curtail her desire to circle and correct every mistake she saw (FC185). Though these discrepancies are easily recognized, they do not have a commonly accepted and all-inclusive name. Terms like grammar, mechanics, and punctuation do not include problems with collocation and vocabulary, nor do they include issues with pragmatics and semantic meanings. In this study, I refer to these features as surface features and, when they are considered not acceptable Standard English, I call them surface discrepancies. However, teachers have invented their own terms.

When Eva referred to her EAL student's writing, she described it as "choppy" (FC176), while Kristen noted that EAL students might have problems with verbs, "switching things around," and maybe writing things "flip-flopped" (FC177). When describing a Malaysian graduate student's writing, Philip claimed it was "not crisp" (FC178). Tammy said that EAL students' writing could be "a little bit weird" because of non-traditional usages of vocabulary, missing articles, and generally being "a little strange from a native speaker's perspective" (FC180). In contrast, both Adam (FC181) and Mark (FC182) said that surface discrepancies

were not necessarily mistakes but an indication of misunderstanding of meaning or the way meaning is constructed.

Most of these terms imply students' deviation from Standard English; however, they do not necessarily imply that students' texts that are so cryptic they cannot be understood. In fact, Eva noted that even if her EAL student's writing was "choppy," she "knew where it was headed" (FC176). Holly had similar sentiments (FC185). One implication is that EAL students are writing with an accent, but unlike a spoken accent that is linked to a person's identity, written texts often stand independent of their authors and may be scrutinized more critically. If surface discrepancies are accents, then should surface discrepancies be addressed?

Several teachers felt that surface discrepancies were essential to address if students wanted to progress. Aaron described teaching EAL students as going step by step, starting with the nitty-gritty aspect of language and then building language into larger structures. He explained,

You have to start with the building blocks and you take those elemental things first and once you feel like a student is on solid ground and can write a grammatically correct sentence, at this point, okay let's start looking at your thesis statement. (FC192)

Sue also spoke of building language skills in incremental steps (FC193-194). Moving from grammar features to sections of a research paper, Sue felt EAL students had to build up their language skills brick by brick.

Other teachers wondered if they needed to address surface discrepancies at all. Holly posited that she had an obligation to address her students' surface discrepancies. She explained, "I do a disservice to them and to their other teachers, that yes I can comprehend their argument but their syntax needs improvement" (FC185). Eva had similar sentiments but for very different reasons. In her field, Eva felt all students should be treated equally, and therefore, EAL students

were expected to meet the same academic language standards (FC190). Mike worked in a very technical field where short texts were commonly used to make proposals. In his field, a discrepancy could drastically alter the meaning of a statement, and Mike had to work at a surface level with students. In class, Mike focused on surface features, highlighting them and pointing out key parts crucial to understanding statements (FC184).

If surface discrepancies are to be addressed, then how should the teacher do so? For Philip, addressing his Malaysian graduate students' surface discrepancies meant circling what Philip considered to be mistakes and giving the paper back (FC191). Gary had a similar approach, going through papers, circling mistakes and, if he had time, writing in correct usage. Since Gary was once an EAL student, he felt obligated to do this for EAL students, stating he had always hoped his teachers would have done the same for him (FC188-189).

However, there were teachers who questioned whether pointing out mistakes actually helped EAL students' address their surface discrepancies. Jane repined that though she edited EAL students' papers, she was not sure if she was helping (FC198). Other teachers were convinced that circling all mistakes did not help. Jillian had experience in WAC theories, and she cited research that concluded that circling a lot of mistakes on a paper is overwhelming and unhelpful (FC196). Natalie felt teachers should look for patterns of errors and try to help or find help for EAL students to address them (FC198). When I asked Tammy what advice she would give teachers who wanted to address EAL students' surface discrepancies, she advised that teachers should, "Relax on the nitpicky grammar stuff. They're never going to get that stuff straight. Or they will, but not in your class, not this semester" (FC197).

Despite views from teachers such as Jillian, Natalie, and Tammy, the data in the study suggest that there is a clear gap between some teachers' practices of addressing surface

discrepancies and EAL specialists' suggested practice. Aaron's (FC192) and Sue's (FC193-194) idea that the nitty-gritty parts of language must be mastered before students can create greater meaning has long been rejected by researchers like Zamel (1995), who see language acquisition taking place in context and not as a separate skill that can be learned in isolation. Also, Gary's (FC188-189) habit of circling all perceived errors and writing in perceived correct usage is generally rejected by researchers who advocate ignoring surface errors and concentrating on ideas (Harris & Silva, 1993; Land & Whitely, 2006). This study, then, adds to evidence from Matsuda, Saenkhum and Accardi (2013) and Ferris et al. (2011) that faculty should continue to address surface errors in contrast to findings from EAL specialists (Ferris 2004, 2007, 2009).

Another finding in this study that supports other research is Holly's statement that she needed to correct surface discrepancies so that students would not repeat them in subsequent classes (FC185). This is very similar to Zawacki and Habib's (2014) findings that teachers might see themselves as gatekeepers and believe that they should not allow students to pass their classes without addressing their language discrepancies. Something else in this study that supports Zawacki and Habib's (2014) findings is that language accuracy can be contextual, influenced by teachers' academic fields. As noted above, Eva worked in a competitive field that graduated students into professions dealing with dangerous situations (see Discussion on EAL students Need to Meet Certain Standards). Language accuracy is important, just as it was for the nursing student Yang in Leki's study (2003, 2007) and for nursing faculty members in Alster's article (2004). This was also true for Mike in his field (FC184).

However, before judgment on surface errors is completed, it is worth taking time to ask what exactly language accuracy is and what surface errors are. As noted, teachers had their own terms for surface errors, from "choppy" (FC176), "flip-flopped" (FC177), or "not crisp" (FC178).

In such cases, errors might actually be accents, and writing accents are not necessarily *wrong*. As Cox (2014) pointed out, we can accept spoken accents, so why can we not accept written ones? Then, one can ask how many of these discrepancies are errors and how many of them are accents?

Eva presented an example where she may have blurred the boundaries of error. She noticed many of her students were using *it* as an expletive pronoun, or dummy subject. Eva reported,

So I vividly, one day, as big as I could put it on the chalkboard, I wrote the word “IT” in capital letters. And then I, when class started, I said, okay, first on the agenda, someone explain to me what this says. And they all looked at me as if I were crazy. And I said seriously, and then I started calling on them. And if I didn’t know their names—whatever they were dressed in. You in the pink shirt, yeah. Well, what is it? Give me a definition. And I said, now this is what. You all can’t give me an answer? That’s the same thing I’m asking myself when I ‘m reading your papers because there’s nothing to relate to it. Nothing. So you shouldn’t use that word in your papers.

Though overuse of syntactic expletives might be confusing, when Eva prohibited students from using *it* as a dummy subject, she also prohibited sentences such as “It is raining” or “It is 3:00,” which are not only accepted convention but very awkward to word otherwise. Thus it seems that in this case, Eva was arguing style more than correctness. One can imagine that other surface discrepancies that teachers deem mistakes might also be style issues, or, in the case of EAL writers, accents in writing.

If accuracy of language is crucial in some areas, then it is even more crucial to figure out what language accuracy is. Matsuda (2012) advocated creating explicit policies for teaching surface structures, stating, “A helpful policy would specify how much and what kind of grammar

teaching and assessment should take place, if any” (p. 158). It might also qualify what is a mistake and what is accent or style.

Teachers Advocating One-on-One to Work With EAL Students

Some teachers felt that one way to accommodate struggling EAL students was to work with them one-on-one. Table 29 represents these teachers’ perceptions. The first five codes (FC200-204) are all from Kristen, who taught in a small program where she was able to work individually with EAL students who were having problems. The rest of the focus codes (FC205-212) move from specific examples to general recommendations of teachers’ suggestions for working one-on-one with EAL students.

Table 29

Advocating One-on-One

Focus Code	Teacher
200 Assuming the answer is one-on-one.	Kristen
201 Talking face-to-face to students to see if they have problems.	Kristen
202 Feeling solution for EAL students is one-on-one.	Kristen
203 Calling new EAL students’ “extra work around the edges” for mentoring.	Kristen
204 Being guilty of “looking out for them a little more.”	Kristen
205 Spending a lot of individual time with EAL students.	Henry
206 Requesting students one-on-one if problems are found.	Eva
207 Reaching out to EAL student to meet one-on-one.	Karl
208 Working through EAL students’ issues one-on-one.	Sean
209 Finding one-to-one essential to overcome cultural issues.	Joe
210 Working one-on-one if students do not understand.	Natalie
211 Spending more time with EAL students as possible solution.	Yvonne
212 Stressing one-on-one is most important feedback.	Holly

200. Assuming the answer is one-on-one: Kristen had never taught EAL students with significant issues. If she did, she thought she would need to approach them face-to-face. She explained, “I think they would have to come in during office hours and I would tutor them extra.”

201. Talking face-to-face to students to see if they have problems: Kristen said that she often checks in with EAL students orally to see if they are doing okay. She preferred to do this “face-to-face.”
202. Feeling solution for EAL students is one-on-one: Though Kristen had never encountered issues working with EAL students, she thought that if she did she would meet with them one-on-one. She surmised, “I would meet with them outside of the classroom. I’m not one to make a big deal in the classroom. I’ll pull them aside, or if I have to first contact them through email, but let’s get together and talk about what’s going on.”
203. Calling new EAL students’ “extra work around the edges” for mentoring: Kristen had been told by Midland University’s administration that her program would have its first EAL exchange student, a student only taking a few courses and not majoring in Kristen’s program. When I asked her if the exchange student might be a problem, she replied, “I wouldn’t call it a problem. Just extra work around the edges. That’s what it comes down to.” When I asked her what that meant, she replied, “Mentoring.”
204. Being guilty of “looking out for them a little more:” Kristen said that she tried to check in with EAL students in her class to see if they were doing all right. She mused,
- I think I’m guilty of looking out for them [EAL students] a little more. I always try to check in on everybody, but I kind of make a mental note that I need to take some time to check in with them every now and then and make sure they are not being shy and avoiding me.
205. Spending a lot of individual time with EAL students: Henry’s colleague spent a lot of one-on-one time with a Korean student. Henry recalled,

He conducted weekly tutorials with this woman. Literally, she was in his office at least once a week and sometimes more than that, and they would spend an hour or more together and he would go over some of this information and spend just an inordinate amount of time.

206. Requesting students one-on-one if problems are found: Eva recommended that if EAL students had a problem in class, then they should meet with her one-on-one during office hours. She stated, “If you don’t understand, then come see me and let’s talk about it. I can discuss with you, and we can work on your English and your grammar, but I can’t do it if you don’t come.”

207. Reaching out to EAL student to meet one-on-one: Karl taught an EAL student who was having trouble understanding material in classes and writing papers. Karl’s solution was to meet with the student every week. “I sat down with him every week. Every single week for at least a half an hour and discussed everything. I was trying to make sure that he wasn’t getting behind on his paper.”

208. Working through EAL students’ issues one-on-one: Before teaching in the university, Sean taught skill courses in a community college. During those classes, one of his EAL students was having language problems. When I asked Sean how he worked with the EAL student, he replied, “One on one. I offered up time afterwards to make sure she understood the material.”

209. Finding one-to-one essential to overcome cultural issues: Joe felt it was essential that he connect with EAL students personally. He said, “But, I really need to have one-to-one interaction with an ESL student to teach effectively.” He felt he needed to read EAL

students' body language to know what they were thinking and also to work individually or in small groups to understand their cultural backgrounds.

210. Working one-on-one if students do not understand: Natalie had two EAL students who were having difficulty. Her solution was to work with them individually. She purported, "I just kept writing emails back and forth until they understood or we talked on Skype. Or they came to my office and we came to an understanding about what they were supposed to be doing."

211. Spending more time with EAL students as possible solution: Yvonne had only taught two EAL students and had not had any particular problems. If she did have difficulties, she surmised,

I would probably try to make myself more available to them. I feel like I make myself pretty available to students as it is. But with that student I would try to make that student as available as I possibly could just so they would feel comfortable.

212. Stressing one-on-one is most important feedback: Holly felt that giving feedback, especially for EAL students' surface-level structures, was best done one-on-one. She maintained,

I think that ultimately that one-on-one is, in many ways, that access is more important than any feedback that I could give on a paper. I could go through and copyedit a paper within an inch of its life. But if I can't sit down with a student and look them in the eye and say you know what, you have some great ideas and I want to help you make your argument clearer.

Discussion on Advocating One-on-One

For some teachers, working one-on-one seemed to be their best approach, or even only approach, to working with EAL students. This was especially true for Kristen. Kristen worked in a small program where she knew all the other teachers and all the students. In this situation, she was able to provide personal attention, particularly for her EAL students. Kristen estimated she had taught less than 10 EAL students over the nine years she had taught at Midland University. Almost all of them were majoring in the program where she worked, and they rarely had issues in classes; in fact, all of them were exemplary students. If her EAL students did have issues, she would contact them individually. She surmised, “I would meet with them outside of the classroom. I’m not one to make a big deal in the classroom. I’ll pull them aside, or if I have to first contact them through email, but let’s get together and talk about what’s going on” (FC202).

Just before our interview, Kristen had been sent an email informing her that administration had determined some of her classes were appropriate for exchange students, and she would have her first exchange student the following semester. Kristen anticipated there might be problems with an international student who had just come for one class and she assumed she might have “work around the edges,” which she defined as personal mentoring (FC203). It is worth noting that administration had not offered Kristen any additional support to teach the exchange student.

Yvonne had only taught one EAL student, though she did tutor another when she worked in a writing center at another university. Like Kristen, Yvonne anticipated if at some point she did teach an EAL student who was struggling, she would work with the student one-on-one (FC211). She ruminated,

I would probably try to make myself more available to them. I feel like I make myself pretty available to students as it is. But with that student I would try to make that student as available as I possibly could just so they would feel comfortable.

Eva also advised meeting one-on-one, stating, “If you don’t understand, then come see me and let’s talk about it. I can discuss with you and we can work on your English and your grammar but I can’t do it if you don’t come” (FC206).

Working individually with a student allowed some teachers to negotiate and communicate. Natalie taught some EAL students who were having difficulty understanding material and assignments, so Natalie worked back and forth through Skype, emails, and in person until they understood (FC210). Holly felt that surface discrepancies were better addressed one-on-one, where communication could occur (FC212). She declared,

I could go through and copyedit a paper within an inch of its life. But if I can’t sit down with a student and look them in the eye and say you know what, you have some great ideas and I want to help you make your argument clearer.

Joe felt that working individually with EAL students was essential because he needed to read their body language but also wanted to know what they were thinking (FC209).

For Karl, working one-on-one was essential for helping an African EAL student who had difficulty participating in class discussions. The African student was soft spoken and did not feel comfortable speaking to the entire class, but Karl based a significant part of his students’ grades on class participation. Karl felt empathy for the African student and decided if the student would meet with him one-on-one, Karl would count it as class participation. As a result, Karl met individually with the African student every week for at least 30 minutes (FC207). Henry likewise

noted that one of his colleagues made a similar commitment, meeting with a Korean student at least once a week for sometimes an hour or more (FC205).

Working one-on-one has some distinct advantages. For Karl, working one-on-one allowed him to focus on an EAL student's particular issues, to give his EAL student proxy participation points, and to allow Karl to explain anything his EAL student had not understood in class (FC207). In this way, working one-on-one allowed him to address the issues his EAL student might have had that his classmates had not. This approach also works very well for addressing surface-level discrepancies because EAL students have writing issues different than monolingual speakers and can benefit from one-on-one attention (Harris & Silva, 1993). Furthermore, surface-level matters can be very difficult to explain through written feedback. This difficulty can be alleviated by meeting individually, something Holly noted (FC212). Finally, if teachers have not had a lot of experience teaching EAL students, meeting one-on-one could help them quickly gain such experience, as Yvonne surmised (FC211).

Findings from Matsuda, Saengkhum, and Accardi (2013) provide similar evidence to this study. Eight university writing teachers wrote in open fields on a survey that teaching EAL students requires more time. One teacher summed this up tersely: "More attention = More learning" (p. 77). For these teachers, spending extra time often meant meeting individually with EAL students, but also might mean spending extra time giving written feedback.

In some situations, giving more time to EAL students may be effective and practical. Kristen worked in a small department with a few talented EAL students, so she was able to meet with them one-on-one. However, this may not work for teachers who teach many EAL students in large classes. Even Kristen admitted she would not know what to do if her program admitted a lot of EAL students with language difficulties (FC203-204).

Working one-on-one can be very effective. However, spending extra time can be problematic. As pointed out in the discussion above, teachers complained of being very busy, and it is unlikely they would have time to spend individually with every EAL student that needed help (Table 15). This is especially true for new faculty, adjunct faculty, and TAs, who, as noted above, may feel inundated with work. Thus, working one-on-one is an option in certain contexts, but not suitable as a panacea policy.

Teachers Accommodating EAL Students for Testing

Tests can be stressful and have drastic impacts on all students. However, EAL students have the added burden of working on tests with language issues. It is not surprising, then, that some teachers accommodated EAL students during testing. In Table 30 below, empathy is presented as an impetus for teachers accommodating EAL students during testing. Next, Table 31 concerns teachers who gave EAL students extra time for testing. Finally, Table 32 concerns various other ways teachers accommodate EAL students during testing.

Feeling Empathy for EAL Students Taking Tests

The focus codes in Table 30 features three teachers who felt empathy for EAL students taking tests based on their own experiences studying abroad. In the last two focus codes (FC216-217), Joe gives his insight into why exams are more difficult for EAL students than for domestic monolingual students and how EAL students can be taught to take written tests.

Table 30

Feeling Empathy for EAL Students Taking Tests

	Focus Code	Teacher
213	Empathizing taking tests in an additional language.	Henry
214	Empathizing testing not the same as communicating.	Josh
215	Empathizing multiple choice tests difficult for EAL students.	Joe
216	Testing extra difficult for EAL students.	Joe
217	Teaching culturally relative rhetoric for exams.	Joe

213. Empathizing taking tests in an additional language: Henry studied overseas in an additional language and empathized with EAL students' situations, including taking tests. He admitted,

Having lived in a foreign country myself during my younger years, yeah, the culture shock is, I would not have wanted to have to sit in a classroom and listen to lectures and read the books and take examinations the way these students do.

214. Empathizing testing not the same as communicating: Josh considered his program's entrance exam to be very difficult and empathized with EAL students who had to take it. He commiserated, "I spent 23 years [in this profession] and most of it in foreign countries. I would not have wanted to take a test in German or Italian. Even though I could speak both of them."

215. Empathizing multiple choice tests difficult for EAL students: Recently, Joe's class sizes had increased to the point that he could not give essay exams, and instead he switched to multiple choice tests. Based on his own experiences studying overseas, Joe empathized with EAL students having to take multiple choice tests.

So, we've gone to multiple choice. They are extraordinarily difficult for ESL students. I took written and oral exams in French and Italian on the undergrad and graduate level. I would not want to have to take a multiple choice in either language even though I have near-native proficiency (on the ACTFL scale).

216. Testing extra difficult for EAL students: Joe believed EAL students encountered problems with testing beyond what domestic monolingual students faced. He maintained,

For ESL students, even just recalling the language can be impossible when you are in a classroom and the clock is clicking. You see, American forms of testing are not necessarily the most effective environments for assessing knowledge and understanding. We understand that. But even if they are effective for assessing native-language students, they may not work for ESL students.

217. Teaching culturally relative rhetoric for exams: Joe taught some Mexican students who were having trouble with essay exams. They were taking too long and not finishing their exams, so Joe taught them the rhetoric of essay exams.

I needed to explain to them the literary genre of American exams. For instance, an I.D. [identification] to us American academics is a way of structuring knowledge that is difficult to grasp for ESL students. The Mexican students in my first class were trying to lay out a disposition. And [laughing] of course they could never get through the ID, much less the exam.

Giving Extra Time for Tests

To accommodate EAL students, some teachers allowed them extra time on tests. For the most part, this allowed EAL students the opportunity to work through language issues. Table 32 represents all teachers who discussed the allowance of extra time for tests. However, the last four focus codes (FC224-227) concern two teachers who had just introduced timed online quizzes. Both teachers noted that the quizzes were particularly challenging for EAL students.

Table 31

Giving Extra Time for Tests

Focus Code	Teacher
218 Giving EAL students all the time they need on tests.	Kristen
219 Giving extra time for test taking.	Harriet
220 EAL students taking 15 minutes to look over tests.	Harriet
221 Giving extra time for exams to compensate language.	Elizabeth
222 Helping EAL students can help domestic students with similar issues.	Adam
223 Exam not about tripping up students, about applying learning.	Jillian
224 Being accommodating for students on exams.	Jillian
225 EAL students asking for more time to process language on quiz.	Elizabeth
226 EAL student requesting and getting more time on online quiz.	Esther
227 Offering alternative testing to EAL students who turn it down.	Kristen

218. Giving EAL students all the time they need on tests: Kristen had no problem giving EAL students all the time that they needed to take tests. She asserted, “Sometimes I’ve noticed they’ll be in the room later. They may be one of the last students in the room. But I just give them all the time that they need.”
219. Giving extra time for test taking: Considering EAL students taking tests, Harriet said, “Usually for tests, they’ll ask for extra time.” When asked how she accommodated them, she explained,
- I would stay in the room or maybe in the classroom that I use we have a little resource lab, curriculum lab right beside it. And so sometimes I might say if you want to take it there where it’s quieter and you can spend as much time as you need. So they have that option.
220. EAL students taking 15 minutes to look over tests: Harriet gave extra time for EAL students taking test. She estimated the time they needed to re-read their tests.

Not a lot. Maybe 15 minutes to a half an hour. And if I'm they're in the class marking, they'll be reading over. They'll do their tests and you'll see them reading them over again. So I think it's clear to them.

221. Giving extra time for exams to compensate language: Elizabeth stated that she had no problem giving EAL students more time to take tests. She said, "If they are taking a little bit of time but it if helps them because of their proficiency with language, I want to accurately assess what they know. So I haven't really had that issue."
222. Helping EAL students can help domestic students with similar issues: The program Adam worked in had timed entrance exams. Adam said that there was concern that EAL students were at a disadvantage with the language and even tasks such as typing. So the program made the exam a week long. Adam said, "We altered some of the ways we did things, like comprehensive exams. We had two timed exams and we changed the way we did it. It's much more accommodating to international students." Adam added that it also helped American students who might not have done well during the exams.
223. Exam not about tripping up students, about applying learning: Jillian approached testing for EAL students the same as she did for all students. She declared, "I just try to emphasize that it's not about tripping them up. It's not about how fast they can read or write during the time limit. It's about understanding the material."
224. Being accommodating for students on exams: When asked if she accommodated EAL students when taking exams, Jillian explained that she accommodates all students on exams. She elaborated,

I've moved from giving in-class exams to giving online ones. For some students I'll have extended time or no time limits. I assume for all the students it's open book, open note, so it's a lot of applications. I will try to make it as accommodating as possible.

225. EAL students asking for more time to process language on quiz: Elizabeth was able to offer more time for EAL students to take tests and complete assignments. She described the situation this way,

I had a student from China last semester I ended giving extra time to complete the exams and even some of the writing assignments because they expressed to me that the assessment wasn't really working for them because it took them longer to process the question and translate the question in terms that they could see what the question was getting at. It wasn't possible to do it in the time I had allocated on an online website.

226. EAL student requesting and getting more time on online quiz: An EAL student in Esther's class said that timed online tests were too fast for him to complete, so he requested extra time through the international office. Esther reported,

One student went to one of the advisors of international students, and the advisor sent me a letter asking could the student get additional time for the exam. It was very easy to set up on D2L, so after the first exam, every exam after that, he was given additional time.

227. Offering alternative testing to EAL students who turn it down: Kristen started a new online, timed quiz and was concerned her EAL students might have trouble with it. She explained,

One thing I've asked them about with other classes is that I started doing an online quiz this semester. I started for the first time, I started doing quizzes on D2L, and I've gone up to them [EAL students] individually, separate from the rest of the class. I don't want to bring attention to make a big issue out of it. I've gone up to them and I've asked if they needed more time.

Though neither EAL student needed extra time, Kristen said that she would ask any other EAL student the same question in the future.

Different Accommodations for EAL Student Testing

In addition to giving more time on tests, some teachers talked about other adaptations they made, or thought about making, on tests. This theme is featured in Table 32.

Table 32

Different Accommodations for EAL Student Testing

Focus Code	Teacher
228 Answering EAL students' questions during tests.	Kristen
229 Having graduate student edit EAL students' entrance exam.	Jillian
230 Considering helping EAL students' language for grad exam.	Josh
231 Allowing EAL students to speak their possible alternative perspectives	Joe
232 Giving oral exams instead to EAL students.	Joe

228. Answering EAL students' questions during tests: Kristen had no problem working with EAL students' language issues during testing. She asserted, "I'll answer questions if they don't understand a word during an exam. I'll verbally try to explain it without giving them the answer."

229. Having graduate student edit EAL students' entrance exam: Faculty in the program Jillian worked in felt that EAL students were at a linguistic disadvantage when they took the doctoral entrance exam, so the program made allowances. Jillian expounded,

We devised a method for students who wanted it could write their exam and then that exam would go to one of the TESOL grad students, who would edit it for grammar and spelling before it went to the readers, so that they would not be able to identify a student. That difference between students' skill sets wouldn't unfairly disadvantage students.

230. Considering helping EAL students' language for grad exam: The program Josh worked in had a rigorous multi-day entrance exam for potential graduate students. Faculty members had discussed allowing EAL students to write the exam in their first language. Josh elucidated,

We've actually had discussion in the department that if we're going to maintain that requirement [the multi-day exam], they should be able to type it in their native language and then we would have it transcribed. That way it wouldn't be placing them at a disadvantage. The counter argument to that by the majority is most of them are going to go somewhere where they are going to be teaching in English, so they need to be able to be proficient in English and that proficiency means passing your qualifiers in English. So there are two sides to that.

231. Allowing EAL students to speak their possible alternative perspectives: Joe believed it was important to give open-ended questions to EAL students. He posited,

I don't want to know what students don't know. I want to know what they know. So, for instance, asking an ESL student at the very end of an oral exam, 'What would you like to say that you haven't told me?' can be a very useful question to ask ESL learners because often times their way of logic can be very different from our own. You're thinking along a certain line of logic. Your way of thinking can

be very different because of cultural reasons that depend on the way they formed their mind in a different academic environment. So, an open-ended question like, ‘What would you like to tell me that you haven’t already done?’ offers ESL learners the opportunity to fill in spaces.

232. Giving oral exams instead to EAL students: Joe felt that some EAL students did not work well with written exams, so he offered them oral exams instead. He elaborated, I also found that giving them oral exams worked well. They would write, and I would read what they wrote. Then I would call them in and base questions on what they wrote. That allowed me to get around some of the difficulties we had.

Discussion on Teachers Accommodating EAL Students for Testing

In many classes, testing remains a main component of assessing a students’ work. However, EAL students may have difficulty with language that impedes them from accurately purveying what they know. It is not surprising, then, that some teachers wanted to make accommodations designed to abate the impacts of language difficulties. This seems particularly true when teachers have experienced taking tests abroad in an additional language. Henry (FC213) and Josh (FC214) had both lived in Europe and studied additional languages, but both believed their experiences taking exams were not as difficult as the testing situations their EAL students went through. Henry attested,

Having lived in a foreign country myself during my younger years, yeah, the culture shock is, I would not have wanted to have to sit in a classroom and listen to lectures and read the books and take examinations the way these students do. (FC213)

Joe had studied in Europe in an additional language and felt that United States academic tests were culturally biased. He especially challenged the use of multiple choice tests, claiming,

I took written and oral exams in French and Italian on the undergrad and graduate level. I would not want to have to take a multiple choice in either language even though I have near-native proficiency (on the ACTFL scale). (FC215)

Joe felt like he actually had to teach EAL students how to take tests. He gave an example of some Mexican EAL students who were writing in too much detail on their essay exams. Joe explained the rhetorical form of essay exams to them so that they could finish their tests on time (FC217). Joe also went beyond language issues and anticipated cultural issues during testing. He felt EAL students might have alternative perceptions of material. Therefore, he purposely gave open-ended questions so EAL students could express novel ideas (FC215). Joe explained,

You're thinking along a certain line of logic. Your way of thinking can be very different because of cultural reasons that depend on the way they formed their mind in a different academic environment. So, an open-ended question like, "What would you like to tell me that you haven't already done?" offers ESL learners the opportunity to fill in spaces. (FC231)

Joe was the only teacher who actually approached testing as a genre and tried to teach it to EAL students or make compensations for EAL students' cultural differences. In fact, Joe went beyond accommodating and shifted the onus of learning from the students to himself, believing he could actually learn from his students.

During testing, one assumption was that EAL students needed a chance to process language (i.e., translating questions and answers), and so some teachers gave EAL students extra time to complete tests (FC218-221, 224-227). This was particularly true for online testing done outside of class time when there were few physical impediments for extending testing time. Elizabeth had just started testing online, and since her EAL students told her they needed more

time to translate and process questions, she extended testing time (FC220). This was the same for Jillian, Elizabeth, and Kristen. All three had started online testing with strict time limits but relaxed or offered to relax limits later (FC224-226).

In a classroom setting, there are physical restrictions with regards to extending testing time. For example, teachers have to leave at some point, and perhaps new classes must use the space. Harriet handled this by asking all students who needed more time for testing to continue in a study room next to her office (FC219). Harriet noted that EAL students had periodically used the extra time, usually about an additional fifteen minutes (FC220). Other teachers stayed in the classroom with students (FC218, 221).

There are a few other accommodations or proposed accommodations teachers made for testing that are worth considering. Kristen had no problem orally rephrasing questions during tests (FC228), and Joe administered oral instead of written tests to EAL students (FC232). Joe also included open-ended test questions to allow EAL students to give their cultural perceptions that might be different than their teachers' (FC231). Adam's program changed graduate entrance exams from being timed, in-class tests to take home tests (FC222). Jillian's program actually hired graduate students to edit EAL students' graduate entrance exams, meaning that applicants would not be recognized and so exams would not be judged negatively for surface errors (FC229). Josh divulged that his program seriously considered allowing EAL students who were applying for graduate school to take essay exams in their native language, after which the program would pay to have the exams translated. Though the policy was never adopted, the intention was to assess students on what they knew of their subject, not on their mastery of Standard English (FC230).

In this section, evidence is given that some teachers accommodated EAL students by alleviating difficulties that might have been caused by language deficiency, for example, giving extra time to allow EAL students to work through language on tests, giving oral directions instead of written directions and giving alternative testing vocabulary. These techniques, as well as others presented, are practical and not complicated, yet they allow teachers to assess EAL students' course knowledge and take the focus off any difficulties they may have with Standard Written English.

However, it needs to be noted that accommodating during testing is also field related. All of the teachers cited in this section taught in the humanities or social sciences. I noted above that faculty members teaching in professional-oriented programs did not allow for extended time during tests or use of resources such as dictionaries (FC18, 29-30). Furthermore, I noted above that Eva insisted that all students be treated equally, including for testing (FC26). Loraine, who worked in the same field, noted that their program had previously allowed for extended practice testing, but that they had to stop for fear of litigation (FC28). In sum, while many of the techniques described might work well in some classes, they might not work at all in others.

Teachers Grading EAL Students With Leniency

Similar to testing, some teachers were willing to make concessions for EAL students when they gave students grades for written assignments; these teachers believed that EAL students should be able to express what they know without being penalized for linguistic discrepancies, particularly surface discrepancies. Table 33 begins with focus codes that are specifically concerned with teachers grading EAL students more leniently for surface-level discrepancies. Then at focus code 237, attention moves toward teachers generally grading EAL students less severely than domestic monolingual students.

Table 33

Grading EAL Students With Leniency

	Focus Code	Teacher
233	Not dinging EAL students for every error or they would fail.	Shannon
234	Grading EAL students less severely than domestic students.	Shannon
235	Taking off a quarter for EAL students of what would for domestic students.	Shannon
236	Judging papers on content but pointing out mistakes.	Holly
237	Giving EAL students a break on grammar.	Holly
238	Giving EAL students latitude on surface-level discrepancies.	Henry
239	Not dinging them hard on writing—giving chance for revising.	Loraine
240	Only addressing grammar that impedes meaning.	Natalie
241	Looking for patterns and focusing on ideas.	Natalie
242	Never taking off points for grammar.	Kristen
243	Grading EAL students a "little lighter."	Jane
244	Grading easier for EAL students on American stylebook.	Jane
245	Grading with effort in mind.	Adam
246	Grading on content, not on sentence level—no red pen.	Robin

233. Not dinging EAL students for every error or they would fail: In one class Shannon taught, she gave a group assignment that included a written report. Almost always, domestic monolingual students would volunteer to do the written work, but one time an EAL student took on the writing task. Knowing this, Shannon graded the group's grammar less severely. Shannon admitted, "It's just the grammatical errors that cause a lot of trouble so I know I wouldn't ding them for every little thing because they would never get a passing grade."
234. Grading EAL students less severely than domestic students: Shannon said she graded EAL students' grammar less severely than she would domestic monolingual students'. She professed, "Yeah, I do, but I grade theirs [EAL students'] differently. I don't hold them to the same standards."
235. Taking off a quarter for EAL students of what would for domestic students: When asked how differently Shannon graded EAL students than domestic monolingual

students, she answered, “I probably instead of taking off an entire point, maybe I would take off a quarter point. There’s no science behind it.”

236. Judging papers on content but pointing out mistakes: Holly considered surface-level structures when grading, but only up to a certain level. Then, she concentrated on meaning. She explained,

I don’t think it’s fair in a class that isn’t specifically about their acquisition of composition of grammar syntax to continually penalize them [mistakes] in the same paper. If it’s completely impenetrable, then as long as I can see that they’ve hit the basic parameters that I’m looking for in terms of content, they will get credit for the content and I’ll put a note in the comments encouraging them to seek help with their writing.

237. Giving EAL students a break on grammar: Holly penalized students for surface-level mistakes up to one letter grade, though she admitted that she is more tolerant towards EAL students’ discrepancies. She confessed,

I have a rubric that in no assignment can grammar, syntax, spelling, the basic mechanics impact more than a letter grade. And I find that probably if I looked really closely across my papers, I probably give my EAL students, with that point mechanism, I’m usually a little more generous for them than I am with somebody I know who has English as their first language and just doesn’t attend to the mechanics.

238. Giving EAL students latitude on sentence-level discrepancies: Henry did not count surface-level structures as a specific percentage of a grade on written assignments, but

treated them more subjectively. Likewise, he gave EAL students more leeway. He ruminated,

It's [grading sentence-level structures] never that specified. I guess I allow myself wiggle room. I think that's why I probably don't beat myself up on giving international students the benefit of the doubt because of the wiggle room. And it's very difficult to read for content and at the same time try to correct all their syntactical and grammatical errors. I think sometimes I may give students generally a pass on some of that stuff. Some of my colleagues are probably a bit more demanding on that level than I am.

239. Not dinging them hard on writing—giving chance for revising: Loraine said that she was more lenient when grading EAL students' surface-level discrepancies. She also let them, as well as domestic monolingual students, make corrections and resubmit papers. She revealed,

So, I typically don't ding them hard on their writing though they do have to work at it. Basically what I do is a lot of papers. They submit to me and we teach it, kind of to the master level for the writing. They submit, I revise, they write it again; that kind of thing. So it's a back and forth process. Really their papers should not be graded anything less than say 100. The opportunity is there for them. Now the way that we grade the course is not just based on writing.

240. Looking for patterns and focusing on ideas: When Natalie used to encounter an EAL student's paper with a lot of surface-level discrepancies, she would mark every one of them, but later she changed her tactics. She explained,

Instead of seeing a paper and thinking this student is not using English, and now I have to go through with a red pen and circle every error, I thought, okay, this student, I can see, is missing a lot of articles, so I recognize that this is a pattern. So instead of marking them all, I'm going to read the paper holistically, comment on the paper's ideas, and then the student and I will either go through and discuss articles or I will make a comment overall about articles, or I will suggest that he or she go to the writing center to discuss articles.

241. Only addressing grammar that impedes meaning: Natalie only addressed EAL students' sentence-level discrepancies when they impeded meaning. She revealed,

I don't address them specifically, but I do talk about addressing grammar in context, addressing grammar that impedes meaning, versus grammatical mistakes that tick you off, that you find annoying. Just using an article as an example, if a student leaves out an article, articles don't typically impede meaning. Missing articles—you still understand what's going on.

242. Never taking off points for grammar: Kristen thought EAL students might have mixed up syntax or verb errors. Considering such surface-level errors, she claimed, "I would correct it but I would never take off points to penalize them."

243. Grading EAL students a "little lighter:" Jane confessed that she was more forgiving when grading EAL students, though she admitted she did not know if that was appropriate. She disclosed, "I grade them [EAL students] differently than I grade the rest of the class too. I don't know if that's appropriate, so I really could use some training in how to teach English as a second language students."

244. Grading easier for EAL students on American stylebook: Jane did not hold EAL students to American standards if she knew they were not going to work in America.

She divulged,

I always use a rubric, so I try to quantify what they are doing as much as possible, but I would be much harder on a [program major] student who's going to work in American [profession] than I would be on her. For example, I wouldn't hold her to the stylebook as much as I would hold one of our students to the stylebook. It isn't anything she would be dealing with in her country.

245. Grading with effort in mind: Adam stated that he considered EAL students' efforts when grading their work. He averred, "I grade according to a labor contract as much as I can. They're putting in a lot of effort, but there is a thing where you have to be able to do this kind of work."

246. Grading on content, not on sentence level—no red pen: Robin stressed content in her class and said that she did not consider surface-level structures when grading any student's work, including EAL students. She posited, "I want content. If somebody tries, I'm not going to beat them up by saying you made these mistakes. I don't even use a red pen when I grade."

Discussion on Teachers Grading EAL Students With Leniency

As noted above, teachers often made accommodations for EAL students who were working through language issues during tests (Table 31; Table 32). The same was true for grading papers. For some teachers, this meant working with EAL students to address their issues. Loraine, for example, circled errors, but also allowed EAL students to make corrections and resubmit papers until there were no mistakes (FC239). Natalie graded holistically, considering

content and surface discrepancies, but would take time to speak to EAL students about common errors or send them to the writing center to address specific surface features (FC240).

However, for other teachers, this meant either ignoring surface discrepancies or not weighing them the same as teachers would for monolingual speakers. Kristen, for example, marked surface discrepancies, but did not subtract points for them (FC242). Robin said that she never graded on surface discrepancies; in fact, she refused to use a red pen because she felt it was threatening (FC246). Shannon estimated that for EAL students, she only took off a quarter of the points she would for monolingual students. She rationed if she were not more lenient with EAL students, some of them would fail (FC234-235).

Though teachers may have graded EAL students' papers more leniently, they seemed to construe it as an act of mercy done with a sense of guilt. Henry, for example, admitted, "I think sometimes I may give students generally a pass on some of that stuff [surface discrepancies]. Some of my colleagues are probably a bit more demanding on that level than I am" (FC238). In this statement, Henry appears to be judging himself as too tolerant when he did not penalize EAL students for making surface errors. Shannon approached discounting EAL students' surface errors as an act of mercy because, without leniency, she thought some of them would fail (FC233). Holly claimed she was being more "generous" when grading EAL students' surface structures, which again seems to be an act of mercy (FC237). Finally, Jane admitted that she graded EAL students "lighter" than her domestic monolingual students, stating, "I grade them [EAL students] differently than I grade than the rest of the class too. I don't know if that's appropriate, so I really could use some training in how to teach English as a second language students" (FC243). Jane had a point. How should teachers grade EAL students? Should they give

them a break and grade them more stringently? Even more to the point, should EAL students have to face uncertainty when they are graded, not knowing if a teacher will be lenient or not?

This precarious predicament originates from the fact that teachers expect college students to be able to address surface discrepancies on their own, believing this was something they should have learned in high school. This is exemplified clearly in a writing assignment Dennis gave me during our interview. The last point of the assignment instructs students to

Follow all the conventions of Standard Written English, be *sure* to use the [Midland] Writing Center if you are shaky on these things, as you must correct your errors if you revise, but you cannot get a higher grade on this component on a revision, as you are already expected to have a command of these things for this non-remedial course.

Dennis assumed that students are capable of writing to the “conventions of Standard Written English,” but there are many EAL students who cannot. It is not that they are too lazy to proofread or slept through grammar class in seventh grade, but rather they are using an additional language and might not have mastered its conventions. In fact, they might never completely master its conventions (Leki, 2004).

Matsuda (2006) pointed out that we cannot assume that all university students are linguistically homogeneous. When we think that they are, we assume that learning surface structures is remedial. Then, some teachers must guiltily show an act of mercy when EAL students cannot address their surface discrepancies. Matsuda (2012) insisted that we must address the assessment of surface discrepancies. For example, he suggested we might limit grammar to be no more than 5% of a total grade. More generally, he asserted, “As a rule of thumb, the proportion of grammar grades should not exceed the proportion of grammar

instruction provided that can guarantee student learning (p. 157).” After all, shouldn’t we grade on matters we teach, not matters we assume were taught?

Matsuda (2012) called for guidelines for grading surface-level discrepancies. Natalie’s (FC240-241) approach is good evidence of what such guidelines might entail. Natalie graded holistically, looking for content but also noting global or reoccurring errors. Then she either spoke to the EAL students about such errors or sent them to get specific help at the writing center. In other words, Natalie was not just assessing her students, but she was working to address their difficulties. Interestingly, she was doing this partly by using the writing center as a proxy for individual help. This was a technique other teachers used to varying degrees and is the topic of the next theme.

Teachers Referring EAL Students to the Writing Center

One of the most prevalent resources teachers discussed was using the writing center to help EAL students. For many teachers, it played an essential part in their pedagogies. For others, it seemed to be a place to outsource EAL students. In Table 34, teachers argue that EAL students actually appreciate the writing center more than monolingual students. In Table 35, data show that teachers referred EAL students to the writing center to address language and other problems. Finally, in Table 36, data are presented regarding some teachers’ use of the writing center as a proxy for one-on-one attention.

Writing Center Advantageous for EAL Students

Harriet and Charlie both felt that EAL students worked better at the writing center than their domestic monolingual student classmates. Table 34 gives their reasons.

Table 34

Writing Center Advantageous for EAL Students

	Focus Code	Teacher
247	EAL students more willing to go to writing center than natives.	Harriet
248	Feeling writing center particularly important for EAL students.	Charlie
249	EAL students appreciating writing center more than monolingual students.	Charlie

247. EAL students more willing to go to writing center than natives: Harriet mentioned that she had referred many of her students to the writing center, but overall, she said EAL students seemed the most receptive of her advice. She considered,

The English as a second language students will often go down to the writing center, and they will get help, where American students won't do it. And you'll have to say go see the writing center. You need help with your writing.

248. Feeling writing center particularly important for EAL students: Charlie required all his students to go to the writing center, but he felt his EAL students made better use of their visits. He posited, "They [EAL students] were better than the American students as far as going and making use of it [the writing center]. The resulting papers weren't terrific, but I suspect they were much more improved than their American equivalents."

249. EAL students appreciating writing center more than domestic students: Charlie felt that, overall, EAL students appreciated the writing center more than domestic monolingual students. He claimed, "For English as second language students, they obviously appreciated the help that they got at the writing center."

Referring EAL Students to Writing Center for Language and Other Problems

Often when EAL students had language discrepancies in their writing, teachers sent them to the writing center for help. Sometimes teachers would ask students to seek specific help, but

other times, they sent them just to clean up their papers so that they papers would be easier for teachers to grade.

Table 35 starts with teachers' general recommendations that EAL students seek help at the writing center (FC250-253) and moves to teachers using the writing center in specific ways. Focus codes 254 to 255 concern teachers sending EAL students to the writing center to get help. Focus codes 256- 264 concern faculty members using the writing center to clean up papers. Focus code 265 is an anomaly that concerns Yvonne's perspective as an ex-writing center tutor. Finally, focus codes 266-269 are about teachers who referred EAL students to the writing center to address specific features.

Table 35

Referring EAL Students to Writing Center for Language and Other Problems

Focus Code	Teacher
250 Referring EAL students to go to the writing center.	Josh
251 Encouraging students to go to writing center to have a peer review paper.	Brian
252 Making EAL students aware of writing center.	Harriet
253 Requiring all students go twice to writing center for grade.	Charlie
254 Generally asking students to go to writing center to make better drafts.	Kenny
255 Marking papers is time consuming, writing center helps.	Shannon
256 Referring students to writing center for sentence-level discrepancies.	Henry
257 Recommending EAL students go to writing center for help.	Karl
258 Referring students to writing center to address surface-level errors.	Elizabeth
259 Sending students with too many errors to writing center.	Robin
260 Sending students with "big trouble" to the writing center.	Robin
261 Recommending students with deficiencies go to writing center	Shannon
262 Sending low-level EAL students to writing center for language help.	Tammy
263 Sending EAL students to writing center for surface-level help.	Esther
264 Sending EAL students to writing center to address surface-level errors.	Sue
265 Writing center telling tutor to help EAL students with grammar.	Yvonne
266 Writing center willing to work with language.	Adam
267 Sending EAL students to writing center for language help.	Adam
268 Recommending on students' papers to go to writing center.	Elizabeth
269 Writing center playing essential part in EAL student's success.	Aaron

250. Referring EAL students to go to the writing center: When Josh was serving as an adviser, he recommended that EAL students to go to the writing center to address problems, though he did not specify what type of problems. He reported,

One of our graduates did have a problem. And what he'd do was go to the writing center. He would get his first paper back—it wasn't for me, it was for another professor—but he came to me and said what should I do, and I said go down to the writing center. And, after the writing center, he sort of got it.

251. Encouraging students to go to writing center to have a peer review paper: Brian thought that the writing center was good for all students, including EAL students. He noted, "I encourage all my students to go to the writing center." He thought it was a good place for students to have a peer review their work, and he stated, "I don't give points or anything, but I encourage them to have someone look over their writing."

252. Making EAL students aware of writing center enough: Harriet sent EAL students, as well as domestic monolingual students, to the writing center to address language discrepancies. She stressed, "And also I don't want to just pinpoint African Americans, sometimes there are students who come from lower income homes, first generation college, rural [location of Midland]. Sometimes their grammar is the same as how they talk." Then she added, "I usually I say go to the writing center. Your English is what's bringing your paper down."

253. Requiring all students go twice to writing center for grade: Charlie actually required all his students go to the writing center twice and counted the visits when grading. He stated, "I used to require all my students to go to the writing center for their short papers. I used to require them to go twice."

254. Generally asking students to go to writing center to make better drafts: Kenny routinely sent EAL students to the writing center to clean up surface-level errors in their draft papers. He noted,

But as a convention, I tell the kids, not just international students, send a draft to the writing center. Let's look and see if you can come up with a better draft. In fact, I just changed my policy on my syllabus. [Reading syllabus] 'Typos, grammar errors, punctuation errors, incomplete sentences, and all the structural issues will be part of the evaluation.' That was part of the evaluation before, but it wasn't written specifically on the syllabus. It was written on the rubric, but now from the beginning it's here. You expect to proofread your work and correct this kind of issues. And the way to do that is to potentially have somebody at the writing center to read that.

255. Marking papers is time consuming, writing center helps: Shannon sent EAL students to the writing center to help them clean up their papers. She explained, "I do require them to go to the writing center. I just tell them they have to go to the writing center. Because I mark so much on their paper when it comes, I just go, 'oh man.' It takes me a long time."

256. Referring students to writing center for sentence-level discrepancies: Henry worked with EAL students on language discrepancies but also sent them to the writing center for help. He reported,

I've also recommend to international students that they consult the writing center. That they prepare a rough draft. I will offer to read rough drafts. I offer that to all the students. International students do submit rough drafts, so I try to deal with the

syntactical and grammar problems the best I can. But I've also referred them to the writing center. I think the writing center is a great resource.

257. Recommending EAL students go to writing center for help: Karl taught an EAL student who had a lot of language discrepancies in his assignments, so Karl referred him to the writing center. Karl said,

The student that semester, I sent to the writing center along with helping him myself. He would take every paper to the writing center and get some help. I don't think he took as much advice as he needed to. Again, he was still getting Cs. But there was an improvement through the semester, though.

258. Referring students to writing center to address sentence-level errors: At a previous university where Elizabeth worked, she taught more EAL students in writing classes and noted they had many language discrepancies, including citing sources. She reported, "I would sit down and talk to them about here's how you cite something. You can't just copy this and talk about it." Her students also had difficulties with surface-level structures. She explained, "Some of the grammatical problems made it really difficult to get at what they were trying to argue." Routinely, she sent these students to the writing center. She said, "I don't know if I did the right thing or not, but what I wound up doing there was to refer students to the writing center and require them to meet with a tutor and revise papers."

259. Sending students with too many errors to writing center: When Robin encountered an EAL student's paper with a lot of surface-level errors, she sent that student to the writing center. She even recommended that the student do this routinely before handing in a paper. She proclaimed,

That's when I'd say go to the writing center. You really need somebody to focus with you on this. The next time, could you make an appointment to see somebody over there and let them do a first look? And then I'll look again and see what I can do to help you. But if it's fundamentals, sometimes I'll let the writing center take their expertise and put it to work.

260. Sending students with "big trouble" to the writing center: Robin worked personally with EAL students and domestic monolingual students who had language discrepancies in their writing, but she said if students had too many errors, she sent them to the writing center. She voiced,

And when they have to do an assignment, I will take the time to edit their work to show them that this is what a sentence should really look like—if you are having trouble because you are trying to accumulate material and present it. So I spend more time editing their work. If somebody is in really big trouble, [from a] communication standpoint, I might send them to the writing center and say I would like you to do more work with somebody, so that's on the written side.

261. Recommending students with deficiencies go to writing center: Shannon said that she recommends EAL students and domestic monolingual students to go to the writing center if they have language deficiencies. She remarked, "I recommend it to everyone [to go to the writing center] if they have deficiencies or weakness."

262. Sending low-level EAL students to writing center for language help: Tammy sometimes encountered EAL students with very low-level English proficiency. She reflected,

Well, I'd say that most of my international students have been very prepared, but occasionally, I've gotten some it's like, did you go to [the intensive English program]? Did you pay somebody to take the TOFEL test? Because I don't get this. And they come up to me, and I don't think they know enough English, and they come up to me and say what's the assignment? And I try to walk them through it again, and I can just see in their eyes. And I'm just like, 'Oh man.' This is not good.

When this occurred, Tammy worked with students and also sent them to the writing center. She reported, "I just try to do the best I can with them. I just tell them to come and see me and show me what they think they understand of an assignment and go to the writing center."

263. Sending EAL students to writing center for surface-level help: Esther sent an Asian student to the writing center for help with written language discrepancies, although Esther was under the impression that there was a writing center specifically for EAL students. She described,

The last time I taught it [an introductory course] I had two Asian students. One was really good and one was really bad. In fact, I suggested one of them go to, I don't know if there's a writing center for international students or what, but I think you need...and there was so much writing, I could tell it was extremely painful for her.

264. Sending EAL students to writing center to address surface-level errors: Sue worked with students on language concerns on a class level, but she did not help individual EAL students with surface-level structures. She declared, "As far as grammar

instruction is concerned, this is college. I simply can't do it. If you need help with sentence structure, then you need to seek out a tutor or go to the writing center."

265. Writing center telling tutor to help EAL students with grammar: Yvonne was a writing center tutor at the previous university where she taught. During training, she was told by writing center staff that EAL students would have language discrepancies, and that the tutors should help to address them. She recalled,

Most of what we had was during our writing center training and they would say, 'Oh we have a lot of international students that come in and they want help with grammar but make sure you help them focus on writing as well.' And... that was basically it. That was about the extent of it.

266. Writing center willing to work with language: Adam was teaching an EAL student who had many surface-level errors, so Adam sent him to the writing center. Adam reported, "I use the facilities on campus that we have. And the writing center has been great because they will work with the language. Because they [EAL students] feel they have written coherent sentences, but they're just not."

267. Sending EAL students to writing center for language help: Although Adam pointed out surface-level errors to EAL students, if there were repeated issues, he sent them to the writing center to address them. He noted, "So minor grammatical things, I might point them out. If there's a habit someone has I say look, go to the writing center and they'll help you."

268. Recommending on students' papers to go to writing center: Elizabeth described teaching at a different university than Midland and working with EAL students who had language discrepancies that obscured their meaning in their work. She said that she

would make a note on the papers for the students to go to the writing center for help.

She explained, “Sometimes I’ll just write on the paper, ‘Listen, this could be a strong paper but you’ve got some major issues here. I would like you to go to the writing center and re-work this. Bring it back to me, and I’ll accept a revised copy.’”

269. Writing center playing essential part in EAL student’s success: Aaron taught an EAL student who had trouble with citations and wrote a paper that contained plagiarism.

Brian told the student to go to the writing center and work with tutors to write a paper on plagiarism. He reported,

By the end of the semester, she was confident. She was able to argue her positions and feel just better about her skills as a writer and a researcher. So, again it was really the writing center played...I couldn’t have done it without the writing center.

Using the Writing Center as a Proxy for One-on-One

In Table 29, teachers talked about the importance of giving one-on-one attention to students, particularly EAL students. However in another section in an earlier section of this chapter, teachers complained they were very busy (Table 15). One way to give one-on-one writing attention is by using the writing center as a proxy. Two teachers described sending EAL students, and domestic monolingual students, to the writing center in lieu of personal attention. Although Table 36 is small and could have been combined with Table 35, I created it to contrast with Table 29, which concerned teachers advocating one-on-one attention for EAL students.

Table 36

Using the Writing Center as a Proxy for One-on-One

	Focus Code	Teacher
270	Suggesting one-on-one can be had from writing center.	Natalie
271	Offering writing center as alternative to one-on-one office visits.	Natalie
272	Using writing center as a proxy for one-on-one attention.	Aaron
273	Asserting less one-on-one forces writing center administering.	Aaron

270. Suggesting one-on-one can be had from writing center: When suggesting how teachers might spend time with EAL students, Natalie suggested the writing center might serve as a proxy for teachers' attention. She opined, "That is why there's the writing center. There's the [intensive English program], not to mention the writing center has online appointments, hours in the library. There's no reason they shouldn't get to the writing center."

271. Offering writing center as alternative to one-on-one office visits: Natalie said if an EAL student, or any student, felt intimidated by going to teachers' office hours, they might instead go to the writing center for help. She instructed,

I always say come to my office. I'd like to go over this with you [a student]. If you don't feel comfortable with that, or if you would prefer to get help from someone else, go to the writing center, and here's what you can tell them, or here's a list of some things you might go over with them.

272. Using writing center as a proxy for one-on-one attention: Aaron complained that his class caps were too large and that he did not have time to spend working one-on-one with EAL students, nor domestic monolingual students. Therefore, he purposely used the writing center as a proxy for one-on-one time. He discussed this when speaking about a particular EAL student:

His writing still had serious grammatical and syntactical problems. What we did, and this is what I often do when I see these kinds of things because I'm so hamstrung with the amount of students that I often have. I don't have the time to give them attention one-on-one. I work hand in glove with the writing center, and I put them on what I would call a plan to for success to get them intensely interacting with the writing center. At least on a once a week basis for the remainder of the semester whenever that intervention takes place.

273. Asserting less one-on-one forces writing center administering: Aaron bewailed that his course cap had grown at the same time the credits for his introductory course were decreased. He felt he could no longer give adequate personal attention to students and had to use the writing center as a proxy. He exhorted,

So I feel almost like I'm facilitating the process while they're kind of embarking on that interaction and that journey with the writing center. It almost sounds like I'm being too much hands off. But I think it does come down to that issue of time, especially in [the introductory course]. They [Midland University] took that extra credit away for that individualized instruction. There would be less reliance on an instrument such as the writing center as a support mechanism than if we had that.

Discussion on Teachers Referring EAL Students to the Writing Center

In this study, teachers referred to the writing center more than any other resource. This is not surprising because the writing center was the only major language resource available to Midland University's students at the time of this study. Thus, teachers used the writing center to address most any language problem students had, from making general improvements to addressing specific grammatical issues. Sometimes teachers even saw the writing center as a

place of last resort for students with major linguistic difficulties. In any case, the writing center was a default place to address language issues.

Two teachers saw the writing center as particularly suitable for EAL students because they felt EAL students utilized the writing center better than monolingual students. Harriet felt that EAL students were more willing to go to the writing center (FC247). Similarly, Charlie felt EAL students appreciated the writing center's services more and made better use of their visits than domestic monolingual students, who sometimes resisted going (FC248-249). Perhaps EAL students did not feel shame in asking for linguistic assistance because they learned English through studying, not acquisition. From this perspective, EAL students actually have an advantage in utilizing the writing center over domestic monolingual students.

When teachers sent EAL students to the writing center, sometimes they did so just for general assistance or to "clean up" their papers (FC240-253). Brian, for example, said that he recommended all of his students to go to the writing center and have their papers looked over (FC251). For a short time, Charlie actually required all of his students go to the writing center and counted their visits as part of their grades (FC253). Kenny felt that the writing center could help students clean up their papers (FC254). Shannon sent EAL students to the writing center so that their papers took less time for her to mark (FC255).

Other teachers sent EAL students to the writing center specifically to address surface discrepancies. These teachers might have tried to help EAL students themselves but realized their students needed further assistance (FC256-263). Henry, for example, said that he would read EAL students' rough drafts and try to address their "syntactical and grammar problems," but he also sent them to the writing center to seek help with such matters (FC256). At the previous university where Elizabeth worked, she sent EAL students to the writing center to

address “grammatical problems,” though she also expressed guilt for not helping her EAL students herself. She admitted, “I don’t know if I did the right thing or not, but what I wound up doing there was to refer students to the writing center and require them to meet with a tutor and revise papers” (FC258). Sue, on the other hand, felt that she did not have time to address EAL students’ surface discrepancies. She attested, “As far as grammar instruction is concerned. This is college. I simply can’t do it. If you need help with sentence structure, then you need to seek out a tutor or go to the writing center” (FC264).

Finally, some teachers sent EAL students to the writing center as a last resort. Robin reported that, when EAL students had “big trouble” with language, she felt writing center tutors had the expertise to help them (FC260). Tammy recalled one student whose English language level was so low that she wondered how he had managed to get accepted into the university. Considering work with such students, Tammy reported, “I just try to do the best I can with them. I just tell them to come and see me and show me what they think they understand of an assignment and go to the writing center” (FC262). Esther had a similar experience. She taught an Asian student who had such difficulty with writing that Esther thought it was “painful” for her. Esther referred her to the writing center (FC263).

Teachers not only had different reasons for sending EAL students to the writing center, but they also had different levels of involvement as well. Some were very passive and uninvolved, perhaps just making general recommendations to go the writing center. Others played a much more active role, sending EAL students to the writing center with detailed instructions. Adam, for example, pointed out specific errors for his EAL students to address (FC267). Elizabeth wrote instructions on students’ papers, telling students what to focus on (FC268). Aaron was most participatory, sending students to the writing center and tracking their

progress (FC269). He described his role as a facilitator who managed students' writing progress, while the writing center was able to give personal attention (FC272). In this way, Aaron felt the writing center was able to act as a proxy for giving the one-on-one attention that Aaron did not have time to provide. However, Aaron described his role as a necessary evil that was forced on him by increased class caps (FC273).

Following Aaron's model, the writing center might be seen as a valid proxy for one-on-one attention. However, not all teachers were as actively involved as Aaron. Some were much more passive, doing what might be described as "outsourcing" (FC254-255), a descriptor used by Matsuda, Saenkhum, and Accardi (2013) to describe teachers sending EAL students to the writing center instead of working with them personally. In their study, Matsuda, Saenkhum, and Accardi described 12 of the 74 composition instructors they surveyed as outsourcing EAL students to the writing center. However, they also believed that five instructors were actively involved in facilitating EAL students' writing center visits (Matsuda, Saenkhum, & Accardi, 2013).

Perhaps the writing center offers a solution for teachers who are very busy. If teachers play an active role in sending their students to the writing center, it may be an effective proxy for individual attention. A similar idea was advocated by Friedrich (2006), who thought teachers could partner with the writing center to provide individualized attention to EAL students, especially when working on sensitive matters such as plagiarism. However, for some teachers, this situation is not ideal, and they regretted doing it. When Elizabeth described sending EAL students to the writing center, she disclosed, "I don't know if I did the right thing or not" (FC258). Her trepidation was possibly derived from a sense of guilt that she should take

responsibility for her students and not send them away. In addition, Aaron was unequivocally bitter that he could not work individually with students (FC272-273).

In the section entitled Discussion on Advocating One-on-One, I noted that teachers working individually with EAL students might be suitable in some situations, but it is not a panacea. Similarly, using the writing center to provide one-on-one attention is an option, but teachers who employ the writing center in this way should maintain certain qualifications. This idea relies on writing center tutors being able to work with language issues, and Yvonne showed that this might not always be the case (FC265). Still, there is no reason tutors might not be prepared to work with EAL students. Actually, at Midland University, some tutors were EAL specialists and therefore were probably more prepared to work with language issues than some teachers.

Addressing the Research Question

Though EAL specialists recommend effective teaching practices, are such practices utilized in the classroom? Several studies have been done, at least in part, to answer this question (Ferris et al., 2011; Matsuda, Saenkhum, Accardi, 2013; Tardy, 2011) and my study builds off their work by addressing my second research question: How do faculty members' perceptions of teaching EAL students compare to the recommendations of specialists in EAL related fields? In this section, I review some of the findings presented in this chapter to ponder two prevalent recommended practices in EAL related studies: addressing surface-level discrepancies and taking responsibility for teaching EAL students. Other findings from this chapter are reviewed in the discussion section of the next chapter.

Surface-Level Discrepancies

Addressing surface-level discrepancies is one of the most salient topics in fields focused on EAL students. Over decades of debate (Ferris 2004), researchers have come to some agreement about approaching surface-level errors, but one should always remember that individual students have individual needs and there is no absolute blanket rule (Goldstein, 2005). Caveats aside, EAL specialists generally see language learning as a long-term process, and a part of this process is making what can be considered errors (Ferris, 2009; Zamel, 1995). Not all of these errors can be addressed at once, and sometimes they will never be addressed. In many cases, EAL specialists recommend that teachers concentrate on EAL students' meaning, rather than attempting to address all discrepancies (Ferris, 2007; Harris & Silva, 1993; Land & Whitley, 2006; Raftery, 2004). As Zamel (1995) pointed out, language is not learned in isolation, but through participation in context. Thus, as EAL students gradually progress in their academic fields, their discrepancies often naturally decrease.

Counter to EAL specialists' recommendations, some teachers in this study felt, to some degree, that surface-level features of language needed to be addressed and that students needed to master them before they could use more complicated features (FC192-194). Aaron described this as starting with the "nitty-gritty" and then building up language to more complicated structures, such as paragraphs (FC192). Sue saw writing similarly, building from words to sentences to paragraphs (FC194). Though other teachers did not describe a building-block approach to language, they did focus on surface-level discrepancies, marking all perceived errors and writing their perceived correct usage in the margins (FC190, FC187-188). Some of these teachers saw themselves as gatekeepers with an obligation to address errors, an attitude similar to teachers in Zawacki and Habib's (2014) study. Holly, for instance, explained, "I do a disservice

to them [EAL students] and to their other teachers that yes I can comprehend their argument but their syntax needs improvement” (FC185). Eva also believed that she would only impede students’ progress if she did not address their errors (FC190).

Other teachers in this study might be deemed as in line with EAL specialists’ recommendations. Natalie looked for patterns of errors instead of circling all mistakes, and she worked with individual EAL students to try to address these patterns (FC199). Jillian believed circling all errors would just overwhelm students, something she learned when working in a WAC program (FC196). Robin also refused to use a red pen when marking papers because she wanted to focus on ideas and not penalize students for surface-level discrepancies (FC246).

Based on these data, one could make an argument that this study gives evidence that some teachers are following EAL specialists’ recommendations while others are not. However, when teachers’ perceptions are considered more closely, this dichotomy turns out to be far too reductive. Holly, for example, saw herself as a gatekeeper for other classes, but she also recognized that circling all errors was not helping students, so she purposely read papers on a monitor to discourage herself from compulsively marking errors (FC185). When grading, Holly took a realistic approach to surface-level discrepancies. She limited their negative impact to one grade level, and she only took points off once for a repeated mistake (FC237). Most of her grading was based on meaning (FC236).

Holly’s pedagogical approach illustrates a basic conundrum: addressing surface-level errors is complicated. Sometimes complications come from teachers’ contexts. In Natalie’s, Jillian’s, and Robin’s fields, the focus was on ideas and not on preparing students to graduate into a high-pressure profession. This was not true for Eva, who truly acted as a gatekeeper for her profession (FC22-26). In Eva’s profession, details mattered and ignoring them could be seen

as irresponsible, something pointed out by other researchers to be true for teachers in other contexts (Alster, 2004; Leki 2003, 2007; Zawacki and Habib, 2014). However, even in Eva's context, there are different approaches. Loraine was in the same field as Eva, and she resolved surface-level discrepancies by pointing them out and allowing students to resubmit papers as many times as they wanted (FC238). In this way, Loraine found a solution for her context.

Other teachers had not found very good solutions and asked for help. Jane, for example, edited students' papers and handed them back. Her students made changes, but Jane was never sure if her actions were helpful (FC198). She repeatedly asked for help from someone who knew more about EAL students (i.e. an EAL specialist) (FC274-277). Other teachers indirectly showed their doubt in addressing surface errors by the way they graded. Some teachers took off fewer points for EAL students' surface errors than they did for their domestic monolingual classmates' errors (FC233, FC237, FC 238, FC243). But some of them expressed guilt for doing so (FC238, FC243). The implications are that they too were not sure what to do.

If EAL specialists want to advise teachers on how to deal with EAL students' linguistic discrepancies, then specialists should consider teachers' contexts. Not considering context could lead to suggestions that are suitable only for certain teachers in certain contexts but not for others. Context can be field related, as in Eva's case, but also personal. Holly, for example, said her father was an English teacher who was very focused on surface-level discrepancies. Perhaps this made Holly too sensitive toward surface-level errors, but, on the other hand, perhaps this made her more qualified to address them. Both possibilities should be considered.

Throughout the years, EAL experts have offered suggestions for effective teaching practices, and then they bemoan when their advice is not taken (Ferris et al, 2011). And yet their advice does not always incorporate teachers' particular contexts. I contend that if EAL experts

talk with teachers to determine their academic and professional context, they will be able to give more individual and suitable advice. Ultimately, such advice is more likely to be adopted.

Outsourcing EAL Students

In Matsuda, Saenkhum and Accardi's (2013) study, some FYC instructors worked with students before sending them to tutors or the writing center; however, the researchers believed that other teachers "simply outsource instruction by sending them [EAL students] to the writing center" (p. 80). Matsuda (1999) argued that this lack of responsibility began decades ago when TESOL split from composition. After the split, compositionists no longer believed that they had a duty to teach EAL students and expected TESOL experts to do it. Researchers have made similar conclusions about individual teachers (Ferris et al., 2011; Ives et al., 2014; Tardy, 2011).

In this study, there were some teachers who appeared to have outsourced some language teaching, often to the writing center. For example, Kenny (FC253) and Shannon (FC254) both said they routinely asked students to go to the writing center to clean up language issues, making their papers easier to grade. Elizabeth also sent EAL students to the writing center to address language issues, but she seemed to feel guilty about it, disclosing, "I don't know if I did the right thing or not, but what I wound up doing there was to refer students to the writing center and require them to meet with a tutor and revise papers" (FC263). And Sue claimed she had no time to work with language discrepancies, so she sent EAL students to the writing center (FC263).

There were also teachers who, instead of outsourcing language problems, guided EAL students to seek specific help for specific issues (FC252, FC255). None did this more than Aaron; since he worked as an administrator, he looked for EAL students' language discrepancies, sent them to the writing center for specific help and then checked their progress in subsequent

assignments (FC272). However, Aaron believed that this was a necessary evil done in proxy for individual attention, something he could not give because he had too many students.

There is nothing inherently inappropriate about teachers sending EAL students to get outside help at the writing center or from other tutors (FC157-159). In fact, Ferris (2009) suggested one-on-one sessions with tutors can be very helpful. She touted, “They [sessions] have the potential to provide the extended, individualized assistance that is responsive to students' unique writing needs and background knowledge (or lack thereof), that is far less feasible in larger classroom settings (even in multilingual writing courses)” (p. 70). However, there is a difference between teachers actively working with EAL students and tutors, such as what Aaron was doing, and simply sending EAL students out to deal with language issues (FC272), such as what Sue did (FC263).

However, before Sue is judged negatively, her context should be considered. Sue was a second semester TA trying to earn her PhD. On six occasions during our interview, she complained she did not have enough time to work with EAL students. One could argue that Sue’s students might benefit more by going to the writing center and working with a tutor, especially if an EAL specialist tutor was available. Some researchers have argued that the writing center can be a central location where EAL students can get continual and consistent help throughout their university studies (Phillips, Stewart & Stewart, 2006). Alternatively, one might recognize that new faculty could feel overwhelmed with their work and, like Sue, not feel that they have time to work with or learn about teaching EAL students. Thus, EAL specialists might try to reach out to new teachers in particular and ask if they need help. EAL specialists might even offer to work one-on-one with new teachers and address issues they have, thus alleviating their workload.

From the evidence this study provided, it is clear that there are still teachers whose pedagogies are not congruent with EAL specialists' recommendations. However, it is also evident that these issues are complicated and other matters must be considered. Teachers' academic fields and contexts can influence the way they teach and support EAL students. If these matters are considered, some of their actions make more sense, and providing assistance to them may become more effective.

Chapter Conclusion

This chapter presented and discussed findings of how teachers accommodated EAL students in particular instances. It began with how teachers accommodate EAL students' cultural difficulties. Sometimes teachers can alleviate these cultural difficulties by making adjustments or accepting differences. First, however, teachers must understand that there are cultural differences. This can be done through research, as Kenny suggests (FC109-111); but also, a general sensitivity can be gained through something as common as realizing everyone has accents—even teachers (FC154, 156)—or that even our academic language contains slang (FC155). Such information could be conveyed during professional development opportunity events, an idea discussed in Chapter Seven.

In this chapter, I also pointed out that cultural differences do not have to be negative. In fact, 15 teachers desired to have EAL students in their classes because they bring diverse opinions to class discussions (Table 17). However, some EAL students might not want to speak up in class (FC126-133). Teachers, then, have a motivation to try to alter their pedagogies to encourage EAL students to speak up. Teachers might be aided by EAL specialists' suggestions on how they could create an atmosphere that would encourage students to speak. This, too, is discussed in Chapter Seven.

The other problems discussed in this chapter were teachers accommodating for surface discrepancies and testing. Some solutions discussed were working individually with EAL students (Table 29), grading with leniency (Table 33), and directing EAL students to the writing center (Table 35). Essentially, then, this chapter gave insight into the difficulties teachers faced when teaching EAL students and some ways teachers overcame these problems. These insights came primarily through discussions with teachers in their particular contexts. These insights are used at the end of Chapter Seven to give suggestions for making assistance for faculty members teaching writing to EAL students. Thus, assistance is based on teachers' input as experienced in their particular contexts. I contend that if assistance is based on teachers' perceptions and context, it will be best suited for teachers and more likely to be adopted. First, however, I give evidence that teachers actually want assistance and their perceptions of what it might entail.

CHAPTER SEVEN

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF TRAINING TO TEACH EAL STUDENTS

The focus of this chapter is two-fold. First the intention is to present and discuss the data concerning teachers' desires, attitudes, and conceptions of training to teach EAL students. This is done through the same structural design as the previous two chapters. Next, I address the third and final research question: What assistance would be suitable to provide for faculty from across the curriculum teaching writing to EAL students? This research question arose from my original impetus for this study. In 2012, I started to design a resource that teachers could use to teach EAL students. However, I needed to know what such a resource would entail. Now, at the end of this study, my emphasis includes not only resources but professional development opportunities, i.e. training⁴, and guidelines for creating assistance.

This chapter begins by asking if there is even a need for training and if teachers desire it. Then data are presented and discussed concerning what this training might or might not entail. Finally, the focus shifts to addressing the third research question. This question is addressed by drawing on all chapters of this study to give recommendations of what training might entail.

Teachers Desire for Training and Their thoughts About Training

Though one of the main intentions of this study was to outline what training might entail, it is important first to give evidence that such training is even needed and/or desired by teachers. Addressing these questions is done through Table 37. Next, Table 38 presents evidence of teachers' thoughts about what type of training they would like. Then Table 39 concerns teachers'

⁴ In the survey, it was noted that two teachers resented the term *training* because it has connotations of passively receiving information. The term professional development opportunities might be more accepted. However, in my survey and in my coding I used the word training. Thus I had to maintain the term for consistency. Sometimes, though, I refer to training as assistance, which is broader and I feel does not have negative connotations.

recommendations to use colleagues as a resource. In addition, in the discussion section, survey results are reviewed.

Wanting Training to Teach EAL Students

Qualitative evidence in this study indicates that there are teachers who need and want training. This is indicated in Table 37 below. In Table 37, most of the focus codes concern teachers who have not received training to teach EAL students but want it. There are, however, two anomalies. Focus code 282 concerns Robin who felt that she was too close to retirement for training, and for the final focus code, Adam was speaking of graduate students in his program (FC283).

Table 37

Wanting Training to Teach EAL Students

Focus Code	Teacher
274 Admitting no training for EAL students.	Jane
275 Being intimidated teaching EAL students.	Jane
276 Looking forward to some kind of training.	Jane
277 Wanting training because it would be fascinating.	Jane
278 Expressing uncertainty how to teach EAL students because inexperienced.	Yvonne
279 Asking for some training to teach EAL students.	Yvonne
280 Regretting not getting EAL student training early.	Henry
281 Feeling as older faculty more time for training.	Henry
282 Retiring soon and not wanting training.	Robin
283 Having no formal EAL student training at all.	Shannon
284 Admitting to zero training to teach EAL students.	Shannon
285 Having no official training.	Sue
286 Welcoming EAL students but wanting training and resources.	Sue
287 Suggesting school needs more EAL student training.	Harriet
288 Agreeing that getting timely help to teach EAL students important.	Kristen
289 Few graduate students getting training to teach EAL students.	Adam

274. Admitting no training for EAL students: When asked if Jane had training to teach EAL students, she admitted, “Not a thing. Actually never had any formal training in teaching writing.”

275. Being intimidated teaching EAL students: When asked if Jane thought teaching EAL students was an additional burden, she replied,

I think it's intimidating, you know. And I'd like to see some kind of training because I mean I'm not sure if I'm doing it right. I don't know (laughing). I know I try, but I don't know if I'm doing it right. But yeah, I think there is an additional burden. Absolutely.

276. Looking forward to some kind of training: Jane believed that there was information that could help her teach EAL students that someone might be able to provide her. She espoused,

I really look forward to some type of training, I don't know. Like I said I feel like there might be some secrets out there. People who study this, that know what we could be doing or what could help us, but I don't know what that would be.

277. Wanting training because it would be fascinating: Jane did not just look at training to teach EAL students as necessary, but also as fascinating. She asserted, "I'm just interested, not because I have an influx of them [EAL students], but I think it would be fascinating. It could improve your teaching overall. How couldn't it?"

278. Expressing uncertainty how to teach EAL students because inexperienced: As a graduate student, Yvonne's teachers glossed over how to teach EAL students. Yvonne avouched, "In my teaching college writing course in my master program, we talked briefly about it [teaching EAL students] then. But for the most part it was 'Oh and you'll have international students, and let's go on.'"

279. Asking for some training to teach EAL students: Yvonne had experience interacting with EAL students both in and out of the classroom, but had no formal training to teach them. She put forth,

I've had the experience and the interactions [with EAL students], but when it comes to teaching I haven't had that exposure, so I want that, so I know this is how it works. We take pedagogy classes, so why not have this under our belts? We've had exposure to students, you know, you're going to get the letter that says they have a learning disability so you need to structure for that. Great, that's fine. Well maybe give us a thing, like a little course, or an afternoon thing, so I know if I have an EAL student how can I prepare for that. It's just one of those things where I'm willing. I've had exposure to students who are EAL and I'm happy around them. I like them. I find that they have refreshing views on things. I enjoy speaking with them and interacting with them. I would just like to know how to teach individuals like that because I have had little no exposure to that.

280. Regretting not getting EAL student training early: When asked if Henry had attended workshops or had coursework to teach EAL students, Henry said, "I have not. It's too bad." Then when asked if he would be interested in such exposure, he answered,

Yes, I would, particularly at an early stage in my career. I mean, it is undeniably true that it's not until later in your career that you recognize what you should have done earlier in your career and so early in your career you may not do things that later in your career you'll regret not doing. Lord knows I have plenty of those experiences. But yeah, I think given the fact that universities are expanding their demographics because native populations are drying out, yeah, they're going to

reach out more vigorously to international populations. And of course the interconnectedness of the world means that that's going to happen more frequently. So yeah, I think instructor sensitivity to those issues is significant. I wish I had. It's kind of just catch as catch can.

281. Feeling as older faculty more time for training: Henry felt that as a senior faculty member he would appreciate more training to teach EAL students. He purported, "Now, I feel like I have the freedom. I feel like I can say yeah I'm willing to devote some of my scarce time to this because I think it's important. I've reached a point in my career when I can do that."
282. Retiring soon and not wanting training: Though some teachers desired training, Robin was too close to retiring and did not want any. She stated, "I don't have formal training. Almost retired, so we're not get'n any [training]."
283. Having no formal EAL student training at all: Shannon was very direct that she had never had training to teach EAL students. She stated, "I've never had any formal training, not in any of my degrees. I've never completed any formal coursework, nothing."
284. Admitting to zero training to teach EAL students: When asked if she had any training to teach EAL students, Shannon professed, "None. Absolutely none. Would anything benefit me? Yeah. And anyone in this hallway [her colleagues]? Yeah. Because nobody has any background. I don't know anyone else who would be willing."
285. Having no official training: When asked about her background in education, Sue put forth, "I haven't had official training in it [teaching EAL students], and I have often

thought that was a hole in the process because how am I an English teacher in this current climate without any official training in that regard?”

286. Welcoming EAL students but wanting training and resources: When Sue was asked what she would think of having more EAL students in her classrooms, she replied,

That’s great, but provide the training and the resources. It would be a little frustrating if they said we’re going to do this and now it’s your problem. Because it’s not even my own frustration. That’s a disservice to the students. It’s a shame, but I don’t mean just here, but education as a whole. It’s become such a business and it’s about making money and keeping students in schools because you want their tuition money. It’s a disservice to the students.

287. Suggesting school needs more EAL student training: Harriet felt that faculty needed more resources to work with EAL students. She espoused, “And honestly, I think if [the university] is trying to attract more students from other countries, I think we as faculty need to have more information, more direction, more ways that we can be most effective with those students.”

288. Agreeing that getting timely help to teach EAL students important: When asked if Kristen would be receptive to training to teach EAL students, she answered, “Yeah, I think in any situation, extra training with anything, or with basic training with this [teaching EAL students] would be helpful.”

289. Few graduate students getting training to teach EAL students: Adam was a graduate student advisor in his program. When asked if students could have taken courses that concerned working with EAL students, he replied, “Did they have anything for ESL or

TESOL? And the answer is a few [courses]. And that's a real minority. It isn't right, but they don't have enough time in the program the way it's designed."

Thinking About Types of Training

This study gives qualitative evidence that there are faculty members who would like training and/or resources to teach EAL students. The next question to address is what this training and/or resources would entail. This is addressed in Table 38. The first four focus codes (FC290-293) concern what specifically teachers think would be valuable to learn about teaching EAL students. The rest of the focus codes (FC294-299) pertain to more logistical matters, such as where and when training should occur.

Table 38

Thinking About Types of Training

Focus Code	Teacher
290 Wanting to know what EAL students' learning styles are.	Esther
291 Asking for training to help "get into their minds."	Kristen
292 Wanting some pointers about how to teach EAL students.	Harriet
293 Suggesting strategies for teaching cultural competency.	Elizabeth
294 Wanting 2-3 hour workshop.	Brian
295 If not teaching EAL students, no time for training.	Brian
296 Requesting guidelines of "hints" to teach effectively.	Dennis
297 Suggesting localized workshop.	Robin
298 Having a language fair to promote colleague conversations.	Holly
299 Getting a lecture from a specialist was enlightening.	Natalie

290. Wanting to know what EAL students' learning styles are: Esther wanted some resources that would help her understand more about EAL students' learning styles.

She put forth,

I have not seen anything on learning styles that would apply to international students. As Americans we're all into this verbal thing. Just bringing in the discussion. I would think that I would want to learn more about what do I need to

consider? Your ability to talk and your ability to write. But are there other things I'm missing and I should consider when I'm putting a class together, so it taps into the learning style of other students?

291. Asking for training to help "get into their minds:" When asked what resources would help her, Kristen thought knowing more about how EAL students think would give her insights into teaching them. She bemused,

Maybe if a student's struggling or maybe just areas to get in their minds with what they have to deal with day to day. I'm not perfect, but I think I'm pretty good and reading them. Maybe other faculty members who are oblivious to that or just don't care. I don't know.

292. Wanting some pointers about how to teach EAL students: When asked what resources would help her, Harriet responded,

Well, maybe to talk about some pointers. This is what you need to do. This is most helpful. Where they [EAL students] tend to have the most problems. What some differences are, so that we can really be aware of those differences. And some pointers. This would be most helpful; this is what would help them learn and help them grasp the concepts. Is there a different way you could do the syllabus? Is there something that you could do as a teacher in the classroom? I always find they [EAL students] sit up in the front of the class, or near the front. They're not the students that are way back in the back. So just different pointers of how you could be most helpful to them. I think that would be great workshops.

293. Suggesting strategies for teaching cultural competency: Considering resources to teach EAL students, Elizabeth suggested forums about promoting cultural competency. She

averred, “I think a really good cultural competency would give the teacher the tools to assess where students are coming from in terms of their learning styles rather than predetermining that.” She then explained how cultural competency could help teachers:

Some of the students might come from different countries. Some who might come from different region of the United States. Some who might come from different social classes. Some of whom just have very different personalities. What are some strategies to assess where people are at and try to appeal to different learning styles?

294. Wanting 2-3 hour workshop: Brian thought a short workshop on teaching EAL students would help. He proposed, “I think like an overview. A two-hour, three-hour workshop that talks about the different ways to help EAL students learn better. I think that would be beneficial.”

295. If not teaching EAL students, no time for training: Brian thought training to teach EAL students would be helpful, but he admitted that he would only be amenable if he had cause to need training. He confessed,

I think the catch with the training like that is unless you have a student in your class that’s going through that experience, it’s not as applicable. I’m not sure if I would say I got to go check that out. I’d probably see it come across in an email, and I’d say wow, that’s a great idea. Okay thanks. If I had a student like [name of EAL student struggling], I would say, oh, I need to go to that training. So if it was real live applicable in my life at the moment, I’d be there. But if it wasn’t, I’d probably put that off for another day. I think that’s the challenge. If I’m struggling with it, I’m there.

296. Requesting guidelines of "hints" to teach effectively: Dennis thought some resource for teaching EAL students would be beneficial, but he was concerned about training that would take up too much time. He surmised,

What are some of the most helpful intervention? Helpful and not time consuming intervention in teaching large classes that could help EAL students. As soon as they're time consuming, you are going to get a lack of consumption on part of the teachers. If there's just a little hint about little things that you could do that would be helpful to these people, people will do those things.

297. Suggesting localized workshop: Robin felt that workshops on teaching EAL students might be best done at lunch time in a department that had a lot of EAL students. She opined,

The other thing, if you have a high concentration of international students in a college, I would offer it through the college. Take it to them. And make it a morning or span the mid-day. And say if you can't come for the whole day, drop in when you can.

298. Having a language fair to promote colleague conversations: Holly claimed that any information about teaching EAL students given during new faculty orientation was eclipsed by a plethora of other information. She felt instead it might be more useful to have some type of open-information fair, where experts would sit at tables addressing certain issues, and teachers could meander, talking to the experts of their choosing. She ruminated,

I think having just done the new faculty orientation it's such a challenge because you get inundated with information that there's some real practical information I

really wish we had. And even if we're kind of a, like they do the fine arts day. How we greet perspective students where there's tours and that kind of thing. There's a bunch of people in the [meeting room] so they can check out all the major [university] something days.

299. Getting a lecture from a specialist was enlightening: Natalie's perceptions of teaching EAL students changed when she listen to a presentation given by a second language specialist. Natalie explained,

She [the specialist] came to the [place of employment] to give a talk to us about how to help multilingual writers. That idea that when we're having conversation, that the student first is hearing it in English, translates it into her own language, forms a response in her own language, then translates it into English then says it back to me, and that's why it takes three minutes for her to respond to me.

Up to that point, Natalie had never thought of an EAL student's perspective. She reported, "That was the first time I had ever heard that. It was completely enlightening."

Using Colleagues as a Resource for Teaching EAL Students

When considering training, several teachers thought their colleagues could help. In Table 39, focus codes concern faculty members' sentiments that their colleagues could provide or have provided relevant advice for working with EAL students. In the final focus code (FC205), Charlie talks about how he has given advice, and he purports that effective training might involve testimony from colleagues.

Table 39

Using Colleagues as a Resource for Teaching EAL Students

	Focus Code	Teacher
300	Gaining EAL knowledge through conferences, reading.	Adam
301	Getting informal training by listening to colleagues.	Tammy
302	Having a colleague give advice on teaching EAL students.	Kristen
303	Talking to colleagues about teaching EAL students.	Mark
304	Suggesting if needing help, would talk to colleague, and has.	Mark
305	Recommending workshops short and with colleagues for tips.	Charlie

300. Gaining EAL knowledge through conferences, reading: Adam had never received formal training to teach EAL students, but he had learned by osmosis and involvement. He posited,
- I've been to many conferences, and I've seen many presentations. I know what my friends and colleagues do in [SLA studies] and their work and research I've both read and benefited from, and I've talked with them. So in that sense it doesn't count as formal training because it doesn't go on my vitae or anything but there it is. So I think I know something about it.
301. Getting informal training by listening to colleagues: Tammy said during her work, she had heard TESOL professionals give talks and had even invited them into her classrooms, and she benefited from hearing them. She recalled, "[An EAL specialists] would come over to train the [students] about some of the cultural things to look at and how that affects cultural things to look at. Just paying attention."
302. Having a colleague give advice on teaching EAL students: Kristen's friend taught in an intensive English program, and in addition to talking about teaching EAL students, Kristen's friend gave her a chance to meet with EAL students. She recalled,

I did participate one time for my friend [name of friend] who taught in [the intensive English program]. She would do the downtown meet and greet where you just have a conversation. And one night someone backed out, so she called and said get down here and just speak English. So I did that for an hour and 15 minutes or something. So I'm aware of that.

303. Talking to colleagues about teaching EAL students: Though Mark had not had formal training to teach EAL students, he had received advice from colleagues. He said,

I've had exchanges with [a colleague] about his language learning classes and students. And just about the approaches that are represented in the materials in his courses. So, I take what he tells me and I just compare it to what I do. I think about what additional questions and issues are implied by that material. That kind of gives another dimension to my thinking at the point when I develop lessons and announcements and help students while they're engaged in a process.

304. Suggesting if needing help, would talk to colleague, and has: Mark thought if he needed to teach more EAL students he would talk to colleagues and read scholarly material. He espoused, "Well, definitely talking to colleagues and, yeah, I would read about those who had gone before. What's their recommendation for that?"

305. Recommending workshops short and with colleagues for tips: When asked what workshop on teaching EAL students would work best for teachers, Charlie said,

I think no format will please everyone. Secondly, I think 45 minutes is probably the amount of attention you are going to have. I would also say that one approach is to contact instructors who have different ideas and have them get together before the symposium and brainstorm the different ideas and then have the

symposium be like three or four professors and like six tips or five tips, three lesson plans, so that you have peers.

Discussion on Teachers Desire for Training and Their thoughts About Training

This study presents evidence that there are teachers who need and would like training to teach EAL students. Some teachers attested that they felt unprepared to teach EAL students and some desired some type of professional development opportunities. None were as adamant as Jane. Six different times during our interview, she expressed how unconfident she felt teaching EAL students, and twice she talked about how she wanted some training. Here she expressed both sentiments:

I think it's [teaching EAL students] intimidating, you know. And I'd like to see some kind of training because I mean I'm not sure if I'm doing it right. I don't know (laughing). I know I try, but I don't know if I'm doing it right (FC275).

Twice Jane expressed concerns that there were some secrets to teaching EAL students, almost like a magic formula that she was missing but that someone might be able to provide her. She explained,

I really look forward to some type of training, I don't know. Like I said I feel like there might be some secrets out there. People who study this that know what we could be doing or what could help us, but I don't know what that would be. (FC276)

Other teachers also felt positive about training. Yvonne explained that in her graduate school coursework there was only a brief mention of teaching EAL students, but she felt she wanted more. She posited,

I've had exposure to students who are EAL, and I'm happy around them. I like them. I find that they have refreshing views on things. I enjoy speaking with them and interacting

with them. I would just like to know how to teach individuals like that because I have had little no exposure to that. (FC279)

Shannon was adamant that she had never received training to teach EAL students and believed none of the other teachers in her program had either, but she thought that they all would benefit from training (FC282-283). Even Henry, who had been teaching for 30 years, said that he regretted not having training to teach EAL students but would welcome it. He felt as a senior faculty member that he had more time to devote to the subject (FC280-281). However, not all teachers wanted training. Robin, for example, said that she was retiring soon and was not interested (FC282).

Along with these qualitative findings, it is useful here to review relevant quantitative survey findings reviewed in Chapter Four. In survey results, 46% of survey takers had never had any academic training to teach EAL students, while 53% had one or more hours of training (Table 5). In addition, 55% were positive or very positive about training, while only 6% were negative or very negative about training. The rest were neutral about it (Table 6). And in total, 71% wanted more training, while 29% did not.

One reason teachers might have wanted training was that they could have been encountering more EAL students, since Midland University was actively increasing its EAL population. This was something Sue (FC285-286) and Harriet (FC287) remarked on. They felt that with this increase, Midland University was obligated to provide more assistance for teachers. Harriet professed, “And honestly, I think if [Midland University] is trying to attract more students from other countries, I think we as faculty need to have more information, more direction, more ways that we can be most effective with those students” (FC286). This study’s survey provides mixed support to the idea that teachers wanted training because they were

encountering more EAL students. While three teachers stated in an open-ended field that they wanted more training, four teachers felt they did not need training because they taught so few EAL students (Table 6).

When asked what training might entail, some teachers were very specific about wanting to know more about EAL students' perspectives. Several teachers wanted to know more about international EAL students' learning styles in their home countries (FC290-292). Such information, they felt, would help them see international EAL students' perspectives and allow teachers to teach more effectively.

If training were to be offered, what types did teachers feel would be effective? Natalie testified that even short workshops can work well. At another university where she worked as an adjunct professor, Natalie listened to a lecture by a colleague who was an EAL specialist. It was the first time Natalie had thought of the difficulties EAL students might face with language and she said it was "completely enlightening." In fact, she said that one short lecture permanently changed her approach to teaching EAL students (FC299).

Several faculty members advocated short workshops. Dennis advised, "As soon as they're [workshops] time consuming, you are going to get a lack of consumption on part of the professors" (FC296). Charlie suggested 45 minutes was about all one could expect teachers to tolerate (FC305). Brian thought that he would attend a two- or three-hour workshop (FC294), but said he would only attend if he was teaching an EAL student who had issues. Brian professed,

I think the catch with the training like that is unless you have a student in your class that's going through that experience, it's not as applicable. I'm not sure if I would say I got to go check that out. I'd probably see it come across in an email, and I'd say wow, that's a great idea. Okay thanks. If I had a student like [name of EAL student struggling], I would

say, oh, I need to go to that training. So if it was real live applicable in my life at the moment, I'd be there. But if it wasn't, I'd probably put that off for another day. I think that's the challenge. If I'm struggling with it, I'm there. (FC295)

At time of this study, Midland University offered no consistent EAL writing workshop. In the absence of formal training, some teachers consulted their colleagues. Mark was able to speak to colleagues who specialized in EAL writing, and he felt that if he had more questions he would consult with them further (FC303-304). Adam divulged that he had never had formal training but was able to work with colleagues who were EAL specialists and even do research and present at conferences with them (FC300). Charlie had taught for 23 years and had a lot of experience with working with EAL students. Charlie suggested one approach to training would be involving colleagues together for a symposium and maybe have three or four teachers with experience teaching EAL students share pedagogical tips (FC305).

In sum, this study gives evidence that there are teachers who felt they were not prepared to teach EAL students, they would like assistance, and they gave some indication of what such assistance might entail. This is similar to several studies reviewed in Chapter Two (Ferris et al., 2011; Ives et al., 2014; Matsuda, Saenkhum, & Accardi, 2013; Tardy, 2011). In addition, this study's survey gives the indication that at Midland the majority of writing teachers wanted more training to teach EAL students (Table 7). Is this true at other universities? In absence of a widespread survey, it is hard to say. But, as noted above, both the EAL student population and WAC programs are expanding, so it is logical to assume that more teachers at more universities will be teaching more EAL students writing in more fields. Thus, it seems plausible that more teachers will also feel inadequately prepared to teach EAL students writing and want assistance to do so.

Addressing the Research Question

In this section, I address the final research question: What assistance would be suitable to provide for faculty from across the curriculum teaching writing to EAL students? To answer this question, first I present evidence that there is actually a need for such assistance. Next, I discuss assistance offered by other researchers. Finally, I give suggestions based on this study's findings.

Do Teachers Want Assistance?

This study provides quantitative evidence that WAC faculty members were receptive to training to teach EAL students. The survey of this study indicates that 86% of the 122 participants had taught two or more EAL students (Table 9), 85% had taught one or more courses that included EAL students (Table 10), 90% had some exposure to EAL students outside of academia (Table 8), and 57% felt positive about teaching EAL students (Table 11). In addition, 52% had received some type of training to teach EAL students (Table 5), 55% were positive or very positive about training to teach EAL students (Table 6), and 71% wanted more training (Table 7). In sum, the survey results indicate that even though the majority of teachers were experienced and knowledgeable about teaching EAL students, they still were very perceptive about receiving more training to teach EAL students.

Qualitative data from interviews gives a closer look at why some teachers might want training. Jane, for example, felt intimidated teaching EAL students (FC275) and stressed multiple times that she would like to have some sort of assistance, including training (FC276-278). Other studies have also given similar evidence (Ferris et al, 2011; Ives et al. 2014; Matsuda, Saenkhum & Accardi, 2013). For example, in Matsuda, Saenkhum, and Accardi's (2013) survey of 74 composition teachers, seven teachers indicated that they wanted more professional development opportunities. In some studies teachers did not ask for assistance, but admitted that

they did not understand what was expected of them (Ives et al., 2014; Tardy, 2011). Finally, there is also supporting evidence in K-12 studies (Dekutoski, 2001; Reeves, 2004).

In sum, survey evidence indicates that Midland University WAC faculty members had received some training to teach EAL students, were positive about training, and were positive about receiving training. Qualitative data give more details about teachers' attitudes toward training. Eight teachers said that they would like to receive training, and six of them said they felt inadequately prepared to teach EAL students (Table 37). If universities do not provide this assistance, even while they actively pursue to increase their EAL population, then these universities are being negligent toward their faculty and EAL students. Furthermore, as both the EAL student population and WAC programs increase, the impetus to provide faculty assistance only becomes more pressing. Therefore, if universities accept international students and take their tuition money, they are obligated to serve these students, and part of this is providing assistance to these students' teachers.

Developing Resources for Teachers

In the literature reviewed in Chapter Two, researchers provided very few suggestions for assistance to instructors teaching writing to EAL students. Matsuda, Saenkhum, and Accardi (2013) and Ferris et al. (2011) endorsed graduate professional development opportunities, but did not offer many specifics, nor did they offer any suggestions for existing faculty. Tardy (2011), though, suggested any changes made to policy should involve faculty input. Based on teachers' perceptions, this study, then, offers some guidelines for providing assistance as well as some specific techniques.

When designing assistance, it is important to consider faculty context. Since teachers accommodating or not accommodating EAL students is affected by context, assistance should be

made while considering teachers' fields, personal experience, and academic position. For example, new faculty, adjunct faculty, and TAs could be very busy and have only limited time for professional training, but they also might have the least experience working with EAL students and not have established networks of support to turn to. Thus, this would be an appropriate group to target for assistance by, perhaps, advertising professional opportunities at orientation meetings or in personal communication such as emails. One idea Mike (FC140), and to some extent Yvonne (FC279), brought up was that EAL students might have the option of having a university office send out letters before a term starts informing teachers they would have an EAL student in their course. This would allow teachers to prepare to teach EAL students, but also such a letter might list resources and assistance available for the teacher.

When considering academic field contexts, those who design assistance might do well to keep in mind that certain fields or programs might stress accuracy while other might stress ideas, even global ideas. For the former, teachers in programs such as Safety Science, Nursing and Math might want more work on giving written feedback, but they might also benefit by considering different ways of accommodating EAL students, such as ignoring discrepancies on drafts or in certain genres. Whereas, teachers in fields such as sociology or global history might benefit more from discussions on creating environments that encourage students' input, such as those Robin (FC138-139) and Charlie (FC136-137) strove to create.

The format of assistance should also be made with teachers' contexts in mind. Teachers in this study complained of increased class loads (FC47-61) and being very busy (FC40-46). When particular types of assistance were brought up, some teachers felt that they only had time for short workshops (FC294, FC305). Short workshops are not always ideal. Ferris et al. (2011) criticized one of their study participants for surmising that a quick two-and-a-half hour training

class would enable teachers to “understand L2 writers’ difficulties” (p. 225). However, short workshops can be effective in the right context. Natalie (FC299) indicated that when she was a new teacher, a single workshop revolutionized her pedagogy. Short sessions might, then, target new faculty, adjunct faculty, and TAs who might not have had much exposure teaching EAL students and could benefit from introductions. Yet, these workshops should be seen mainly as an introduction, not as something of a quick-fix, something several teachers desired (FC294, FC305).

Something else some teachers desired was to know learning styles of different cultures (FC120, 290, 291, 296). They seemed to believe that each culture could easily be summarized and this summary could be used to teach students from these cultures. Some professors even created stereotypes about students from certain cultures (FC104, 105, 106, 114). The problem is that stereotypes are for general populations and not meant for individual students. Seeing a student only from his or her culture is reductive and can be inaccurate and even harmful. A better approach might be one Elizabeth (FC293) suggested. Elizabeth believed that teachers could benefit by gaining a general cultural competence. For example, teachers could learn “to assess where people are at and try to appeal to different learning styles.” This is a much more student-centered approach that values students as unique individuals.

Instead of workshops, one of the most effective and succinct formats might be giving assistance one-on-one, especially to new teachers. As Holly pointed out (FC298), during orientations, new teachers might feel overwhelmed and miss information. One-on-one consultations could provide custom assistance at a more convenient time. In addition, one-on-one consulting could involve EAL specialists negotiating with teachers to create the most suitable solutions.

Something else teachers brought up was using veteran faculty as a resource (FC300-305). Experienced teachers have the advantage of experience as well as having an insider's academic field and even program perspective. A long-time nursing professor might be able to give newer faculty advice on balancing field requirements with student accommodation. Thus EAL specialists might ally with experienced faculty, working with them to create assistance such as panel discussions or ongoing support.

One factor that seemed to have motivated teachers to accommodate EAL students was empathy. Teachers who had studied abroad in an additional language were more motivated to accommodate EAL students in various ways (FC89-101). However, to ask faculty to go abroad and study an additional language is not realistic. Still, there are other ways faculty might be able to gain empathy. Charlie advised his colleagues to try to empathize with EAL students by recalling their experiences studying an additional language domestically (FC99). This is similar to what Cox (2014) tries to emulate in her workshops. She asks faculty to write in an additional language they studied, then switch to their mother tongue, and finally reflect on their experiences. This simple technique is a powerful way for teachers to experience some of what EAL students might experience.

Empathy can also be gained by raising the awareness of language usage. Eva described how she had failed to communicate with an EAL student because she had used slang (FC155). This was an epiphany moment for Eva when she realized that she actually had a vernacular language different than Standard English. Jane had a similar experience and tried consciously not to use slang when speaking to EAL students (FC156). Both Eva and Jane had to negotiate language to communicate, something some EAL students must do all the time. Creating similar

experiences for other teachers might lead to empathy. For example, even just asking teachers to converse without using slang or idioms might raise their consciousness of language.

Research in K-12 studies has given evidence that training can make teachers feel more positive toward EAL students (Blake & Culter, 2003; Garcia-Nevarez, Safford, & Arias, 2005; Mantero & McVicker, 2006; Smith, 2004). Some of these training programs even attempted to instill empathy in teachers. In one case, researchers replicated EAL students' situations by asking preservice teachers to live with a family with limited English abilities (FERENCE & Bell, 2004). In another case, preservice teachers were asked to tutor EAL students one-on-one (Pappamihel, 2007). In both studies, preservice teachers gained empathy for EAL students. Empathy might also be encouraged in university teachers. For example, offering teachers the opportunity to tutor EAL students or just meet and talk with them could lead to more understanding and then empathy.

Concerning more practical matters, teachers in this study also gave some helpful suggestions about accommodating EAL students in the classroom. Though this study was not designed to give pedagogical tips, it is worth a moment to quickly go over a few. Considering teaching in very large classes, some teachers recommended that students might be divided into smaller groups that could work as a proxy to giving individual attention (FC168-175).

Considering teachers who are very busy, teachers could send EAL students to tutors, such as those in the writing center, to get help, but the teachers might consider taking an active role in monitoring such assistance, like Aaron did (FC272-273). To accommodate for testing, teachers might consider the options put forth by teachers in this study, such as giving extra time or providing alternative testing (FC218-227). Finally, providing more written text gives context to lectures and is a much more familiar media to some EAL students (FC163-167).

Since these techniques and tips come from teachers, they already have tested successes. They also offer grassroots ways of accommodating EAL students, and so might have more chance of being accepted by teachers. Yet they are only suggestions, options to use, and may not work in different contexts. They could, however, be investigated by researchers to see how well they work and what their limits are. In this way, teachers and researchers could work together to find effective pedagogies for working with EAL students.

There is one technique that teachers often turn to that is problematic. Often teachers see spending one-on-one time with EAL students as a default way to accommodate them (FC200-212). This was also suggested by one of this study's survey participants in an open-end field (Appendix D) and by participants in Matsuda, Saenkhum, and Accardi's (2013) study. For some teachers, this might be their default because they simply do not know what else to do (FC200, 211). The problem is that it is a difficult approach to sustain. Karl worked an hour or more every week with one EAL student who was struggling (FC207). Fortunately Karl had only one student who needed help. If he had more, it would be difficult for him to provide all students with the assistance they need. To give teachers this one-on-one capability, college administration would need to allow teachers more time and/or fewer students. Alternatively, teachers might learn classroom techniques for working with EAL students so they would not have to rely giving one-on-one attention.

Finally, teachers could be encouraged to partner with the writing center to help EAL students. EAL students might feel very comfortable seeking out linguistical help at the writing center (FC247-249). And, in some cases, the writing center can be a proxy for individual attention for teachers (FC270-273). However, this is contingent on having a writing center with tutors who can work with EAL students, and this is not always the case (FC265). If teachers do

send their EAL students to the writing center, they might be encouraged to give students specific instructions and then watch students' progress (FC272-273), not just outsource students to the writing center. Again, these are suggestions only, and they need to be compared to current writing center research.

Chapter Conclusion

The main purpose of this chapter was to present evidence that there is a need and desire for assistance for faculty members teaching EAL students writing and then to describe what this assistance could entail. The intention was not to provide specific pedagogical techniques, though some were discussed, but instead to give some foundational concepts which assistance might be based upon. One of the main concepts is that context influences the way teachers accommodate EAL students, and teachers' context should be considered when assistance is being offered. Using this concept as a guide, EAL specialists can build more appropriate assistance for teachers. Another concept pervasive throughout this study is that to learn about context, researchers need to talk to teachers. This conversation could benefit researchers, teachers, and students.

CHAPTER EIGHT

WHAT HAPPENED AND WHAT COULD HAPPEN

In this final chapter, I begin with a summary of findings, focusing particularly on answering my research questions. I include this because my findings were spread out over multiple chapters, and I feel that the reader would benefit from having one succinct overall summary. These findings, I argue, were only possible because I had a dialogue with teachers; hence, after my summary of the findings, I present a case that the field of second language writing (SLW) could benefit from an increase in dialogue, not only among researchers and teachers, but also with EAL students and administration. Following this section, I discuss this study's limitations, implications for future research, and some final thoughts.

Summary of the Findings

In this study, Chapter Five addressed the first research question: What conditions impede or enable teachers to accommodate EAL students? However, I began this chapter by pointing out that some EAL students neither need nor want accommodation because they feel that they have no problem competing with their domestic counterparts. Then I discussed how teachers accommodating or not accommodating EAL students was influenced by teachers' contexts. Three teachers were in fields that required students to meet certain standards that the teachers did not feel could be changed to accommodate EAL students (Table 14). This applied in particular to three teachers: Sean (FC16-21), Eva (FC22-26), and Loraine (FC27-30). Other teachers, particularly new teachers, did not feel that they could accommodate EAL students because they were too busy (Table 15). In particular, these comments came from four teachers: adjuncts Aaron (FC43) and Shannon (FC44-45); new tenure-track faculty member Brian (FC46), and TA Sue (FC40). There were 12 teachers who felt their classes were too large, and so they felt that they

could not give EAL students the personal attention they believed the students needed (Table 16). They were Aaron (FC47), Esther (FC48-50), Henry (FC51), Charlie (FC53), Holly (FC 53-54), Elizabeth (FC 56), Philip (FC57), Gary (FC 58), Brian (FC59), Jillian (FC60), and Robin (FC61). Next, there were 15 teachers who were in fields that valued diverse opinions. These teachers wanted to accommodate EAL students because they thought these students could add content to their classes. These teachers were Josh (FC62), Henry (FC63-64, 74), Charlie (FC65), Brian (FC66), Jane (FC67, 72), Harriet (FC68, 80), Adam (FC69, 76, 84), Esther (FC70), Josh (FC73, 85), Mark (FC75), Jillian (FC77-78), Elizabeth (FC79; 88), Tammy (FC81), Eva (FC82-83) Kristen (FC86), and Philip (FC87). Also, there were eight teachers who had personal experiences, such as studying an additional language abroad, which moved them to accommodate EAL students because they felt empathy toward them. Specifically, they were Jane (FC89), Karl (FC90-92), Kenny (FC94-95), Harriet (FC68; FC93) Charlie (FC97-99, 167-168), Joe (FC214-216), and Josh (FC214). In sum, whether teachers accommodated EAL students or not could depend on teachers' contexts—either personal or professional.

The focus of Chapter Six was to address what factors might influence teachers accommodating EAL students, and if they do, how do they? The chapter began by looking at how teachers accommodate cultural differences. Sometimes teachers perceived that they have an onus to learn about EAL students' first cultures, rather than EAL students bearing the onus to learn about US culture (Table 19). Six teachers expressed this sentiment. They were Holly (FC102), Joe (FC103), Harriet (FC104), Kenny (FC105-106), Jillian (FC107), and Loraine (FC108). Sometimes teachers' motivation for accommodation resulted in creating classroom environments that encouraged EAL students to make contributions during discussions and to add their diverse opinions to the class (Table 22). Eight teachers expressed this sentiment: Elizabeth

(FC134), Charlie (FC135-136), Henry (FC137), Robin (FC138-139), Mike (FC140), Esther (FC141-143), Karl (FC144), and Joe (FC145-147). Other forms of accommodations were very specific, including the use of more written texts and the practice of breaking large classes into smaller groups (Table 25). Six teachers expressed these sentiments. They were Karl (FC168), Joe (FC169-170), Dennis (FC171), Esther (FC172), Loraine (FC173), and Shannon (FC174-175). Nine teachers felt that they needed to work one-on-one with EAL students (Table 29). They were Kristen (FC200-204), Henry (FC205), Eva (FC206), Karl (FC207), Sean (FC208), Joe (FC209), Natalie (FC210), Yvonne (FC211), and Holly (FC212). This seemed to be a default that they relied on if they did not know what else to do. Ten teachers, accommodated EAL students during testing (Table 30; Table 31), seven of them did so by allowing them to take extra time. They were Kristen (FC218), Harriet (FC219-220), Elizabeth (FC221, 225), Adam (FC222), Jillian (FC223-224), Esther (FC226), and Kristen (FC227). Nine teachers admitted to grading EAL students more leniently. These teachers were Shannon (FC233-235), Holly (FC236-237), Henry (FC238), Loraine (FC239), Natalie (FC240-241), Kristen (FC242), Jane (FC243-244), Adam (FC245), and Robin (FC246). Of these, Henry (FC238), Shannon (FC233), Holly (FC237), and Jane (FC243) seemed to do so guiltily, as if they were doing something they should not do. Finally, 16 teachers utilized the writing center in various ways (Table 35). Kenny (FC254) and Shannon (FC255) did so just to have students clean up papers, while Aaron (FC269) worked more as an administrator who assigned EAL students' textual features to address at the writing center and later checked students' progress.

I used select findings from Chapter Six to address my second research question: How do faculty members' perceptions of teaching EAL students compare to the recommendations of specialists in EAL related fields? I addressed two particular issues. First, I asked if teachers were

outsourcing their EAL students instead of taking responsibility to teach them. There was evidence that this had happened, and teachers explained why. Sue (FC40), Aaron (FC43), Shannon (FC44) and Brian (FC46) felt too busy to help EAL students. Six teachers claimed that they lacked the needed knowledge to help EAL students and asked for assistance with training. They were Jane (FC274), Yvonne (FC278), Shannon (FC283), Sue (FC285), and Kristen (FC288). The second specific issue I addressed was do teachers ignore surface-level discrepancies in texts and instead concentrate on meaning, something recommended by researchers. Seven teachers did not follow such recommendations and often focused instead on addressing surface-level errors (Table 27). They were Shannon (FC183), Mike (FC184), Holly (FC185), Eva (FC 187), Gary (FC188), Aaron (FC192) and Sue (FC193-194). Sean (FC17) and Eva (FC23) felt their field demanded it because in their field paying attention to detail was imperative. Holly (FC185) and Jane (FC198) professed to focusing on surface-level discrepancies, but questioned if their practice helped and asked for advice. In short, there was evidence that professors were not following EAL specialists' recommended practices, but some felt that this was because their contexts would not allow them to. Others admitted that they did not know what to do and asked for assistance.

In Chapter Seven, I took findings from the previous chapters to address my final research question: What assistance would be suitable to provide for faculty from across the curriculum teaching writing to EAL students? First I asked if there was evidence that the teachers actually wanted assistance. My research (Table 37), and that of others (Ferris et al., 2011; Ives et al., 2014; Matsuda, Saenkhum, & Accardi, 2013), suggested that they do. Next, I gave suggestions for practical techniques for providing assistance to teachers. I based these suggestions on my

findings, though some were direct suggestions from teachers. In this way, I believe I show that assistance can be created by talking with teachers and evincing their needs.

A Case for Increasing Dialogue

This study was an attempt to listen to teachers. By listening to teachers, I was able to understand their contexts and see that these contexts can influence the way teachers may or may not accommodate their EAL students. I was also able to learn about methods that teachers use to teach EAL students. Some of these methods are very effective, such as when they give EAL students extra time to process language when taking tests. Some methods are inefficient and difficult to sustain, such as working one-on-one with EAL students while class caps are rising. However, they are methods that can be investigated and tested to see which ones work in a given situation.

By listening to teachers, I was also able to learn about teachers' perceptions of EAL students. Some of their views appear to be essentialist, stereotyping EAL students as diligent or lazy. Some of their perspectives appear to be linguistically biased, looking at EAL students mostly as being language deficient. However, before these perspectives are criticized, teachers and their contexts must be considered. When contexts are understood, teachers' perspectives might not seem as negative. For example, when one considers that nursing students all need to pass a timed board exam to enter their profession, one can understand why nursing faculty would want to duplicate board exam conditions and therefore be reluctant to give EAL students extra time to take practice tests. However, this does not mean accommodation cannot be made. It means that if accommodation is made, it must be done while respecting the contexts of teachers and their fields. In the case of nursing students, perhaps a system could allow for EAL students, and others, to register for extra testing time on practice exams that would decrease gradually

until they actually are required to take board exams. Such a solution is created with the understanding of contexts and has more chance of being accepted by nursing faculty than solutions which are made without considering context.

Listening to teachers can help us to understand their situations and methods, but it can also be an important step in starting a dialogue. We can listen to teachers to learn about their methods; then EAL specialists can research these methods to find out which ones are effective. We can report our findings to teachers, who may consider our findings, and adjust their pedagogies. This is a reiterative process, which is essentially what a dialogue is. Through this dialogue, we can find effective pedagogies for different contexts. Without this dialogue, EAL specialists are just telling teachers what is best practice, and they risk giving advice that is irrelevant.

Not all teachers would enter into such a dialogue. However, this study gives evidence that there were teachers who wanted to talk about teaching EAL students. Indeed, based on survey data, WAC faculty members are experienced in teaching EAL students, positive about teaching EAL students and desire training to teach EAL students. Having a dialogue with teachers can help to determine what type of training or resource they might want while promoting the exchange of ideas with a population that is informed and positive about teaching EAL students.

Dialogue does not have to stay between the researcher and teacher, but rather it should include EAL students. Such inclusion might to help resolve issues such as how teachers can take advantage of EAL students' diverse opinions without treating them like a resource to be tapped. The dialogue could be further extended to university administration, which could help to address issues such as large class cap sizes that impede teachers from spending individual time with students. Administration would also benefit by knowing what support teachers need in order to

successfully work with EAL students. Through dialogue, then, the division of labor might be addressed and the task and privilege of working with EAL students could be shared by the greater university community.

Study Limitations

One of the main limitations of this study was that it was done at a single location. Studies done at other universities in other situations might yield very different results. However, having one location also has its advantages because the population pool of this study can be described and further research can compare it to similar populations. In this study, the population pool consisted of WAC faculty at a mid-sized, Midwestern state university. Based on survey results, these faculty members were seasoned teachers with experience teaching EAL students and who had some academic training to teach EAL students. They had, for the most part, positive attitudes toward teaching EAL students, training to teach EAL students and receiving more training to teach EAL students. Comparing these results to similar universities, or universities in very different situations could yield very different results.

Finally, for this study I had limited time and resources to conduct this study, so I was not able to perform follow-up interviews. Follow-up interviews could have clarified some matters and elucidated others. They could also offer the chance to make a more statistical impact. In this study, questions to teachers were not always consistent, which means that the numbers of teachers who expressed certain opinions cannot be compared to the total number of teachers. For example, even though eight teachers gave extra time for testing, it would be inaccurate to state that only 27% of teachers felt this way. Other teachers might have held similar sentiments, but the matter was simply not discussed. Follow-up interviews could make such comparisons possible.

Implications for Future Research

Limitations can also be seen as opportunities. Although only a limited amount of faculty members from one university were involved in this study, this means there are opportunities to expand. Future studies could also investigate different universities. This study concerned a mid-sized university with a small but expanding EAL student population. Other universities have maintained large EAL populations for many years. Studies at universities like these could yield more pedagogical techniques that could be passed on to other teachers. Other universities have experienced very rapid increases in EAL students, sometimes going from very few to a substantial number. A study at one of these universities could help to determine if teachers were prepared to teach EAL students and, if not, what assistance might help them.

With more time and resources, future studies might involve follow-up interviews, strengthening findings while adding needed details. One particular approach would be to do a follow-up study over a number of years, particularly with faculty from this study. A longitudinal study would make it possible to follow new and temporary faculty and see how their perceptions toward EAL students develop. If any study was done in the future, I would advocate it strive to promote a dialogue between teachers and researchers. I would like to address this before my final thoughts.

Finally, the survey results were only used in their rudimentary form. Adding cross tabulation and conducting correlation analysis could elucidate how specific teachers felt about teaching EAL students and if different factors correlate. For example, further statistical analysis might elucidate whether teachers' perceptions of EAL students become more or less positive with more exposure to EAL students, both inside and outside of academia.

Final Thoughts

Many universities today are trying to attract EAL students, especially those from abroad. If done with care, universities can address EAL students' needs and foster an atmosphere conducive to reaping the benefits that EAL students can provide. EAL students can be an invaluable resource for their teachers and their classmates. EAL students are not, however, something that can be tapped at will. Their right to be left alone must be respected. Still, universities and teachers can work to make an inclusive environment so that EAL students might be more comfortable sharing their opinions.

Part of creating this supportive atmosphere is providing assistance to the teachers who teach EAL students, especially those who need and desire such assistance. Helping these teachers not only helps their EAL students, but it can also help all students (Hall, 2009). This study provides some evidence of what these resources and training may entail, but it has only scratched the surface. With more research, I might be able to determine which practices ensure that all students can work in a supportive environment.

One final note concerns something only briefly discussed in the study. Why are EAL student populations growing in universities? In some cases, universities see international students as a source of revenue and a way to boost enrollment numbers (Fischer, 2015). In fact, in the spring of 2015, Midland University hired a recruiter with the specific task of boosting international student enrollment. This is something that other, perhaps many, universities appear to be pursuing. In fact, at a local conference in 2014, I spoke to university administrators from several universities that were actively pursuing international students, but only as an afterthought were looking to provide support for these students or their teachers. This is the situation that Kristen (FC203) was put into. Administration had informed her program that the school was

admitting more international exchange students but were not offering any type of support to her or her program. Without support, faculty members can start to feel resentment, something especially evident in this study's open-field survey comments, where one teacher accused Midland University of using international students as a "cash cow."

I am, however, happy to state that Midland University was making an effort to help international EAL students. In the fall of 2014, Midland University opened a new tutorial service just to support EAL students. Changes like these reflect on an institution's desire not just to take international students' tuition dollars but to support them and create a better university overall.

References

- Alster, K. B., (2004). Writing in nursing education and nursing practice. In V. Zamel & R. Spack (Eds.) *Crossing the curriculum: Multilingual learners in college classrooms* (pp. 163-180). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bazerman, C. Little, J. Bethel, L. Chavkin, T. Fouquette, D., & Garufis, J. (2005). *Reference guide to writing across the curriculum*. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press.
- Bereton, J. C. (1995). *The origins of composition studies in the American college, 1875-1925: A documentary history*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Berlin, J. (1987). *Rhetoric and reality: Writing instruction in American colleges, 1900-1985*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Blake, R., & Cutler, C. (2003). AAE and variation in teachers' attitudes: A question of school philosophy? *Linguistics and Education*, 14(2), 163-194. doi:10.1215/00031283-1668217
- Block, D. (2003). *The social turn in second language acquisition*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Charmaz, K. (2011). Grounded theory methods in social justice research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. E. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed., pp. 359-380). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Charmaz, K. (2000). Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 509-535). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Charmaz, K. (1991). *Good days bad days: The self in chronic illness and time*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Chiang, Y-S., & Schmida, M. (1999). Language identity and language ownership: Linguistic conflicts of first-year university writing students. In L. Harklau, K. M. Losey, & M. Siegal (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 meets college composition: Issues in the teaching of writing to U.S.-Educated Learners of ESL* (pp. 81-96). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cho, Y., Kim, M., Svinicki, M. D., & Decker, M. L. (2011). Exploring teaching and characteristics of graduate teaching assistants. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 16(3), 267-279. doi:10.1080/13562517.2010
- Cox, M. (2014). In response to today's "felt need": WAC, faculty development, and second language writers. In T. M. Zawacki & M. Cox (Eds.). *WAC and second language writers: Research towards linguistically and culturally inclusive programs and practices*, (pp. 299-326). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cox, M. (2011). WAC: Closing doors or opening doors for second language writers? *Across the Disciplines: A Journal of Language, Learning, and Academic Writing*, 8(4), Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/ell/cox.cfm>
- Dekutoski, C. G. (2011). *Mainstream teacher attitudes toward English language learners. Unpublished dissertation*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Available from Proquest Dissertations and Theses Database. (UMI No. 3466838).

- Ference, R. A., & Bell, S. (2004). A cross-cultural immersion in the U.S.: Changing preservice teacher attitudes toward Latino ESOL students. *Equity & Excellence*, 37(4), 343-350.
doi:10.1080/10665680490518605
- Ferris, D. (2004). The “Grammar correction” debate in L2 writing: Where are we, and where do we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime...?). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(1), 49-62.
- Ferris, D. (2007). Preparing teachers to respond to student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(2), 165-193. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2007.07.003
- Ferris, D. (2009). *Teaching college writing to diverse student populations*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Ferris, D., Brown, J., Hsian, L., Eugenia, M., & Stine, A. (2011). Responding to L2 students in college writing classes: Teacher perspectives. *TESOL Quarterly*, 45(2), 207-234.
doi:10.5054/tq.2011.247706
- Fisher, K. (2016, May 5). Colleges help the faculty adapt teaching for foreign students. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.chronicle.com>
- Fischer, K. (2015, November 16). Overseas students pour into some American campuses, but other colleges haven’t kept up with the growth. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.chronicle.com>
- Fishman, S. M., & McCarthy, L. (2004). When writing to learn is not enough. In V. Zamel, & R. Spack (Eds.) *Crossing the curriculum: Multilingual learners in college classrooms* (pp. 145-162). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

- Friedrich, P. (2006). Assessing the needs of linguistically diverse first-year students: Bringing together and telling apart international ESL, residential ESL and monolingual basic writers. *Writing Program Administration*, 30(1-2), 15-35. Retrieved from <http://www.wpacouncil.org>
- Garcia-Nevarez, A. G., Safford, M. E., & Arias, B. (2005). Arizona elementary teachers' attitudes toward English language learners and the use of Spanish in classroom instruction. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 29(2), 295-317.
doi:10.1080/15235882.2005.10162837
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine Publishing.
- Goldstein, L. M. (2005). *Teacher written commentary*, Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Hall, J. (2009). WAC/WID in the Next America: Redefining professional identity in the age of the multilingual majority. *The WAC Journal*, 20, 33-48. Retrieved from <http://www.wac.colostate.edu/journal/>
- Hanauer, D. I. (2010). *Poetry as research*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Harklau, L. (2000). From the “good kids” to the “worst”: Representations of English language learners across educational settings. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(1), 35-67.
doi:10.2307/3588096
- Harklau, L., Losey, K., & Siegal, M. (1999). Linguistically diverse students and college writing: What is equitable and appropriated? In L. Harklau, K. Losey & M. Siegal (Eds.) *Generation 1.5 meets college composition: Issues in the teaching of writing to U.S.-educated learners of ESL* (pp. 1-18). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Press.

- Harris, M., & Silva, T. (1993). Tutoring ESL students: Issues and options. *College Composition and Communication*, 44(4), 525-537. doi:10.2307/358388
- Hood, J. C. (1983). *Becoming a two-job family*. New York, NY: Praeger Special Studies.
- Institute of International Education. (n.d.a). International students: Enrollment trends. Retrieved from <http://www.iie.org/opendoors>
- Institute of International Education. (n.d.b). The economic benefits of international students to the U.S. economy: Academic year 2011-2012. Retrieved from <http://iie.org>
- Institute of International Education. (n.d.c). Special reports: Economic impact of international students. Retrieved from <http://iie.org>
- Ives, L., Leah, E., Leming, A., Peirce, T., & Schwartz, M. (2014). "I don't know if that was the right thing to do": Cross-disciplinary/cross-institutional faculty respond to L2 writing. In T. M. Zawacki and M. Cox (Eds.). *WAC and second language writers: Research towards linguistically and culturally inclusive programs and practices*. (pp. 183-210). Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouse.
- Johns, A. (2001). ESL students and WAC programs: Varied populations and diverse needs. In S McLeod, E. Miraglia, M. Soven, & C. Thaiss (Eds.), *WAC for the new millennium*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Kanno, Y., & Varghese, M. M. (2010). Immigrant and refugee ESL students' challenges to accessing four-year college education: From language policy to educational policy. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 9(5), 310-328. doi:10.1080/15348458.2010.517693

- Land, R. E. Jr., & Whitley, C. (2006). Evaluating second-language essays in regular composition classes: Toward a pluralistic U.S. rhetoric. In P. K. Matsuda, M. Cox, J. Jordan, & C. Ortmeier-Hooper (Eds.) *Second-Language Writing in the Composition Classroom* (pp. 324-332). New York, NY: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L., (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Leki, I. (2007). *Undergraduates in second language: Challenges and complexities of academic literacy development*. New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Leki, I. (2004). Before the conversation: A sketch of some possible backgrounds, experience, and attitudes among ESL students visiting a writing center. In S. Bruce & B. Rafoth (Eds.), *ESL writers: A guide for writing center tutors* (pp. 1-17). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton Cook Publisher.
- Leki, I. (2003). Living through college literacy: Nursing in a second language. *Written Communication*, 20(1), 81-98. doi:10.1177/0741088303253571
- Light, R. L. (1967). English for speakers of other languages: Programs administered by the U.S. Office of Education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 1(1), 55-61. doi: 10.2307/3585915
- Marx, S. (2001). How whiteness frames the beliefs of white female pre-service teachers working with English language learners of color. ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education. (ERIC document ED 457119).
- Mantero, M., & McVicker, P. (2006). The impact of experience and coursework: Perceptions of second language learners in the mainstream classroom. *Radical Pedagogy*, 8(1). Retrieved from <http://www.radicalpedagogy.org/>

- Matsuda, P. K. (2012). Let's face it: Language issues and the writing program administrator. *Writing Program Administration*, 36(1), 141-163. Retrieved from <http://wpacouncil.org/>
- Matsuda, P. K. (2006). The myth of linguistic homogeneity in U.S. college composition. *College English*, 68(6), 637-651. doi:10.2307/25472180
- Matsuda, P. K. (2003). Basic writing and second language writers: Toward an inclusive definition. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 2(22), 67-89. Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu/>
- Matsuda, P. K. (1999). Composition studies and ESL writing: A disciplinary division of labor. *College Composition and Communication*, 50(4), 699-721. doi:10.2307/358488
- Matsuda, P. K., Fruit, M., & Lamm, T. L. B. (2006). Second language writers and writing program administrators. *Writing Program Administration*, 30(1-2), 11-14.
- Matsuda, P. K., Saenkhum, T., & Accardi, S. (2013). Writing teachers' perceptions of the presence and needs of second language writers: An institutional case study. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 22(1), 68-86. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2012.10.001
- Myers, M. F. (2010). The individual graduate teaching assistant negotiating current preparation models: A case study of four composition graduate teaching assistants. Unpublished dissertation. (Doctoral Dissertation). Available from Proquest Dissertations and Theses Database. (UMI No. 3416088).
- The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 Annual Report to Congress. (2005). Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov>
- O'Brien, J. (2011). The system is broken and it's failing these kids: High school social studies teachers' attitudes towards training for ELLs. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, 35(1), 22-38. doi:10.1080/2331186X.2015.1030176

- Ortmeier-Hooper, C. (2010). The shifting nature of identity: Social identity, L2 writers and high school. In Cox, M., Jordan, J., Ortmeier-Hooper, C., & Schwartz, G. G. (Eds.), *Reinventing identities in second language writing* (pp. 5-28). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English. doi:10.1080/2331186X.2015.1030176
- Pappamihel, E. (2007). Helping preservice content-area teachers relate to English language learners: An investigation of attitudes and beliefs. *TESL Canada Journal*, 25(2), 42-60. doi: 10.18806/tesl.v24i2.138
- Park, C. (2004). The graduate teaching assistant (GTA): Lessons from North American experience. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 9(3), 349-361. doi: 10.1080/1356251042000216660
- Park, G. (2013). Situating the discourses of privilege and marginalization in the lives of two East Asian women teachers of English. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 18(1), 108-133. doi:10.1080/13613324.2012.759924
- Park, G. (2012). "I am never afraid of being recognized as a NNES": One teacher's journey in claiming and embracing her nonnative-speaker identity. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(1), 127-151. doi:10.1002/tesq.4
- Park, G., Amevuvor, J., & Hanauer, D. (in press). An MA TESOL Program housed in the English Department: Preparing teacher scholars to meet the demands of a globalizing world. In M. Strain's (Ed.), *MA Programs at Work*. National Council of Teachers of English.
- Phillips, T., Stewart, C., & Stewart, R. D. (2006). Geography lessons, bridge-building, and second language writers. *Writing Program Administration*, 30(1-2), 73-100. Retrieved from <http://www.wpacouncil.org>

- Preto-Bay, A. M., & Hansen, K. (2006). Preparing for the tipping point: Designing writing programs to meet the needs of the changing population. *Writing Program Administration*, 30(1-2), 37-57. Retrieved from <http://www.wpacouncil.org>
- Rafoth, B. (2015). *Multilingual writers and writing centers*. Boulder, CO: Utah State University Press.
- Rafoth, B. (2004). Responding online. In S. Bruce & B. Rafoth (Eds.), *ESL writers: A guide for writing center tutors* (pp. 1-17). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publisher.
- Reeves, J. R. (2006). Secondary teacher attitudes toward including English-language learners in mainstream classrooms. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 99(3), 131-142.
- Reid, J. (2006). "Eye" learners and "ear" learners: Identifying the language needs of international student and U.S. resident writers. In P. K. Matsuda, M. Cox, J. Jordan, & C. Ortmeier-Hooper (Eds.), *Second-language writing in the composition classroom* (pp. 76-88). New York: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Scott, T. (2009). *Dangerous writing: Understanding the political economy of composition*. Logan, UT: Utah University Press.
- Shuck, G. (2010). Language identity, agency, and context: The shifting meanings of multilingual. In Cox, M.; Jordan, J.; Ortmeier-Hooper, C.; Schwartz, G. G. (Eds.), *Reinventing identities in second language writing* (pp. 117-137). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Shuck, G. (2006). Combating monolingualism: A novice administrator's challenge. *Writing Program Administration*, 30(1-2), 59-82.

- Sieber, T. (2004). Excelling in the critical study of culture: The multilingual-multicultural student advantage. In V. Zamel & R. Spack (Eds.) *Crossing the curriculum: Multilingual learners in college classrooms* (pp. 129-144). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Silva, E. (2010). Teaching ESL students in mainstream BYU composition classrooms: Strategies for success. *Locutorium*, 4, 28-40. Retrieved from <http://locutorium.byu.edu/>
- Smith, P. C. (2004). Pre-service teachers' attitudes regarding ESL students. *Academic Exchange Journal*, 8(1), 183-186.
- Tardy, C. M. (2011). Enacting and transforming local language policies. *College Composition and Communication*, 66(4), 634-661.
- Thaiss, C., & Porter, T. (2010). The state of WAC/WID in 2010: Methods and results of the U.S. survey of the international WAC/WID mapping project. *College Composition and Communication*, 61(3), 534-570.
- Thaiss, C. & Zawacki, T. (2006). *Engaged writers and dynamic disciplines: Research on the academic writing life*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2015). *Detailed languages spoken at home and ability to speak English for the population 5 years and over: 2009-2013*. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2013). *Population by sex, age, nativity, and U.S. citizenship status: 2013*. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov>
- White, J., & Nonnamaker, J. (2011). Supervising graduate assistants. *New Directions for Student Services*, 136, 43-54. doi: 10.1002/ss.413

- Zamel, V. (1995). Stranger in academia: The experiences of faculty and ESL students across the curriculum. *College Composition and Communication*, 4(46), 506-521.
doi:10.2307/358325
- Zawacki, T. M., & Habib, A. S. (2014). Negotiating “errors” in L2 writing: Faculty dispositions and language difference. In T. M. Zawacki and M. Cox (Eds.). *WAC and second language writers: Research towards linguistically and culturally inclusive programs and practices*. (pp. 183-210). Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouse.
- Zhou, R., Knoke, D., & Sakamoto, I. (2005). Rethinking silence in the classroom: Chinese students’ experiences of sharing indigenous knowledge. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 9(3), 287-311. doi:10.1080/13603110500075180

Appendix A

Questionnaire for Potential Participants

You are invited to complete this 14-item questionnaire. My name is Nathan Lindberg and this questionnaire is part of my dissertation. It is designed to give me general information about [the university] writing teachers' backgrounds and experience with English as an additional language (EAL) (also referred to as ESL) students. Another purpose of this questionnaire is to ask if you would participate in my study and to determine if you are suitable for it. Being suitable means you are a non-EAL specialist, university faculty member who has or will teach EAL students writing. I hope to speak to non-EAL specialist faculty about their understandings of the needs of EAL students and addressing those needs.

At the end of this questionnaire is a request for your name and contact information, so I can ask if I can interview you for my study. Consenting to be contacted puts you under no obligation to do anything. If you consent to be contacted, I will send you a consent form inviting you to be interviewed. Your participation will help add to the fields of TESOL and composition and would be greatly appreciated by me.

1. If you want to continue, select next. Otherwise select no thank you.
 - A. Next
 - B. No thank you
2. What is your position?
 - A. tenured faculty
 - B. tenure-track faculty
 - C. teaching assistant (TA)
 - D. adjunct faculty
 - E. For the first time, I am a teaching assistant in the fall of 2013.
 - F. For the first time, I am an adjunct teacher in the fall of 2013.
3. What point are you in your writing teaching career?
 - A. I am just starting teaching this year.
 - B. I have taught before, but not college writing.
 - C. I have taught college writing for 1-3 years.
 - D. I have taught college writing for more than 3 years
4. Were you once an English as an additional language (EAL) student?
 - A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. Maybe
5. How would you describe your level of pedagogy for teaching EAL students? (One = no knowledge at all, and 5 = expert.)
 - A. 1
 - B. 2
 - C. 3
 - D. 4
 - E. 5
 - F. I'm not sure

6. How much academic training have you had to teach EAL students?
- A. 0 hours
 - B. 1-14 hours (examples: workshops, section of a class, a class)
 - C. 15-30 hours (examples: several classes, multiple workshops, certification)
 - D. 31 or more hours (examples: academic focus)
7. In general, how do you feel about training to teach EAL students?
- A. very positive
 - B. positive
 - C. neutral
 - D. negative
 - E. very negative
- If you want, briefly explain your answer: _____
8. Would you like training or additional training to teach EAL student writers?
- A. Yes, I have never had training.
 - B. No, I have never had training and do not want it.
 - C. Yes, I have had training and would like more.
 - D. No, I have had training already and do not want more.
9. How much exposure to EAL students have you had outside of academia?
- A. 0 hours
 - B. 1-8 hours (examples: speaking to people who have English as an additional language, reading related material)
 - C. 9-20 hours (examples: traveling abroad, working with EAL students, extensive reading of related material)
 - D. 21-60 hours (examples: traveling abroad, working with EAL students, extensive reading of related material)
 - E. 61 or more hours (examples: traveling abroad extensively, living abroad, working with EAL students, reading related material)
10. How many EAL students have you taught?
- A. none
 - B. 1
 - C. 2-5
 - D. 6-25
 - E. 26 or more
11. How do you feel about teaching EAL students?
- A. very negatively
 - B. negatively
 - C. neutral
 - D. positive
 - E. very positive

12. How well do you feel [the university] supports EAL students?

- A. very poorly
- B. poorly
- C. neither well nor poorly
- D. well
- E. very well

If you want, briefly explain your answer: _____

13. How many of your courses have had EAL students in them?

- A. none
- B. 1
- C. 2-3
- D. 4 or more

14. If you would like to add any comments, please do so in the space below.

15. May I contact you to invite you to be interviewed for this study? This will in no way obligate you to do anything.

- A. Yes
- B. No
- C. If yes, in the space below, please include your name and contact information so I may get in touch with you.

NAME: _____

EMAIL: _____

THE BEST WAY TO CONTACT YOU: _____

Appendix B

Interview Protocol

Introduction

You have been invited to participate in this study. You were invited because on a 14-item questionnaire you completed, you indicated you would be willing to be contacted about being interviewed for the study. You were recruited because you have taught or likely will teach EAL students and because you are a non-EAL specialist, which here is defined as having less than 15 academic credits related to teaching EAL students. The questionnaire also asked for some background information that served to provide general information about [the university] writing faculty's backgrounds and experience teaching EAL students. In addition, this information serves to guide the questions I will ask in the interview process.

I would like to interview you and ask about your teaching experiences. I am seeking to know your understandings of the needs of EAL students and addressing those needs. In general, I wish to compare the understandings of university faculty who have different academic positions, backgrounds and experiences with EAL students, and attitudes toward EAL students.

I hope you had a chance to look over the consent form. It gives me permission to use what we talk about for my research, but it also assures that your identity will remain confidential. In addition, it states that you can withdraw from this study at anytime, and that I will destroy parts or all of our interviews that you do not want me to use.

For accuracy, I will be taping our conversation. I will not share these recordings. I will transcribe these recordings and then destroy them. Afterwards, I will send you the transcriptions so you may have a chance to review them and make changes if you want. If you make changes, the old transcriptions will be permanently destroyed and only the new transcriptions will be used. These transcriptions will be stored for a minimum of three years, as federal standards require.

Interview Questions

1: Questions about Your Background

- A. Would you please talk about your position of employment (your job, your goals...) ?
- B. Would you please discuss EAL students in your department (how many are there, where are they from, how many have you taught, what about past EAL students...) ?
- C. Have you received training to teach EAL students? If so, what kind? If not, what do you think of it (how many hours of training, what kind of training, when was the training...)?

2. Questions about EAL students

- A. What do you know about EAL students (linguistic traits, language issues...)
- B. Have your perceptions of EAL students changed? If so how?

3. Questions about teaching EAL students

A. What do you know about teaching EAL students (techniques, differences from mainstream students. . .)?

B. Could you please share any personal stories about teaching EAL students?

Appendix C

Consent Form

You are invited to participate in this research study. The following information is provided in order to help you make an informed decision whether or not to participate. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to ask.

You have been chosen to participate in an exploratory study because you are a writing faculty member who is a non-English as an additional language (EAL) specialist. (Some people might refer to EAL as English as a second language, i.e. ESL). The researcher, Nathan Lindberg, is seeking information about your perceptions of EAL students. This information will come from interviews Nathan conducts with you. This consent form is intended to gain your permission to use your comments for research in the fields of TESOL and composition.

Your identity will only be known by Nathan. The location of the interview will be made to ensure confidentiality. If Nathan writes any academic texts based on the information you provide, a pseudonym will be used for your name, and your place of employment will only be described in general terms (e.g. Jane Doe works at a mid-sized university in Pennsylvania).

During interviewing, Nathan will record the conversation. After interviewing, Nathan will transcribe all that was said, destroy the recordings, and send the transcription to you. At that time, you may look over the transcript and change any of your statements. Afterwards, only the new transcription will be used. All previous copies of transcriptions will be permanently deleted. The approved transcriptions will be kept for a minimum of three years, as federal standards require.

Participation in this study is voluntary. If at any time you wish to withdraw from the study, you may do so by contacting Nathan or his dissertation committee chair, Dr. Gloria Park (see contact information below). At that time, any information that was collected will be permanently destroyed at your request.

I have read and understand the information on the form and I consent to volunteer to be a subject in this study. I understand that my responses are completely confidential and that I have the right to withdraw at any time. I have received a copy of this informed Consent Form to keep in my possession.

Name (PLEASE PRINT)

Signature

Date

Phone number or email where you can be reached

Best days and times to reach you

I certify that I have explained to the above individual the nature and purpose, the potential benefits, and possible risks associated with participating in this research study, have answered any questions that have been raised, and have witnessed the above signature.

Date

Investigator's Signature

Project Contact Information:

Researcher:

Nathan Lindberg

Graduate Student

English Department

Email: n.w.lindberg@iup.edu

Phone: 360-353-4668

Leonard Hall, Room 111

421 North Walk

Indiana, PA 15705-1094

Dissertation Committee Chair

Dr. Gloria Park

Associate Professor

English Department

Email: Gloria.Park@iup.edu

Phone: 724-357-2263

Leonard Hall, Room 111

421 North Walk

Indiana, PA 15705-1094

Appendix D

Survey Results

Online Informed Consent for Questionnaire

Non-EAL Specialist Faculty's Understandings of EAL Student Writers

Researcher: Nathan Lindberg

Affiliation: Indiana University of Pennsylvania (IUP)

Office Phone (724) 357-2261

E-mail address: N.W.Lindberg@iup.edu

Project Director: Gloria Park

Office Phone (724) 357-2261

E-Mail Address: Gloria.Park@iup.edu

Overview

You are invited to complete this 15-item questionnaire. My name is Nathan Lindberg and this questionnaire is part of my dissertation, designed to give me general information about [the university] writing faculty backgrounds and experience with English as an additional language (EAL) (also referred to as ESL) students. A second purpose of this questionnaire is to ask if you would participate in my study and to determine if you are suitable for it. Being suitable means you are a non-EAL specialist, university faculty member who has or will teach EAL students writing. I hope to speak to non-EAL specialist faculty about their understandings of the needs of EAL students and addressing those needs. At the end of this questionnaire is a request for your name and contact information so I can ask if I can interview you for my study. Consenting to be contacted puts you under no obligation to do anything. If you consent to be contacted, I will send you a consent form inviting you to be interviewed. Your participation will help add to the fields of TESOL and composition and would be greatly appreciated by me.

Time

This questionnaire consists of 15 questions and will take about five minutes to complete.

Confidentiality

This questionnaire has been set up so your response will be anonymous. If you choose to provide your contact information at the end of the questionnaire so I may ask if I can interview you, your identity will be kept strictly confidential. The information obtained from this questionnaire may be published in scientific journals or presented at scientific meetings, but your identity will be kept strictly confidential.

Voluntary Participation

You may choose to opt out of completing the questionnaire at any time by closing the questionnaire browsing window. If you agree to participate, please click 'Next' below to start taking the questionnaire. By clicking "Next." you certify that you have read and understood the information on the form and you consent to volunteer to be a participant. You understand that your responses are completely confidential and that you have the right to end the questionnaire at any point.

This project has been approved by the Indiana University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (Phone: 724/357-7730).

Table D1

Participants Consent to Proceed

Q1: Do you wish to proceed?		
Answer	Number of respondents	Percent of who responded
Next	122	100
No thank you	0	0
Total	122	100

Table D2

Faculty Positions

Q2: What is your position?		
Answer	Number of respondents	Percent of who responded
Tenured faculty	61	51
Tenure-track faculty	27	23
Teaching assistant (TA)	10	8
Adjunct faculty	14	12
For the first time, I am a teaching assistant (or part time temporary faculty) in the fall of 2013.	6	5
For the first time, I am an adjunct teacher in the fall of 2013.	2	2
Total	120	100

Table D3

Faculty Career Levels

Q3: What point are you in your writing teaching career?		
Answer	Number of respondents	Percent of who responded
I am just starting to teach this year	2	2
I have taught before, but not college writing	6	5
I have taught college writing for 1-3 years	26	21
I have taught college writing for more than 3 years	22	18
Very knowledgeable	88	72
Total	122	100

Table D4

Faculty Who Were EAL Students

Q4: Were you once an English as an additional language (EAL) student?		
Answer	Number of respondents	Percent of who responded
Yes	10	8
No	111	91
Maybe	1	1
Total	122	100

Table D5

Faculty Levels of Pedagogy for Teaching EAL Students

Q5: How would you describe your level of pedagogy for teaching EAL students?		
Answer	Number of respondents	Percent of who responded
No knowledge	16	13
Very limited knowledge	34	28
Some knowledge	42	34
Knowledgeable	22	18
Very knowledgeable	8	7
I'm not sure	0	0
Total	122	100

Table D6

Faculty Training to Teach EAL Students

Q6: How much academic training have you had to teach EAL students?		
Answer	Number of respondents	Percent of who responded
0 hours	56	46
1-14 hours (examples: workshops, section of a class, a class)	38	31
15-30 hours (examples: several classes, multiple workshops, certification)	16	13
31 or more hours (examples: academic focus)	11	9
Total	121	100

Table D7

Faculty Perceptions about Training

Q7: In general, how do you feel about training to teach EAL students writing?		
Answer	Number of respondents	Percent of who responded
Very positive	21	18
Positive	43	37
Neutral	44	38
Negative	5	4
Very negative	2	2
Total	115	100

Open-Field Comments Concerning Faculty Perceptions of Training

1. This is a poorly designed question. Whose training? My own? In general? And 'feel' is so vague it's meaningless.
2. The writing issues for EAL students are often very different from those of native English speakers
3. I have plenty of experience teaching EALs abroad, but it was within a highly problematic context (corporate profiteering, native speakerism, etc.). I've read about and discussed issues surrounding the teaching of EALs extensively in my doctoral coursework. However, in terms of classes for EALS where I actually got to determine the course content, pedagogical approaches, etc, I have taught just two classes, with good but not outstanding results.
4. I don't have the background to train, but I think training is important.
5. My minor was TESOL in college, but that was almost 21 years ago. Therefore, I am assuming I am not up to date with new methodologies
6. I'm not sure what you mean by "training"? I would appreciate an opportunity to learn more about EAL, but not an opportunity to be trained.
7. It's been more than 10 years since my courses. I encounter very few EAL students, so have not actively used the knowledge I gained 10 years ago.
8. Have not taught ESL students in PSYC280.
9. i am extremely busy and have very little time for training
10. I don't understand the question. How do I feel about past training, about current training, about how I teach?
11. I have never had a ESL student in the senior internship course for SAFE488 or SAFE493
12. I haven't trained EAL students to teach writing per se, but I have worked extensively with EAL students and their writing. Based on my experience, EAL undergraduate students work harder and care more about the work they produce as compared to non-EAL students.
13. It is probably irrelevant because the History Department sees VERY few EAL students, and in our large, Liberal Studies classes, very little writing is assigned.
14. I have not had sufficient training, and we do not provide sufficient training to instructors of all ranks.

Table D8

Faculty Perceptions about Receiving More Training

Q8: Would you like more training to teach EAL student writers?		
Answer	Number of respondents	Percent of who responded
Yes, never had training.	39	34
No, never had training and do not want it.	20	17
Yes, I had training and would like more.	43	37
No, I had training and do not want more.	14	12
Total	116	100

Table D9

Faculty Exposure to EAL Students Outside of Academia

Q9: How much exposure to EAL students have you had outside of academia?		
Answer	Number of respondents	Percent of who responded
0 hours	12	10
1-8 hours (examples: speaking to people who have English as an additional language, reading related material)	39	33
9-20 hours (examples: traveling abroad, working with EAL students, extensive reading of related material)	17	14
21-60 hours (examples: traveling abroad, working with EAL students, extensive reading of related material)	9	8
61 or more hours (examples: traveling abroad extensively, living abroad, working with EAL students, reading related material)	43	36
Total	120	100

Table D10

How Many EAL Students Faculty Taught

Q10: How many EAL students have you taught?		
Answer	Number of respondents	Percent of who responded
None	14	12
1	3	3
2-5	25	21
6-25	26	22
26 or more	51	43
Total	119	100

Table D11

Faculty Perceptions of Teaching EAL Students

Q:11 How do you feel about teaching EAL students?		
Answer	Number of respondents	Percent of who responded
Very negatively	0	0
Negatively	2	2
Neutral	48	41
Positive	45	38
Very positive	23	19
Total	118	100

Table D12

Faculty Perceptions of How Well Midland University Supports EAL Students

Q12: How well do you feel [Midland University] supports EAL students?		
Answer	Number of respondents	Percent of who responded
Very poorly	4	3
Poorly	12	10
Neither well nor poorly	18	15
Well	20	16
Very well	8	7
I don't know.	60	49
Total	122	100

Open-Field Comments Concerning How Well University Supports Students

1. I think EAL students are supported very well at [the university] because they have access to a knowledgeable and helpful writing center staff, and because there are now sections of LSE writing courses for multi-lingual writers. Of course, we could still do more to support them.
2. They're a cash cow for the university and sometimes for this reason they're placed in classes they're not ready for
3. I know that there are some issues that need to be addressed regarding EAL in so-called "mainstream" English courses at [the university], but I clicked "I don't know" because I'm not sure how well international students are supported by [the university] on the whole
4. It seems like, unless you're directly involved in it, it's not something that has much exposure.
5. My experience teaching EAL students all occurred in a different country where I was an English teacher. I've heard [the university] does a very good job, but I have no firsthand knowledge to this.
6. EAL students are put into jumbo LS classes and I wing up tutoring them and giving them oral exams or else they fail (all at no pay),
7. [the university] provides appropriate resources, but students may not know how to access them
8. There is the ALI classes to help many ESL/EFL students.
9. Despite the OIE, international students report feeling excluded from American life and feeling separated from [the university] populations.
10. The EAL students I have taught have not been at [the university]. I don't know enough about [the university] students and courses to say.
11. I know this is the first time the issue has been brought up to me in my 2+ years here.
12. From what I've seen, [the university] has at least two programs (e.g., OIE and [IEP]) that are dedicated to helping international students succeed at [the university]. Also based on what I've seen, these programs are successful in meeting their goals.

Table D13

How Many Courses with EAL Students Faculty Taught

Q14: How many of your courses have had EAL students in them?		
Answer	Number of respondents	Percent of who responded
None	18	15
1	14	12
2-3	24	20
4 or more	63	53
Total	119	100

Table D14

General Open Field Comments

Q14: If you would like to add any comments, please do so in the space below.		
	Number of respondents	Percent of who responded
	26	21

General Open Field Comments

1. At [the university] I have only had one EAL Student in my classroom, but over my teaching career I have had hundreds. I wasn't sure if by "courses" you meant here at [the university] or in general - so I went with [the university]. In the questions with "Taught" I went in general - hope that wasn't confusing.
2. The range of experience I have had -- from teaching bilingual adult college students in Texas to international doctoral students makes it very hard to generalize about the experience or to put a meaningful point on my attitudes. I feel differently, for instance, teaching a 2L student in a class than advising him/her in the writing of a literature dissertation, and, what's more, I feel differently (as with all my students) in large part as a function of how intelligent, well-prepared, hard-working and ambitious they are.
3. Actually, I would be ok with a bit more training. I'm just not sure when I could fit it in.
4. This is an important survey on an exigent topic. Thank you for allowing me to participate with my feedback.
5. As an undergrad I tutored English, mainly to EAL students. It wasn't a specific job description; it just so happened.
6. I would really enjoy training in teaching EAL students. I would feel more confident that these students are receiving the quality of education they deserve, if I was better trained.
7. EAL students rarely are in our majors classes.
8. I feel our EAL students at [the university] turn in assignments that are just as good, if not better (in quality) than their peers.
9. I teach in the education department where students get state certification to teach in public schools. We really do not have EAL students in the mmajority of our undergraduate courses. I have had one EAL student take a course and she struggled greatly with the technical terminology and the writing
10. There is no clear communication about responsibility. If students do not have English language skills, is it the responsibility of the instructor or the student to have address the differences between EAL and native speakers/writers? This issue is similar to the problems I have experienced with students who do not know basic rules for punctuation, grammar, and syntax but are native speakers/writers.
11. My experience with ESL students is not at [the university].
12. EAL students seem to write science as well, and often better than US students. I believe this is because science writing is very formal, almost always active voice, and the unique terms are difficult for everyone regardless of language.

13. I think you need to rethink some of your questions! The issues you imply go well beyond providing more training to college professors! Training implies simply imitating techniques rather than critical engagement with the issues of second-language instruction.
14. This is not my area, and I prefer not to teach in this field. Crazy busy, so I will pass on the follow-up.
15. EAL students should be advised to work with the writing center on major projects. They should also be advised to start well in advance of the due date for critical writing projects. They should not be afraid to practice their skills by revising their work before submitting assignments. Overall, the goal is become more comfortable. If effort is shown, most students will do acceptable work.
16. I enjoy ESL students when they are motivated and desire to learn. The students who expect special treatment instead of doing the work upset me.
17. Some of your survey questions are somewhat unclear. When you ask for hours of interaction with EAL students... is that this semester, over my lifetime, academic career?
18. I believe we should give additional support, as well as faculty that are educated in best practices and pedagogy to help students learn more effectively as ESL students
19. I wish I could've taken a grad class or two but the strict program requirements meant I could not do those and the comp electives I wanted.
20. Answer to the first question is incorrect. I am retired.
21. Most of my experience with EAL students has been exclusive of writing intensive courses...
22. I don't have the skills to really help EAL students. Very time intensive with minimal benefit for the student.
23. I'm really glad to see this research being conducted, the field of teaching education (in general) needs a deeper understanding of teacher and student perspectives in EAL education.
24. I feel about EAL students the way I do about non-EAL students. Love them all!
25. Then English test needs to weed more students out. Many slip in who have no chance of success in my class. Great people but set up for failure by the admission process.
26. The only reason that I am not "very positive" on the previous question is that in the MBA class I teach EAL students are roughly 70% of the roster. With over 150 students in all my classes, the extra time necessary to do well with EAL students is not a possibility. Thus, I have to scale back the writing to a small portion of what I would like to do.

Table D15

Consent To Be Interviewed

Q15: May I contact you to invite you to be interviewed for this study? This will in no way obligate you to do anything.

Answer	Number of respondents	Percent of who responded
Yes	58	49
No	61	51
Total	122	100
