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ABSTRACT

Richard C. Gebhardt, Advisor

This pilot study investigates the current state of Latino/a students in higher education and first-year writing (FYW) programs in the United States. This project explores if and how FYW programs address the literacy skills of second generation Latino/as who speak either Spanish or variations of Spanish and English, or who speak only English. I hypothesized in the beginning of this project that the contributing factors to Latino/as' poor academic performance may stem from some educators, policy makers, and political leaders overlooking students' cultural differences. This hypothesis led me to explore the following research questions: (RQ #1) How and why are Latino/as struggling in higher education? (RQ #2) How do Latino/as confront the problems that they encounter in higher education? (RQ #3) What happens to Latino/as' identities when they realize that their family or home culture differs from the academic or school culture? (RQ #4) Do writing programs show awareness of diverse populations? For instance, do they emphasize language diversity in their curricula and policies? (RQ #5) Do writing programs address the needs of minorities and Latino/a students? For instance, do they offer a support group for minorities and/or Latino/a students? (RQ #6) Do WPAs know how successful their writing programs are for minorities and Latino/a students? For instance, do they know if minorities and Latino/a students are doing well in their writing courses? An examination of published research focusing on academic, linguistic, and cultural issues in higher education and FYW helped identify specific problems that Latino/a students encounter in U.S. colleges/universities.
Additionally, I developed 13 survey questions for Writing Program Administrators (WPA) intended to provide evidence of Research Questions 4, 5, and 6. The final chapter of this project details conclusions from the study, discusses implications for FYW programs based on the scholarship and data gathered, and provides recommendations for future research. The findings suggest that a high percentage of FYW programs show awareness of diverse student populations, although there is room for improvement in specifically addressing Latino/a students' needs by taking an “accommodation without assimilation” approach.
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CHAPTER 1: THE NEW SECOND GENERATION OF LATINO STUDENTS

Borderlands are physically present wherever two or more cultures edge each other, where people of different races occupy the same territory, where under, lower, middle and upper-classes touch, where the space between two individuals shrinks with intimacy […] Borders are set up to define the places that are safe and unsafe, to distinguish us from them. A border is a dividing line, a narrow strip along a steep edge. A borderland is a vague and undetermined place created by emotional residue of an unnatural boundary. It is in constant state of transition.

Anzaldúa, Borderlands/La Frontera

The university becomes what Gloria Anzaldúa calls a borderland for many entering students whose languages and cultures differ from the dominant campus environment. For these students there are borders everywhere: in their dormitories, classrooms, cafeterias, lounges, etc. There is a “dividing line,” “an unnatural boundary” between them and their teachers, other students, and sometimes even the family and friends that they may have left behind. These students live “in a constant state of transition” as they maneuver in and out of different borders within university walls.

This dissertation introduces the university as a borderland and the boundaries within it by not only presenting the issues that create this ongoing state of separation among groups, but also by investigating what steps are being taken to institute educational reform. Specifically, this project explores if and how first-year writing (FYW) programs in the United States address the
literacy skills of second generation Latinos\(^1\) who speak either Spanish or variations of Spanish and English, or who speak only English. The first section of this chapter, titled “Definitions/Issues Shaping the Dissertation,” explains the use of the term Latino versus Hispanic, distinguishes between generations of immigrant groups, and discusses language skills as one specific characteristic among generations. In section two, “Misconceptions of Language Acquisition,” considers English proficiency, cultural differences and transmitters, and identity issues in higher education, including FYW—the focus of this dissertation. In section three, “The Study: Latinos and First-Year Writing,” I provide a brief explanation of the study, highlighting its importance and contribution to composition studies; and section four offers a brief overview of the following chapters of this dissertation.

**Definitions/Issues Shaping the Dissertation**

*Latino versus Hispanic*

As Joel Spring notes, using the terms Latino and/or Hispanic to identify an individual or group is complicated by language (68). Specifically, “non-Spanish speaking Native American groups throughout Mexico, Central America, and South America” came to the United States “speaking only their native tongues and without any knowledge of Spanish” (68). Moreover, both terms originated from important historical events that give them their meaning and complicate their use. Spring explains that the term Hispanic, when examined in the context of Christopher Columbus' landing in 1492, represents “the birth of the Hispanic people as a new hybrid race created from a mixture of Africans, Europeans, and Native Americans” (68-69).

\(^1\) Adopting Leonard A. Valverde's approach in *Latino Change Agents in Higher Education*, Latinos/Latino includes both male and female.
From this perspective, Spring points out that the term Hispanic includes “most Mexican, Central American, Caribbean, and South American peoples, including French-speaking Haitians, Portuguese-speaking Brazilians, and English-speaking Trinidadians,” but the term “excludes those Native Americans who have no African or European ancestors and those of European ancestry living south of the U.S. who have no African or Native American forebears” (69). In addition, the term also signifies Simon Bolivar, who was “the liberator of South America from Spanish rule” (69). He wanted “a Pan-American republic” extending “from the tip of South America up the west coast of what is now the United States” (69). In this context, the term Hispanic includes everyone “living in areas not under the control of the United States or Canada” (69).

Similar to Bolivar’s Pan-American republic, Francisco Bilbao, who was a Chilean author, also wanted “a Pan-American union” (Spring 69). He coined the term Latin America “in 1858 to distinguish between the supposedly cold and rigid temperament of Anglo-Saxons and the hypothetically warm and light-hearted souls of others living in the Americas” (69). Spring further explains that in addition to the significance of the term Latin America, the “use of the word Latino broke direct connection with Spain,” thus, changing Spanish America to Latin America (69). Furthermore, the terms Latin America and Latino include “all speakers of Latin-based languages including Portuguese-speaking Brazilians and French-speaking Haitians,” but the terms exclude “Native American peoples who do not speak Spanish, Portuguese, or French” (69). Spring notes, “many people prefer the term Latino because Hispanic is associated with Spanish cultural imperialism” (69).
Although the terms Hispanic and Latino have complex meanings, creating controversy on their appropriate usage, for the purpose of this study I use the term Latino in reference to all groups of Spanish speaking tongues and dialects who live in the U.S. and consider themselves Latino, possibly whose families have come from Mexico, parts of the Caribbean, such as Puerto Rico, Cuba, and Dominican Republic, Central and South America regardless of ancestry. Since parts of this study focus mainly on Spanish and English literacy skills, I limit my definition of Latino to include generations whose primary language is Spanish or variations of Spanish, including those who are bilingual or dominant in English only, but I realize that the term Latino excludes other non-Spanish speaking groups, such as Brazilians from South America or Haitians from the Caribbean. I also identify as a Latina woman, which is part of the reason why I use the term Latino.

_The Second Generation_

Scholars, such as Vivian Louie, Richard Fry, Jeffrey S. Passel, Roberto Suro, Paul Kei Matsuda and Aya Matsuda, discuss and define the generations of immigrant groups. Passel defines the first generation as individuals “[born] outside the United States, its territories or possessions” (2). Louie adds that these are “foreign-born individuals, who migrate as adults (e.g., ages 18 and older)” (43). For instance, my parents are first generation Latinos because they emigrated from Buenos Aires, Argentina to the U.S. on October 19, 1974 with my two older brothers. Since my brothers came to the U.S. with my parents at an early age, they are second generation Latinos. Passel defines the second generation as people who were “[born] in the United States with at least one foreign born parent” (2). Matsuda and Matsuda add that the term
is also sometimes used for “children who came into the United States early in their lives with their [...] parents” (60). I am a second-generation Latina as well because I was born in the U.S. a few years after my family settled in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Finally, Passel defines the third—and future—generation as people who were “[born] in the United States with both parents also born in the United States” (2). Matsuda and Matsuda add that the third generation is “U.S.-born grandchildren of the first generation immigrants who grew up speaking mostly English” (60). My brothers' children are third generation Latinos. Fry and Passel's 2009 report, “Latino Children: A Majority are U.S.-Born Offspring of Immigrants,” provides demographics of first, second, and third generations of Latino children in the U.S. Fry and Passel report that 52% “of the nation's 16 million Hispanic children are” second generation (1). While “11% of Latino children are” first generation, “37% are 'third generation or higher'” (1). Fry and Passel's report reveals that second generation Latinos are the majority.

Language Skills

There are generational differences among the Latino population (Pew Hispanic Center 2). Some of these differences include different perceptions of family, marriage, religion, education, and language skills. While future chapters will discuss these generational differences, including others not mentioned here, this section focuses on the most important difference among Latinos, which is pertinent to this study. Suro and Passel, referencing the 2002 National Survey of Latinos, mention, “Spanish-speakers make up most of the first generation. The second generation is substantially bilingual, and the third-plus generations are primarily English speakers” (8). The Pew Hispanic Center's 2009 report, “Between Two Worlds: How Young Latinos Come of Age in
America,” reveals that “immigrant families grow more proficient with their new language and less with their old” (31). For instance, 48% of first generation 16-25 year-olds “can carry on a conversation in English,” while for the second generation “the likelihood of speaking proficiently in English [more than] doubles, to 98%” (31). An additional report from the Pew Hispanic Center “combines all four dimensions of English and Spanish reading and speaking ability” (33). Forty-four percent of the second generation is dominant in English, “while 54% are bilingual and only 2% are Spanish dominant” (33). Furthermore, Shirin Hakimzadeh and D’Vera Cohn point out that “[as] fluency in English increases among generations, so, too, does the regular use of English […] both at home and at work” (2). While “English is not the primary language” most immigrants “use in either setting,” it is the dominant language “for their grown children” (2).

Misconceptions of Language Acquisition

*English Proficiency*

… one Saturday morning three nuns arrived at the house to talk to our parents. Stiffly, they sat on the blue living room sofa. From the doorway of another room, spying the visitors, I noted the incongruity—the clash of two worlds, the faces and voices of school intruding upon the familiar setting of home. I overheard one voice gently wondering, 'Do your children speak only Spanish at home, Mrs. Rodriguez?' While another voice added, 'That Richard especially seems so timid and shy.' That Rich-heard!

With great tact the visitors continued, 'Is it possible for you and your husband to encourage your children to practice their English when they are home?' Of course, my
parents complied … In an instant, they agreed to give up the language (the sounds) that had revealed and accentuated our family's closeness.

Rodriguez, *Hunger of Memory*

Richard Rodriguez and I, as well as other Latinos, share similar experiences involving language and literacy development. Specifically, the excerpt above reminds me of a conversation that I had with my Mamá during my undergraduate years. She told me that during a parent-teacher conference in elementary school, my teacher cautioned my parents that I would never learn English if they kept talking to me in Spanish. She advised my parents that they should avoid speaking Spanish at home so that we would stop mixing the two languages in school. For both Rodriguez and me, our teachers viewed our 'home' language as a disadvantage for us to learn English. As Dora Ramírez-Dhoore and Rebecca Jones note, “Rather than valuing both languages, some schools inadvertently ignore and punish students who speak Spanish at home” (67). It seems that our teachers wanted us to ignore our family's culture and adapt a new culture. However, if I would have rid myself of my first language, I probably would not be bilingual nor would I have been able to communicate with my family. Our teachers probably meant well, but I think that their ignorance kept them from offering us useful advice and understanding our needs.

Our teachers' approaches to our difficulties with learning English reflect the historical perception of language differences as being “the primary cause of educational difficulties” (Gándara and Contreras 121). Patricia Gándara and Frances Contreras, in *The Latino Education Crisis: The Consequences of Failed Social Policies*, explain this view by comparing what the civil rights movement meant for African Americans, Latinos, and other minorities during the
1960s. These groups all shared common inequalities in education, such as “inadequate and overcrowded facilities, underprepared teachers, inappropriate curriculum and textbooks, and segregated schools” (121). However, Latinos' “inability to speak English” made language learning and instruction the main focus of civil rights for Latinos (121-123). Consequently, because “language is inextricably bound up with identity,” it also became a social marker of their inferiority and the “primary rationale for segregating” them (122-123). As Gándara and Contreras further explain, the focus on language “met the objectives of a number of different political actors” because “language is a tangible and malleable characteristic, and is addressable in relatively straightforward ways” (122-123). It became easier for politicians and educators—and, in some cases, is still easier today—to view language as the core problem in prohibiting the success of Latinos in the U.S. With this perception in mind—language being the cause of Latinos' underachievement—policy makers and educators believed, and some continue to hold the belief, “that mastering English will solve these students' educational problems” (124). The problem with this belief, however, is that, especially in cases like Rodriguez's and my own, “most schools have” considered, and, continue to regard, a student's “home' language and anything else that [they] carry with them—cultural differences, individual learning styles—primarily as a liability to their learning, something to be dismissed or erased before school learning can take place” (Kutz and Roskelly 57). Consequently, the push for English proficiency causes some politicians and educators to become culturally insensitive to the needs of Latino students.

*Poor Academic Performance Despite English Proficiency*
While learning English may be challenging for some Latinos, Gándara and Contreras argue, “it is by no means the core educational problem for the majority of Latino students, or even [...] for most English learners” (124). As Hakimzadeh and Cohn prove in their 2007 report, “English Usage Among Hispanics in the United States,” generational differences, “especially between those born outside of the U.S. and their U.S.-born children,” reveal that “the ability to speak or read English” increases throughout generations (4). In fact, there are Latino students who speak only English, but perform poorly academically (Gándara and Contreras 124).

Ricardo R. Fernández notes that Latinos' poor academic performance is visible through the “low rates of academic attainment at all levels,” high drop-out rates, and “lower participation rates in higher education” (xii). He further explains that Latinos have low enrollment in higher education because “urban and rural public elementary and secondary schools” do not fully prepare students for future academic pursuit. Students also encounter “limited financial means” with little or no support, and there are a small number of Latino faculty and administrators to help students (xii-xiii). Thus, language learning is only part of problem. Gándara and Contreras highlight that the “critical aspects of language learning that do contribute to underachievement” are the following:

1) The effect of labels; the dichotomy that “one is either an English learner or a fluent English speaker”;
2) Lack of “specialized language instruction and support”;
3) The focus on students who are ESL (English as a Second Language) to attain language proficiency;
4) The push for students to quickly learn English, “to the exclusion of any other learning” (124-127).

From inadequate student preparation to the pressure to quickly learn English skills, all of these and more contribute to Latinos' underachievement in education.

_Students’ Cultural Differences Overlooked_

The contributing factors to Latinos' poor academic performance may stem from some educators, as well as policy makers and political leaders, who overlook students' cultural differences. For example, some educators might overlook Latino family values, which differ from American educational beliefs, leaving some of them to assume that Latino students cannot succeed in their classrooms. Raul E. Ybarra and Frederick Erickson argue that students' cultural differences can affect their learning and academic performance. Ybarra highlights that due to Latino students' high dropout rates, it is necessary for educators to become aware of their students' cultural differences (161). Frederick Erickson agrees, adding “that we know very little about how differences in language and differences in culture affect school achievement” (qtd in Ybarra 161). Students’ “rebellious behavior, their low academic achievement, and their high dropout rate” do not stem from, what some educators may assume to be “dullness, laziness, [their] inability to project themselves into the future, and lack of self-discipline” (Mehan, et al 97). As a result, theorists explain that some students may feel inadequate and isolated due to their teachers' misconceptions and expectations. Specifically, Nancy G. Barron notes that many Latino students believe that no matter how hard they try in school, they will not succeed because “school is meant for and maintained by the Anglo mainstream” (13). Furthermore, she points out
that Latino students “begin to believe that maybe they've done something wrong, or that their ways of seeing need to adjust to the external behaviors from the Anglo mainstream, exclusively” (21-22). Likewise, Eleanor Kutz and Hephzibah Roskelley explain that some Latino students also “come to believe that because they don't speak Standard English, they're stupid or can't think” (59). Moreover, Ybarra reveals that Latino students may feel that “school is trying to change them” (168). More specifically, Latino students may feel that school is trying to change their cultural identities, making them look, act, and speak differently.

Erickson, in “Transformation and School Success: The Politics and Culture of Educational Achievement,” points out that the “more alienated the students become, the less they persist in doing schoolwork. Thus they fall farther and farther behind in academic achievement” (41). Scholars that address this issue explain that students' resistance can lead to misbehavior, low-achievement, or poor school performance. John D'Amato notes that “much of student resistance is based on both structural and cultural differences and learning styles among the students and teachers” (qtd in Ybarra 168). While D'Amato points out that cultural differences have significant impact on students' learning styles and teachers' pedagogical approaches, Hugh Mehan, Lea Hubbard, and Irene Villanueva explain that some theorists stress that resistance “[contributes] to the lowly position of blacks and Latinos in the occupational structure [...] because working class students refuse to develop the skills, the attitudes, the manners, and the speech that are necessary for the achievement of success in capitalist societies” (96). But, while resistance theorists center on the actions of minorities, some of them seem to fail to acknowledge what D'Amato explains in “Resistance and Compliance in Minority Classrooms.” He suggests
that “the source of resistance to school must be the features of schooling rather than the particular cultural or sociocultural characteristics of the children who attend school (188). In other words, rather than viewing resistance at an individual basis, it is vital for theorists to also examine the educational system.

*Assimilation, Enculturation, and Acculturation in Education*

The educational system is a cultural transmitter because culture—ideas, “symbols, behaviors, values, customs, and beliefs that are shared by a human group”—is passed “through language, material objects, rituals and institutions […] from one generation to the next” (Jones and Castellanos xix). As a writing teacher I believe that if we continue to raise awareness that education is a “deliberate transmission of culture,”—conveying “what is considered the most worthwhile knowledge, belief, skills, behaviors, and attitudes,”—then it may help us begin to understand how cultural differences can affect learning. Understanding these differences may also reveal to us the challenges that some Latino students, especially between the ages of 16-25, encounter when having to “navigate the intricate, often porous borders between the two cultures they inhabit—American and Latin American” (Pew Hispanic Center 1). There are three processes—*assimilation, enculturation, and acculturation*—that may help us better comprehend how and why “Latino youths, be they first or second generation, are straddling two worlds as they adapt to the new homeland” (Pew Hispanic Center 3).

Assimilation is “a process whereby individuals of one society or ethnic group are incorporated or absorbed culturally into another” (Gibson 24). An individual or group does not simply learn about a culture during this process. Instead, mainstream society forces an individual
or group to adapt to their culture. Immigrant assimilation is an expectation in mainstream society. For instance, immigrants or minorities are not only expected to learn and speak English fluently, but they also are expected to adapt to the cultural values and attitudes of the majority. Victor Villanueva's description of two graduate students' conversation best illustrates this view, the expectation for full assimilation in every aspect of a person's life:

A writing group in a graduate composition course. Martha Lopez's and Paul Reyes's group-work gets loud, drowning out the rest. Martha: black eyes, thick black hair, an accent to her voice. Paul: pale skinned, green eyed, red haired, no accent. Martha argues that her writing suffers from having learned English through grammar instruction, rather than through real conversation and writing practice. Paul argues that even after learning the languages there is still a problem of thinking like white folks. He'd be white to anyone's eyes […] Martha is arguing the case for assimilation through learning the language of the majority. Paul is arguing that learning the language isn't all there is. Both are Latinos, Spanish speakers. But Martha is Colombian; Paul is Puerto Rican. Martha, the immigrant. Paul, the minority. Martha believes in the possibilities for complete, structural assimilation; Paul is more cautious. (24)

Martha and Paul's conversation also reveals that some immigrants or minorities believe in assimilation, as is the case for Martha. As Nancy G. Barron explains, “the messages from most of the Anglo mainstream especially in higher education is that full monocultural monolingual assimilation is what we should all do” (18). Monoculturalistic and monolingual views—one
culture/one language—can complicate learning for some minority students, especially when considering “education as a form of enculturation” (Pai and Adler 40; emphasis in original).

The second term, enculturation, is “the process of learning one's own culture” (40). In FYW, for example, students are expected to live by a certain writing model or academic discourse (Ybarra 162). As Ybarra explains, academic discourse “is a way of thinking and a way of mapping the world. This is the type of discourse highly favored and valued in academic institutions, as well as the mainstream United States society” (97). Furthermore, Patricia Bizzell defines academic discourse “as the language of a community” (1), and through it scholars “articulate [their] theories and pedagogies using images that inscribe a more monolithic viewpoint” (Royster 24). Jacqueline Jones Royster adds, in “Academic Discourse or Small Boats on a Big Sea,” that the “use of such terms as academic language and academic discourse do not convey a sense of collectivity of uses,”—that is, “[there] is the language, the discourse of academe and there are other languages and discourses that are not academic” (24). The language valued in the academy is Standard English. Moreover, Bizzell argues that the “ones in power in the traditional academic community create discourses that embody a typical worldview” (2). The dominant group possesses the power to culturally transmit through language their values, attitudes, and beliefs within the institution of higher education. A student who learns to use academic discourse successfully “establishes one's place within the community,” assuming a place of higher status, privilege, and power (Bizzell 1). For students who fit the mainstream—that is, they speak Standard English, appear white, and come from a middle or upper-middle
class family—this example of the enculturative process simply becomes a way for them to learn about their own culture.

Another process at work for students who are culturally different and “are attempting to grasp a new and different—that is, dominant—culture” (Pai and Adler 40) is known as acculturation. Young Pai and Susan A. Adler explain that “[education] as an acculturative process can also be viewed as the modification of one culture through continuous contact with another” (41). Similarly, Margaret A. Gibson describes acculturation as “a process of culture change and adaptation which results when groups with different cultures come into contact” (24). The Pew Hispanic Center's 2002 national survey, “Assimilation and Language,” further explains the connection between assimilation and acculturation. Both processes “[describe] the changes in both the newcomers and the hosts when they come into contact with each other” (1).

While assimilation focuses “on an individual” as well as “members of one group adopting the cultural patterns of the majority or host culture,” acculturation “focuses on the impact that the two cultures have on each other” (1). These processes occur in what Mary Louise Pratt refers to as the contact zone. She describes it as a “social space where cultures meet, clash, [and] grapple with each other, often in contexts of highly asymmetrical relations of power, such as colonialism [and] slavery” (34). Where there is conflict, there is a power struggle. The conflict that occurs in these social spaces affects minority groups more so than the dominant one. While the dominant group has the power, it expects minority groups to change, adapt, or assimilate; but the dominant group remains the same. For instance, in Martha and Paul's conversation detailed earlier, Paul is cautious because he believes that the immigrant or minority “even after learning”
English has to face the “problem of thinking like white folks” (Villanueva 24). Paul argues “that learning the language isn't all there is” (24). Aja Y. Martinez explains that “[even] though the 'white voice' is a necessary tool to succeed in academic spaces, it should be recognized as [...] a tool, not a way of being” (593). However, when the academy expects students to learn academic discourse and teachers present it “as ideology, students are inclined to align and assimilate” (593).

While for mainstream students academic discourse is a part of learning about their own culture, for some Latino students it becomes an acculturating process. Learning academic discourse is not a smooth transition, and may turn into “a hostile and invasive course of action which ultimately leaves a negative impression [...] about writing” (Ybarra 43). Ramírez-Dhoore and Jones note that “[there] is a struggle […] that reflects a power dynamic where one dominant group regulates and thereby influences the language and linguistic identity of another group” (71). Assimilation and acculturation can lead to psychological effects on identity.

*The Effects of Assimilation and Acculturation on Identity*

The Pew Hispanic Center's 2009 report “Between Two Worlds: How Young Latinos Come of Age in America” notes that “[throughout] this nation's history, immigrant assimilation has always meant something more than the sum of [...] economic and social measures [...] It also has a psychological dimension. Over the course of several generations, the immigrant family typically loosens its sense of identity from the old country and binds it to the new” (2-3). Anzaldúa explains the psychological effects of acculturation well in *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza* when she notes:
Chicanos and other people of color suffer economically for not acculturating. This voluntary (yet forced) alienation makes for psychological conflict, a kind of dual identity—we don't identify with the Anglo-American cultural values and we don't totally identify with the Mexican cultural values. We are the synergy of two cultures with various degrees of Mexicanness or Angloness. (85)

The psychological struggle described by Anzaldúa reveals the complex “process of acculturation and identity formation” on Latino adolescents striving to navigate between two cultures (Roberge 10). Mark Roberge further explains that this complexity may lead “immigrant children [to] progressively give up their home culture and accept American culture” (10). For example, in the writing classroom some Latino students may struggle with writing and academic discourse because their language and identity are linked together. Mark Noe highlights, in “The Corrido: A Border Rhetoric,” that “[academic] discourse, for all its critical utility, like all discourses of order, asks those who use it to fix their identity in specific ways” (600).

Furthermore, Anzaldúa explains the relationship between language and identity, noting that “[ethnic] identity is the twin skin to linguistic identity—I am my language. Until I can take pride in my language, I cannot take pride in myself … as long as I have to accommodate the English speakers rather than having them accommodate me, my tongue will be illegitimate” (81). In other words, language is what makes a person who he or she is. Language defines a person's identity. It can also become a marker of one's race, class, and gender. For instance, Susan Naomi Bernstein, in “Writing and White Privilege: Beyond Basic Skills,” refers to this marker when she describes her first time teaching a basic writing course. Her “students were native speakers of
Spanish, Urdu, Vietnamese, and Black English Vernacular, languages that were inseparable from culture—and culture that was inseparable from race” (128). Because of the relationship between language and identity, altering or replacing a person's language can change his or her identity as well.

Daniel Villa, in “No nos dejarmos: Writing in Spanish as an Act of Resistance” explains that because language and identity are connected, the voices that express themselves in primary discourse, in either English or Spanish, must be valued” (89-90). If students' voices are not valued, the writer may feel alienated, “resulting in her disengaging from working toward literacy” (89-90). Because language and identity are closely tied, writing can become a means of expression. Villa describes writing as “a means to examine the world. The writer creates knowledge both she and the instructor previously did not possess” (89). For this reason, the student “must have a voice,” their point of view [must] be recognized and examined critically,” and “the way in which they express their thoughts, the language(s) they use, must be valued” (89). While language and identity are closely related, writing can become a part of that connection, allowing expression, exploration, and, most importantly, self-identification. For example, Anzaldúa describes how writing is a part of who she is. For her “[writing] produces anxiety” causing her to “[look] inside [herself] and [her] experience” (94). Anzaldúa also depicts an image of writing and what it means to be a writer when she notes that “[to] write, to be a writer, [she] … [trusts] and [believes]” in herself “as a speaker, as a voice for the images” (95). She adds that she has “to believe that [she] can communicate with images and words and that [she] can do it well. A lack of belief in [her] creative self is a lack of belief in [her] total self and
vice versa—[she] cannot separate [her] writing from any part of [her] life. It is all one” (95).

Anzaldúa believes that to be a writer she has “to trust and believe” in herself (95). Yet, some Latino students need more than trusting and believing in themselves. They need to know that their linguistic and cultural identities are valued.

“Accommodation without Assimilation”

Gibson explains that the acculturation process “need not be the rejection of old traits or their replacement” (24-25). Instead, it “may be an additive process or one in which old or new traits are blended” (24-25). This additive process described by Gibson is similar to “a new pattern of acculturation and identity formation among immigrant children” where the acculturating process occurs “without assimilation” (Roberge 11). Roberge notes that in this new process “immigrants have increasingly maintained aspects of their home culture identities instead of rapidly 'Americanizing’” (11). This observation is similar to Gibson's discussion of accommodation in *Accommodation without Assimilation: Sikh Immigrants in an American High School* where she defines it as “a process of mutual adaptation between persons or groups for the purpose of reducing conflict and allowing separate group identities and cultures to be maintained” (25). Therefore, accommodation can become a two-way relationship where understanding and and/or acceptance exists, and where power and conflict diminishes between individuals or groups. Martinez adds that there “must be another way for … marginalized students to obtain an education without risking” their identities “caused when they are encouraged to turn their backs on their cultures/ethnicities to join the traditions of a system that
has not been founded on—and not necessarily maintained with the intention to serve—an underclass population” (594).

In “Beyond the Methods of Fetish: Toward a Humanizing Pedagogy” Lilia I. Bartolome explains that some educators might only focus on “finding the 'right' teaching methods, strategies, or prepackaged curricula that will work with students who do not respond to so-called 'regular' or 'normal' instruction” (174). Their approach is based on the assumption that students “need to be rescued from their 'savage' selves,” which may result in “robbing [them] if their culture, language, history, and values” (Bartolomae 176). Bartolome challenges this assumption, posing an alternative line of thinking to help marginalized students. She advocates a humanizing pedagogy, involving more than simply “structuring learning experiences that both help students write their way into the university and help teachers learn their way into student cultures” (Dean 23). Instead, teachers also “understand that educational institutions are socializing institutions that mirror the greater society's culture, values, and norms,” reflecting “both the positive and negative aspects of society” (Bartolome 178). Bartolome adds that “teachers must confront and challenge their own social biases so as to honestly begin to perceive their students as capable learners,” and, also embrace culturally responsive instruction through which “teachers use teaching approaches and strategies that recognize and build on culturally different ways of learning, behaving, and using language in the classroom” (184).

This dissertation, of course, is concerned with embracing a humanizing pedagogical approach in the FYW classroom. Toward that end, composition teachers and scholars Kim Brian Lovejoy, Steve Fox, and Katerine V. Wills suggest, “to change the way teachers think about
language and diversity, it is important, certainly, that teachers share knowledge of the language policies adopted by [their] professional organization and the key research that supports those policies” (264). Writing Program Administration (WPA) scholars, Philip P. Marzluf, Jonathan Alexander, Matsuda, and others have been addressing issues of language and diversity in their research. Marzluf in “Mainstreaming Diversity Writing” points out that “notions of 'standardized' academic English and academic discourse communities contradict our desires for inclusive classrooms” (198). In “Literacy and Diversity: A Provocation” Alexander stresses the importance of teaching students “how dominant discourses contribute to the construction of particular privileged—and under-privileged—identities” (167). Moreover, Matsuda in “Embracing Linguistic Diversity in the Intellectual Work of WPAs” adds that WPAs should continue addressing issues of language and diversity in their scholarship, as well as make these issues an important administrative concern in every aspect of their work (170). By examining policies, exploring current research, and publishing about diversity issues, WPAs and the teachers that they train and supervise can continue to “reflect on their own language experiences, to engage in conversations about language with their colleagues, and to share these experiences with students” (Lovejoy, et al 264). Barron adds that FYW teachers need “training that includes learning how to reflect on their own value systems, their cultural frameworks, as well as maintain an openness to Difference” (16-17). Recognizing and accepting difference is vital. As Barron explains, “we need to accept que las escuelas are not a neutral ground nor a territory donde somos iguales”—that is, schools are not neutral nor are they places where people are equal (17).
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The rhetoric and composition scholars—Lovejoy, Fox, Wills, Matsuda, and Barron—in the previous paragraph (and others in earlier sections of this chapter) confirm that the Latino borderland experience in higher education is relevant to FYW instruction and to composition studies, especially given the projected increase of “native-born Latinos entering the nation's schools” (Suro and Passel 2). As Lovejoy, Fox, and Wills argue, some composition teachers “struggle with the implications of home and community languages as part of classroom pedagogy, and most composition programs do not have explicit language policies or program initiatives that address linguistic diversity in the classroom” (262). Of course WPAs are central to addressing diversity issues, but missing from some of the scholarship seems to be much attention to the role of WPAs in helping FYW programs address Latino students' needs. WPAs have the responsibility to coordinate their programs and train their teachers to meet the needs of all students because “it no longer makes sense to teach writing as though all students share a common language or dialect” (Lovejoy, et al 262). Through their scholarship and leadership, it is important for WPAs to continue raising awareness regarding students' cultural differences and how these differences may affect students' learning. Because, as Lovejoy, Fox, and Wills emphasize, WPAs “are in the positions to lead and support efforts toward 'unleashing' the literacies of linguistically diverse students” (261).

To this end, this dissertation focuses on FYW as a specific starting point to investigate the problems that Latinos face in higher education, to examine if and how writing programs may be helping them, and, to also stress that educational reform may be necessary. Focusing on the
literacy skills of second generation Latinos, I examine published research not only in composition studies, but also in the context of research in other disciplines, such as higher education administration, race studies, and anthropology, to help explore the following research questions:

1) How and why are Latinos struggling in higher education?

2) How do Latinos confront the problems that they encounter in higher education?

3) What happens to Latinos' identities when they realize that their family or home culture differs from the academic or school culture?

The first two questions identify what kinds of problems Latino students encounter, why they encounter them, and how they deal with them. The third question considers the impact of Questions 1 and 2, as well as examines the problematic effects on Latino students' cultural identities. In addition, I use a survey designed for WPAs, questioning if and how their FYW programs address Latino students' needs. The pilot study assists in my exploration of the following research questions:

4) Do writing programs show awareness of diverse populations? For instance, do they emphasize language diversity in their curricula and policies?

5) Do writing programs address the needs of minorities and Latino students? For instance, do they offer a support group for minorities and/or Latino students?

6) Do WPAs know how successful their writing programs are for minorities and Latino students? For instance, do they know if minorities and Latino students are doing well in their writing courses?
The last three questions focus on how FYW is serving Latinos and other underrepresented groups. I formulated Questions 4, 5, and 6 by drawing from student affairs scholars Raechele L. Pope and Amy L. Reynolds' multicultural competence model. Based on this research, I argue that adapting what Gibson calls an “accommodation without assimilation” approach toward FYW instruction can help Latinos succeed in higher education and the writing classroom.

**Overview of Chapters**

Chapter 2, “Latinos in Higher Education and First-Year Writing,” builds on the first chapter's introduction to the historical context and significant issues behind the study. It focuses on further exploring the problems that were identified in the second section of Chapter 1, which include, but are not limited to, the effects of labels, lack of instruction and support, the focus on ESL students, and the push to learn English quickly. Exploring these issues in higher education contributes toward understanding the situation of Latino students in FYW. More specifically, these research questions guide Chapter 2: How and why are Latinos struggling in higher education? How do Latinos confront the problems that they encounter in higher education? What happens to Latinos' identities when they realize that their family or home culture differs from the academic or school culture? With these questions in mind, Chapter 2 assists in the analysis of the survey in Chapter 4, offering insight into Latinos' struggles and the contributing factors that have placed them, and continue to place them, in a controversial state, including how they are affected by these problems.

Chapter 3, “Methods and Methodology of the Study,” presents the methods used to investigate the current state of Latino students in FYW, and to determine if and how writing
programs meet their needs. More specifically, this chapter explains the survey method used to question WPAs about their writing programs. These general research questions, which I will elaborate on in Chapter 3, guide the methodology used to further this study: Do writing programs show awareness of diverse populations? Do writing programs address the needs of minorities and Latino students? Do WPAs know how successful their writing programs are for minorities and Latino students? For instance, do they know if minorities and Latino students are doing well in their writing courses? These research questions are the main focus in Chapter 4.

Chapter 4, “Findings and Analysis of the Study,” provides the findings and analysis of the data derived from the questionnaire. In the four sections of this chapter, I use concepts from Pope and Reynolds' multicultural core competencies as a frame of reference to analyze survey responses bearing on the effectiveness in multicultural awareness and multicultural knowledge of FYW programs in serving Latino students, and WPA desires about serving Latino students better in the future. The final chapter, Chapter 5 “Conclusion,” details conclusions from the study, discusses implications for FYW programs based on the scholarship and data gathered, and provides recommendations for future research.

This dissertation aims to expand composition studies' knowledge of language and diversity. More importantly, I hope that this research continues raising awareness of diversity issues in higher education, and motivates change of policies if necessary among WPAs, writing teachers, and national leaders in composition.
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Reform of the current U.S. system of education, especially in higher education—its structure, goals, curriculum, and instructional pedagogy—is desperately needed […] if the country is to address the educational needs of Hispanics.

Fernández, “Forward”

Ricardo R. Fernández asserts, in *Latino Change Agents in Higher Education: Shaping a System That Works for All*, that many scholars call attention to educational reform “to address the […] needs of Hispanics” in the U.S. (xi). Chapter 2 explores the reasons scholars call attention to education reform. More specifically, this chapter explores the following questions that were introduced in Chapter 1: Why are Latinos struggling in higher education? What factors contribute to the problems that they face? How do they confront these problems? How do these problems affect their identities? Chapter 2 explores these questions by focusing on academic, linguistic, and cultural issues in higher education and first-year writing (FYW). Building on Chapter 2 as a whole, the final section provides a more pointed discussion of how these problems affect Latino students in FYW.

Richard Fry reported in “Latino Youth Finishing College” that 80% of Latinos “go on to college by age 26, the same rate as white high school completers” (2). The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) reveals that the percentage of post secondary education entry among young high school completers between Hispanic and Whites was equal at 82% in 2003-2005 (see Figure 1).
But another EPI study cited by Fry shows that Latino undergraduates “are far behind their white […] peers in completing a bachelor's degree” (2). Figure 2 shows that only 23.2% of Latinos have graduated with a BA, while 47.3% of Whites have attained the same degree.
Although Fernández argues that Latinos should “be educated at rates comparable to those of the majority” (xi), these statistics reveal that something is wrong. What causes Latino college students to have significantly lower graduation rates? While this question is too complex to fully answer here, this dissertation builds on Alberta M. Gloria and Jeanett Castellanos' research in “Latina/o and African American Students at Predominantly White Institutions: A Psychosociocultural Perspective of Cultural Congruity, Campus Climate, and Academic Persistence.” They focus on the “socialpolitical and sociocultural aspects of environmental and cultural contexts” of both Latinos and African American students, which have been overlooked by the educational system resulting in students struggling in an institution “that is based on White or European American culture and values” (72). This dissertation reflects Gloria and Castellanos' discussion of overlooked “issues of campus and racial climate,” which create an alienating, “unwelcoming environment” leading to feelings of “powerlessness, normlessness, and social isolation” (78).

**Four Issues Affecting Latinos in Higher Education and First-Year Writing**

In “Resituating Race into the Movement Toward Multiculturalism and Social Justice” B. Afeni Cobham and Tara L. Parker explain, “Scholars have argued that educators and decision makers in higher education must be aware of the differences among underrepresented groups and not compress them into a meaningless whole” (91). Similarly, in applying Gloria and Castellanos' approach to the experience of Latinos in higher education and FYW, this dissertation emphasizes the following academic, linguistic, and cultural issues to continue raising
awareness among Writing Program Administrators (WPAs) and composition teachers who specifically work with Latino student populations:

1) The effects of academic and social grouping labels on Latino students;
2) The controversies regarding language skills and instruction;
3) The differences between Anglo-American and Latino cultures;
4) The effects of these differences on Latino students' identities.

These academic, linguistic, and cultural issues are evident in each of the sub-sections that follow.

The Effects of Labels on Latino Students

With an increasingly diverse student population, as English professor and immigrant education scholar Mark Roberge explains “scholarship on immigrant students has […] become more complex” to the point where “generic categories such as 'immigrant,' 'non-native,' or 'minority’” and “educational and institutional labels, such as” English as a Second Language (ESL), Standard English Learners (SEL), and Generation 1.5, have been used, and continue to be used, to “understand and describe the diversity of students from multilingual/multicultural immigrant families” (3). Beatrice Méndez Newman, Patricia Gándara and Frances Contreras, Roberge, Meryl Siegal, and Linda Harklau define the terms “ESL,” “SEL,” and “Generation 1.5.” In “Teaching Writing at Hispanic-Serving Institutions” Newman, an English professor, Writing Center director, and coordinator of FYW programs, explains that ESL “implies that the student is relying predictably and consciously on competence in an established first language (L1) to achieve competence in a second language (L2)” (23). Latino education scholars Gándara and Contreras note that SEL refers to students “who come from non-standard English
backgrounds who have many of the same needs as English learners” (126-127). Roberge, and linguistic scholars Siegal and Harklau mention in *Generation 1.5 in College Composition: Teaching Academic Writing to U.S.-Educated Learners of ESL* that Generation 1.5 is “a term that typically refers to English language learners who arrive in the U.S. at an early age, obtain much or all of their education in U.S. K-12 settings, and arrive in college with various patterns of language and literacy that don't fit the traditional, 'institutionally constructed' profiles of Developmental Writing, College ESL, or Freshman Composition” (vii). Despite the use of these different labels, Roberge points out that “scholars have become aware that” these labels “can serve to highlight or conceal, validate or invalidate, and define or convolute the histories, experiences, and educational needs of individual students” (4). Thus, these labels can have a negative impact on Latino students' learning abilities and social identities. For this reason, scholars such as Roberge, Newman, Christina Ortmeier-Hooper, Teresa L. McCarty and Lucille J. Watahomigie and others argue against the use of these labels to describe the literacy skills of diverse student populations. More importantly, compositionist Ortmeier-Hooper stresses that it is important for “composition instructors […] to [not only] understand the fluidity of the ESL descriptor” including other labels “but also to understand what the experiences of these students are in the composition classroom” (391). Recognizing how and why these labels may affect Latino students may contribute to our understanding of their classroom experiences not only in FYW, but also across the curriculum.

Raul E. Ybarra's *Learning to Write as a Hostile Act for Latino Students*, for instance, details how institutional labeling affected Letty, an 18-year-old, first-year student who
“categorized herself as Mexican” (Ybarra 44). Although Letty did well in high school, a low score on the college placement exam placed her into Basic Writing (44). Ybarra explains that Letty had problems writing her essays according to the structure that her teacher wanted (59). Based on Ybarra's conversations with Letty, he points out that because of her interest in writing, eagerness to learn, perseverance, and regular attendance he “was sure she would do okay grade wise and that she enjoyed being in the class” (60). However, after completing all of her required writing courses, Ybarra interviewed her and found out that Letty was upset that she was put into the basic writing course (61). Letty's assumption that “everybody places” into first-year composition and her difficulties writing the placement essay caused her to feel stupid and behind as she described it as going backwards rather than forward (Ybarra 61-62). While Letty did not view herself as a basic writer, especially since “in high school [she] always did really well” (Ybarra 61), she “accepted her placement” (62). Ybarra explains that for Letty “[being] placed in Basic Writing and then struggling there is also what contributes heavily to her negative feeling about all her writing courses and about herself” (62). The institutional assessment of Letty's literacy skills not only affected her perception of writing, but most importantly, it negatively impacted her identity.

As Ortmeier-Hooper suggests, “[the] institutionalized labels that are placed on second language students clearly have profound effect on how they define themselves in the college classroom and in their writing” including their place in the university (393). Some students view these institutional labels as negative markers, especially when they desire to progress toward English fluency upon their college arrival (Ortmeier-Hooper 410). Ortmeier-Hooper adds that
when students reject these labels, composition instructors may get the impression that their classroom is a monolingual space. As a result, they may fail to see their students' diverse backgrounds, experiences, and literacies that reflect “the reality of the first-year composition course” (413).

While most composition specialists who work specifically with Latino students and other immigrant groups are aware of the effects of these labels and understand their students' diverse experiences with language, some writing teachers, WPAs, and educators who are outside of the field of composition studies may be misinformed about these labels. As a result, they may have misconceptions about these students' language skills. Ortmeier-Hooper points out that institutional labeling such as ESL and English Language Learner (ELL) become status markers that leave outsiders with the impression that these students are deficient in English (390). In doing so, some educators may not consider the students' unique and diverse experiences as well as what types of knowledge their students may already bring with them that may contribute to their learning (392). As a result, some students may refrain “from seeking academic assistance” because they do not want others to view them as inferior (393).

These negative or “misinformed attitudes,” as Newman suggests, may lead some educators into placing all Latino students into one category, viewing them as “‘foreigners' linguistically and culturally in the academy,” when in fact these students' experiences do not reflect the institutional labels assigned to them (23). As explained in Chapter 1, generational differences show that Latinos' language skills are diverse, ranging from the first-generation of Spanish-speakers, the second generation of bilingual-speakers in both Spanish and English, and
the third generation of English only speakers. Native American education scholars Teresa L. McCarty and Lucille J. Watahomigie, in “Language and Literacy in American Indian and Alaska Native Communities,” acknowledge language differences and how institutional labels obscure these differences to the point where they may become a non-existent part of one's identity. McCarty and Watahomigie add that “[within] major language groups, people often speak distinct dialects, some so different they merit being treated as separate languages […] But linguistic labels mask the immense differentiation that exists with regard to proficiency in indigenous languages” (492). In “Second Language Writing and Writing Program Administration,” second-language writing scholar Tanita Saenkhum and Paul Kei Matsuda, founding chair of the Symposium on Second Language Writing and of the CCCC Committee on Second Language Writing, further explain that student writers labeled as ESL, SEL, and/or Generation 1.5 “speak English as an additional language. Some of them are fluent in spoken English but may transfer features of spoken language to written language. Others may be highly literate in their first language, but their rhetorical assumptions and practices may be quite different from those that are familiar to users of dominant varieties of English in the United States” (1). Furthermore, Ortmeier-Hooper highlights the problems and difficulties with grouping all students into one or several similar institutional labels without taking into account their diverse experiences. She explains that “[the] wide range of origins, immigration status, prior education, prior experience with ESL courses, feelings about home language and culture make these students difficult to box into a single definition” (Ortmeier-Hooper 412), and the institutional labeling does not consider or reflect these type of experiences that first-year students may bring with them. Ortmeier-
Hooper also adds that “we do not want to 'box' students into an ESL identity category of which they want no part” (412). Some students may reject these labels because they may feel inadequate or incompetent. Others may realize that these labels do not reflect their literacy skills and diverse experiences. For that matter, it is important for all educators to understand that “the 'ESL' label is [not] this monolithic, universal code word that explains everything we need to know about a student” (414). Thus, having knowledge about Latinos' language differences and experiences that they bring with them to college may help prevent some educators from making false assumptions and groupings.

*Language Skills and Instruction of Latino Students*

As noted in Chapter 1, Gándara and Contreras point out that language is not “the core educational problem for the majority of Latino students, or even […] for most English learners” (124). Scholars Shirin Hakimzadeh and D'Vera Cohn and the Pew Hispanic Center indicate that although for some Latinos learning English can be challenging, they know how important it is for them to acquire a certain level of proficiency in English. Hakimzadeh and Cohn add, “Latinos believe that English is necessary for success in the United States” (1). Their research reveals “that the ability to speak English and the likelihood of using it in everyday life rise sharply from Hispanic immigrants to their U.S.-born adult children […] Hispanic immigrants are most likely to speak and read English very well if they are college-educated, arrived in the United States as children or have spent many years here” (2-3). Therefore, among generations of Latinos several levels of English proficiency are present. According to the Pew Hispanic Center, “More than three-fourths of all Latino youths ages 16 to 25 can read and speak English with a
high degree of proficiency” (“Between Two Worlds” 32). However, regardless of what the
statistics suggest, Hakimzadeh and Cohn assert, “[Many] Latinos believe that the inability to
speak English well is the leading cause of discrimination against Hispanics” (1). The
discrimination against Latinos’ “inability to speak English well” may be due to society having
little or no knowledge about Latinos' experiences with literacy.

In “English Usage Among Hispanics in the United States,” Hakimzadeh and Cohn
address Latinos' experiences with literacy, highlighting generational differences and Spanish-
English transfer among families. They note that the “[use] of English at home is rare among
Latino immigrants” (5). However, first-generation immigrants are “more likely to use English on
the job than at home,” while “their children”—mainly the second-generation—“speak English at
home and at work” (3). Hakimzadeh and Cohn also explain that “the most highly educated”
Latinos “are most likely to speak both English and Spanish” (17). The second generation Latinos
retain their Spanish, “about half of whom speak only Spanish, mainly Spanish or Spanish and
English equally at home. By the third and higher generations, that falls to one-in-four” (3),
meaning that the use of Spanish begins to decrease between generations. While Daniel Villa
links the decrease of Spanish usage “to patterns of migration and continued contact with
communities of origin” (90), Hakimzadeh and Cohn note that it “does not disappear” (5).
Spanish is an important part of Latino culture because the language is representative of Latino
identity—one of the connections that they have to their homeland and everyone and everything
that they may have left behind. In “Más Allá del Inglés: A Bilingual Approach to College
Composition,” compositionists Isis Artze-Vega, Elizabeth I. Doud, and Belkys Torres support
this point well, noting that “[the] Spanish language is much more than a linguistic tool; it is a link to our heritage that many have felt compelled to abandon so as to succeed in this country” (99).

The feeling of abandonment that some Latinos encounter may be due to “language [playing] a central role in the assimilation process” (Pew Hispanic Center 1)—the process described in Chapter 1. In “Linguistic Contact Zones in the College Writing Classroom: An Examination of Ethnolinguistic Identity and Language Attitudes,” rhetoric and composition scholar Michelle Hall Kells explains, “Immersion in new linguistic territory transforms speakers from the inside out, separates and assimilates [them]” (36). This transformation may cause some Latinos to possibly lose all connections to their Spanish heritage. McCarty and Watahomigie add that while “language immersion and two-way bilingual programs serve the dual purposes of maintaining the native language and facilitating children's acquisition of English […] in other communities, such as some Pueblos in Arizona and New Mexico, there is a strong resistance to teaching the native language in school, as language is believed to be the province of the family and community rather than outside institutions” (492). In the communities described by McCarty and Watahomigie some teachers oppose the intersections of Latino students' home language and the academic institution. The separation of the home and school culture reflects what was mentioned in Chapter 1, Gloria Anzaldúa's borderland. In this sense, Latinos' home culture—a private space where they keep their language, traditions, beliefs, and values—becomes hidden from the university—a public space where they encounter a dominant language, different traditions, and American beliefs and values. The perpetuation of this type of borderland separates
Latino culture from the academic culture, and may also separate teachers from their students. As a result, this separation may cause some teachers to overlook their students' cultural differences.

* Differences between Anglo-American and Latino Cultures

The White cultural values of rigid schedules, a competitive nature, individual achievement, autonomy, although not universally accepted […] were clearly reflected in the university and I had no other option but to abide by them.

Orozco, “Latinas and the Undergraduate Experience”

I was so proud to inform my family that I was going to be a graduate student. While they had an idea that this was a good thing, they didn't really know what it meant for me or for them, particularly in terms of sacrifice, hard work, and perseverance.

Herrera, “Notes from a Latino Graduate Student”

Although Veronica Orozco and Raymond “Ramón” Herrera do not reflect all Latino students' experiences, their stories are a part of Jeanett Castellanos and Lee Jones' edited collection, *The Majority in the Minority: Expanding the Representation of Latina/o Faculty, Administrators and Students in Higher Education*. Their edited collection offers personal stories from several teachers, administrators, and student scholars. These authors focus on their experiences trying to balance their Latino family values and obligations with their Anglo-American education. Becoming familiar with Orozco, Herrera, and others' experiences may contribute to WPAs, composition instructors, as well as other educators' current awareness and understanding of diverse student populations and how cultural differences may impact their learning. Latino family values and beliefs differ from Anglo-American values and beliefs, which
may pose challenges for Latino students who are trying to maintain their heritage, but at the same time, are trying to become members of the academic community.

According to the Pew Hispanic Center, “The way today's young Latinos choose to describe themselves is linked to a series of identity and cultural signals they received from their parents. Young Latinos are more likely than older Latinos to say their parents socialized them more with a Hispanic focus than an American focus” (“Between Two Worlds” 25). Some Latino parents stress the importance of retaining the Latino heritage throughout generations. The Pew Hispanic Center reports that “[while] large shares of first- and second-generation Latinos say their parents encouraged them often to speak Spanish, significantly smaller shares say their parents encouraged them to speak only English” (“Between Two Worlds” 26). Spanish is just one example of what parents pass on to their children, but, as the 2004 report from the Pew Hispanic Center indicates, language differences influence “views on a number of topics” among Latino groups (“Assimilation and Language” 2). More specifically, some of “the attitudes and beliefs of” Hispanics may depend on their dominant language (“Assimilation and Language” 1). For instance, “English-dominant Hispanics are much more similar to those held by non-Latinos than the attitudes and beliefs of Spanish-dominant Latinos” (1). In addition, generational differences according to birthplace (as well as language) may also affect Latinos' beliefs. As the Pew Hispanic reports, “Latinos who are either immigrants themselves or whose dominant language is Spanish tend to be more conservative and family-oriented than […] Latinos who are in third and higher generation. Latinos who are second generation typically fall in between” (“Between Two Worlds” 55).
The “family-oriented” value stems from Latino parents instilling a sense of collectivism and dependency in their children. Orozco explains, “The traditional Latino culture is family and community oriented, where the collective and not the individual is stressed” (129). Furthermore, in “Latina/o Cultural Values and the Academy: Latinas Navigating through the Administrative Role,” psychologist Kathleen Harris Canul adds, “Latino/as believe that all behaviors affect the family and the greater community,” including the importance of meeting their “children's needs” and teaching them “to rely on their parents for survival” (170). Some Latinos also embrace, what Canul calls, “personalismo,” which “can be described as the value placed on building and maintaining personal relationships […] Personalismo is the avoidance of conflict and emphasis on harmony” (170). With personalismo comes respect and “tolerance for individual differences” (Canul 171). While the Latino culture believes in collectivism and personalismo, Canul notes that in Anglo-American culture, “the dominant culture” considers “independence [as] a virtue” (170). In Literacy Matters: Writing and Reading the Social Self Robert P. Yagelski, an English professor and literacy scholar, further explains that “notions of individuality and self-reliance” become prevalent in the dominant culture with an emphasis on the fact that “You can do anything you want if you are given the opportunity and work hard enough” (37). Yagelski adds, “[It's] up to the individual to make the most of” the opportunities that are given to them; this idea connects “individual responsibility […] to the ideology of capitalism, with its promise of economic opportunity for all who are willing to compete for it” (37). While the academic institution, for instance, provides individuals with the opportunity to succeed as long as they take advantage of it (Yagelski 37), Castellanos and Jones point out that “[in] the social organization
of Latina/os, family is considered the single most important institution” (6). The distinctions among Latinos and Anglo-American values regarding education and family may pose challenges for Latino students who wish to pursue higher education.

As Newman explains, “family expectations constantly conflict and compete with academic expectations” (20). Sometimes this type of conflict may cause some Latino students to not “attend class regularly, to [not] complete assignments on time, and to [not] participate wholeheartedly in the classroom experience” (20). When Latino students are confronted with conflicting expectations from both their families and the academy, they may confront issues such as differing viewpoints on education and competitiveness. There seems to be a divide among Latino parents when it comes to encouraging their children to attend college. On one hand, in “Latinos and Education: Explaining the Attainment Gap,” Mark Hugo Lopez suggests, that Latino “parents place a great emphasis on the need to go to college” (3). On the other hand, Newman explains that “in many traditional Hispanic families living in borderlands areas and urban areas with high Hispanic populations, college attendance is viewed as delaying one's entrance into the workforce” (19). A report from the Pew Hispanic Center offers insight into “the gap between the high values Latinos place on education and their more modest expectations to finish college” (“Between Two Worlds” 52). Besides “poor English skills [and] a dislike of school and a feeling that they don't need more education for the careers they want” (Pew Hispanic Center 52), some Latinos face the responsibility of “[needing] to support their family” and the financial dilemma of not being able to “afford to go to school” (Lopez 6).
Additionally, the competitive nature that occurs in university settings conflicts with family values, and Latino students' beliefs in collectivism. Jaime Mejía, a compositionist and Chicano/a studies scholar, explains that “[the] collaborative behavioral nature that Mexican-American students are often raised to have by their extended families, for instance, is being disrupted by competitiveness that schools inevitably inculcate in our students” (51). The competitiveness seems to stem from the Anglo-American value of the individual taking advantage of the opportunities given and competing for success among other individuals. In this case, the Latino family and the university become “two separate entities,” as Orozco describes, “like water and oil, they never mixed—they seemed to repel one another” (131). When there is dissonance between the family and the student, the “parents are unaware of the demands and workings of the educational system” and are “often […] unable to value their children's efforts or provide the type of support and encouragement needed to influence goal achievement and academic attainment” (Orozco 131). Some Latino students, therefore, live in the university borderland where they experience barriers between their teachers and classmates, and their parents and relatives. The problems and differences that they encounter with their families and the university may affect their identities.

*The Effects of Cultural Differences on Latino Students' Identities*

In order to fit in, Jóse had to deny his Latino identity.

Garrod, Kilkenny, and Gómez, “Introduction: Being and Becoming Latino”

Alessandro Meléndez tells how he first became aware of his identity as being both black and Latino.
Garrod, Kilkenny, and Gómez, “Introduction: Being and Becoming Latino”

Jóse and Alessandro Meléndez's experiences are just two among the several students presented in Andrew Garrod, Robert Kilkenny, and Christina Gómez's edited collection, *Mi Voz, Mi Vida: Latino College Students Tell Their Life Stories*. Although they do not reflect all of Latinos' experiences, their stories do show how some students confront identity issues that are mainly due to cultural differences. Cultural differences between the family and the university may have an impact on some Latino students' identities. This clash may cause them to acculturate—and, as mentioned in Chapter 1, the acculturation process “focuses on the impact that the two cultures have on each other” (Gibson 1). Acculturation occurs in a “social space where cultures meet, clash, [and] grapple with each other, often in contexts of highly asymmetrical relations of power, such as colonialism [and] slavery,” what Mary Louise Pratt calls the contact zone (34). Newman points out that “Hispanic students from strongly traditional families must negotiate two 'contact zones': their own family environment and the institution environment” (20). For instance, while some Latino students “acculturate into institutional success,” Newman explains that their families may view “their attempts […] as [a] rejection of family and culture” (20). On the contrary, some teachers may view “problematic composition classroom performance as an indicator of general academic inadequacy” (20) when in reality Latino students' struggles in the classroom may stem from problems with conflicting family values. Thus, some Latino students are stuck in a contact zone with two separate authority figures: their parents and their teachers, and “they recognize that the demands of one authority […] frequently contradict the demands of the [other] authority” (Newman 20). The conflict in
this situation becomes more and more complex because, while the students encounter problems with their families, they also have to deal with their teachers' expectations. In “Speak for Yourself? Power and Hybridity in the Cross-Cultural Classroom” compositionist and literacy scholar Bronwyn T. Williams explains the complexity of the student-teacher relationship as a power dynamic where the teacher assumes a “civilizing role” (590).

Teachers expect students to recognize their authority through the adoption of the culture and values of the institution […] At the same time, the course is expected to help them overcome the cultural and discursive beliefs and habits that are unacceptable to the mainstream of the academy […] students are not expected or permitted to challenge the hierarchy of the teacher-student relationship. Their membership in the academy is contingent and always subject to the approval of their teachers. Such power relationships come into even sharper focus in the cross-cultural classroom where students are not only confronted with the ideology of the academy but with the academy as the representative of the dominant culture of which they are not members […] Thus the teacher takes on a 'civilizing' role not unlike the colonial authority's, making sure that the postcolonial subjects adopt the values of the center and adapt themselves to the norms of the dominant culture. (590)

Several power dynamics occur in the Latino student's academic experience, all of which Williams describes as taking place in the teacher-student relationship. As the Latino student faces the challenges of becoming a member of the academic community, she attempts to find a balance between her family and the university. For some Latino students balancing these two
distinct worlds may involve “[suppressing] their normative values and behaviors for those of the larger environment” (Gloria and Castellanos 82). More specifically, as Gloria and Castellanos further explain, “[Students] must balance the values of competition versus collaboration, individualism versus collectivism, and formality of relationships versus personal and collegial relationships” (82). As a result, sometimes the balancing attempt may lead some Latino students to “strip away their own values and culture” and their own identity to become a part of “the university culture and environment” (Gloria and Castellanos 82).

However, Latino students can negotiate between two different cultures without compromising their identities. Biculturalism, as defined by Garrod, Kilkenny, and Gómez, means “to exist within two cultures and to be able to adapt to both ways of being” (6). In doing so, Garrod, Kilkenny, and Gómez add that “[neither] culture needs to be more important or all encompassing; rather, an individual can move from one space to another, learning and deciding what to take or leave behind from each” (6). This concept allows students to “move away from the either/or conception of acculturation” (6), which lines itself with Margaret A. Gibson's “accommodation without assimilation.” In addition, the term “hybrid” also describes an individual who can embrace both cultures without compromising his/her identity. Villa describes himself as a “hybrid” who has not assimilated, but has learned to move between both cultures as he pleases or sees fit. He notes, “If assimilation means that a person loses part of him or herself in the process of becoming an American, I have not assimilated. I am a hybrid. I operate within two environments, and I look out from two perspectives” (Villa 124).
Latinos and First-Year Writing

My own undergraduate experience in English classes had certainly not helped me to construct my identity as a Chicano, except in a highly negative manner, and I certainly never had a Chicano or Chicana as an English instructor or professor. But my own family background never once stopped having the constitutional effect of working to construct my identity as a Chicano, despite the Eurocentric, Anglo American education I’d received before college and after high school. My first college students' family backgrounds constructed their identities similarly, but nothing in the initial training I received as a composition teacher took this type of identity construction into account. In fact, I know of no pedagogical approach in composition, today, that takes a Texas Mexican student's ethnicity into account. (44)

Mejía, “Bridging Rhetoric and Composition Studies”

Mejía's experiences in his English courses offer insight into how some teaching approaches might fail to take into account “students' ethnic identities and cultures” (51). He also adds that some “rhetoric and composition programs throughout the Southwest, and elsewhere in the United States, are […] still failing to address how rhetoric and composition pedagogies could directly and positively impact the largest segment of the largest collective ethnic minority group in the United States” (51). Mejía explains that if these problems are not addressed, they “can and will have adverse effects on our students' academic success” (51).

To address these problems in educational programs, student affairs scholars B. Afeni Cobham and Tara L. Parker advise that “it is the responsibility of institutional leaders and
policymakers to acknowledge that while some issues may be universal to underrepresented students, there are many issues that are not and therefore require heightened attention” (91). In this case, Cobham and Parker's principle suggests that FYW needs to be guided by an awareness of students' individual cultural and linguistic differences. Yet, as Douglas Downs and Elizabeth Wardle explain, FYW “is usually asked to prepare students to write across the university” (552). Williams adds that “the goal of such a course, as it often is with writing courses, [is] to assimilate the students into what the faculty [considers] mainstream academic discourse” (588). The problem with this particular approach to FYW is that it “assumes the existence of a 'universal educated discourse' […] that can be transferred from one writing situation to another” (Downs and Wardle 552). This universal approach—teaching “the conventions of Western-style argument and research” including “thesis statements, supporting evidence, outlines, logical fallacies, note taking, research sources, plagiarism, and proper citation formats” (Williams 588)—might prove difficult for some Latino students whose home discourses differ from mainstream notions of language and writing. Williams also explains that “[for] the students not from the U.S., it also [means] forcing assimilation into the epistemological and rhetorical conventions of the culture” (588). A writing pedagogy that adopts the universal approach to teaching FYW contradicts an awareness of students' individual differences because “the teacher takes on a 'civilizing' role not unlike the colonial authority's, making sure that the postcolonial subjects adopt the values of the [institution] and adapt themselves to the norms of the dominant culture” (Williams 590). Williams also asserts that “[this] is done for the students' 'own good,' so they can more successfully work within the framework of the dominant culture” (590).
This contradiction lies between the universal approach to teaching FYW and the value of students’ individual differences. Similarly, Yagelski suggests that “our inability to address adequately the literacy needs of students is a function of a fundamental contradiction in prevailing conceptions of literacy that grows out of deeply held beliefs about individuality and self-determination” (33). He adds that “[in] American culture, the idea of the Writer is deeply imbued with Romantic beliefs about individuality and truth. The Writer is a special, inspired individual who functions as a kind of conduit for personal and universal truth” (33-34). In other words, the writer is a solitary person, determined to seek truth through language. Therefore, the writer's “success depends in large measure on [his/her] competence with written language” (Yagelski 34). In the case of FYW, students' success is reflective in their ability to adopt, as Downs and Wardle describe, the “universal educated discourse” (552). While “students are assessed as individual writers, as individuals possessing certain 'basic' literacy skills,” assessment does not necessarily consider “an individual student's experiences and background” (Yagelski 35). As the student strives to improve her writing “in a formal educational system that is structured around standardization,” she may be viewed “as a kind of faceless individual who possesses (or does not possess) these required skills that are universally applicable” (Yagelski 35). For example, an FYW instructor assumes the responsibility to teach her students five essays including fundamental, academic features, such as research, thesis statements, synthesis of sources, opposing arguments, MLA conventions, etc. in just four months. It is the responsibility of every student to learn these important rhetorical features because their success in the course depends on their writing abilities. To help the students become successful writers, according to
the institution's standards, the FYW instructor focuses on each students' writing performances while assessing and commenting on multiple drafts. In this scenario, how does the FYW instructor take into account an individual student's cultural and linguistic differences, such as Mejía's, when she spends most of her time ensuring that each student meets the “universal educated discourse” (Downs and Wardle 552)? Consequently, while the field of composition studies values students' individual differences, sometimes the individual emphasis lies more on students' writing abilities than the different linguistic and cultural experiences they bring with them into the classroom. Adopting a universal approach to FYW can become a problem for some Latino students. This educational dilemma that they face might be due to the fact that they are finding ways to balance their family values and the university's values, and facing the challenges of maintaining their Latino heritage, all while acquiring English proficiency. In turn, this universal approach to FYW can also, as Mejía explains, “fail to incorporate […] students' ethnic identities and cultures” (51), keeping the emphasis on students' individual writing abilities, rather than on their whole selves.

I want to also stress, as Yagelski does, that “I am not arguing that all educators interested in or involved with literacy education consciously espouse the beliefs and assumptions about writers and writing [previously described]” (35), nor am I arguing for the replacement of FYW as Downs and Wardle do. However, I agree with Yagelski that some educators may “remain unaware of the ways in which these cultural attitudes about writers and writing may undercut their own attempts to create effective pedagogies” (36) and to meet all students' educational needs.
To get a rough sense of awareness of individual linguistic and cultural differences in FYW, I turned, early in my research to the listserv of the Council of Writing Program Administrators (WPA-L). The WPA-L, according to its official description, “is an […] e-mail discussion list intended primarily for individuals who are involved in writing program administration at universities, colleges, or community colleges” (“The WPA-L Listserv”). It also includes faculty and graduate students who are interested, but not actively involved in writing administration. WPA-L postings, I thought, could offer a general sense of how people interested in FYW instruction view issues of language and cultural diversity. I found that from January 13, 2010 to April 13, 2010 only three posts focused on diversity issues, including two calls for proposals for a conference on social justice and writing, and a conference on writing across the curriculum and second language writers, and a postdoctoral diversity fellowship at the University of New Mexico. Discovering minimal postings and discussions regarding diversity on the listserv led me to wonder to what extent FYW is influenced by the issues discussed earlier in this dissertation, and how FYW programs are trying to address Latino students' needs.

As mentioned in Chapter 1, WPA scholars, including composition teachers and other diversity specialists, have been addressing issues of language and diversity in their research. In this chapter I reviewed some of their scholarship describing the academic, linguistic, and cultural issues that may impact some Latino students' academic performance in higher education and FYW and their own cultural identities. The review of scholarship contributes to our understanding of Latinos students' experiences in higher education and in FYW. More specifically, the review of scholarship in this chapter assists in the analysis of the survey in
Chapter 4 by providing necessary background information on the factors that may influence Latinos' struggles, including the effects of academic and social grouping labels, the controversies about language skills and instruction, the differences between Anglo-American and Latino cultures, and the effects on Latino students' identities.

The final chapters of this dissertation provide some insights based on a pilot study—described in Chapter 3—centered on how FYW programs show awareness of diverse populations, address the needs of minorities and Latino students, and prove successful for minorities and Latino students. Such things are important because, as Villa points out, “language and identity are closely entwined” (89). As discussed earlier in this chapter, language is a part of retaining one's Latino heritage, and if some FYW instructors dismiss or devalue the home language (whether the language is Spanish or variations of Spanish, or English variations, or both), they “may well alienate the writer, resulting in her disengaging from working toward literacy” (Villa 89). If, as Ortmeier-Hooper suggests, “writing is the key to developing a certain sense of identity [and] writers often 'perform' certain identities in their writing” (391), then it is important for composition specialists who work with diverse student populations to continue raising awareness on how FYW may affect Latino students' identities.
CHAPTER 3: METHODS AND METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

My students are people of color, people of a unique culture, and I believe this makes a difference in how they learn and how they write. Furthermore, as a white female teacher, I represent the “other” in my classes. If I am to teach effectively, I must find ways to address issues of difference and make them work for rather than against us. Without essentializing my students or myself, I must negotiate difference in positive ways.

Fredericksen, *A New World of Writers*

Elaine Freedman Fredericksen highlights what Janice M. Lauer and J. William Asher call the “motivating concern” (5) that has led me to explore the diversity issues discussed in this dissertation. Fredericksen is aware that her classroom consists of students with different cultures, literacies, and educational backgrounds. She realizes that these varying student experiences will have an impact on “how they learn and how they write” (Fredericksen 40). Because of this, Fredericksen knows that she has to adapt her pedagogy to ensure that she meets all of her students’ needs.

Similar to Fredericksen, my concerns focus on the experiences of Latino students as well as other marginalized groups in the academy. I am also interested in learning the views of Writing Program Administrators (WPA) and composition teachers regarding issues of diversity in first-year writing (FYW) programs. To accomplish this, I relied on a descriptive research design allowing me to examine and analyze “data with as little restructuring of the situation or environment under scrutiny as possible” (Lauer and Asher 15). Because I wanted “to collect data
from” (65) WPAs to investigate if and how their FYW programs are meeting the needs of Latino students, I decided to use survey-based research. Lauer and Asher's *Composition Research: Empirical Designs* explains that “sampling survey research describes a large group, a *population*, of people, compositions, English courses, teachers, or classrooms, in terms of a *sample*, a smaller part of that group” (54). For this reason, designing a questionnaire for WPAs made it possible for me to find information from a larger population than a case study or ethnographic approach would have offered.

The main purpose of this chapter is to describe the survey used to gather information about the administration of FYW programs upon which the results detailed in Chapter 4 are based. The second part of this chapter, “The Pilot Study,” presents the research questions, describes the data-collection instrument, and identifies the variables and limitations of the pilot study. First, though, let me briefly discuss a review of information from the listserv of the Council of Writing Program Administrators (WPA-L), which I conducted early in my research.

**Review of the WPA-L**

Early in my research I conducted an informal review of postings in the WPA-L to get a sense of what people interested in writing administration work were discussing in relation to issues of language and cultural diversity. Before beginning the review, I brainstormed a list of keywords to look for while scanning subject lines. The list included search terms such as *diversity, social justice, Hispanic, Latino, Latina, multiculturalism,* and *language diversity* and *cultural diversity*. These terms helped me sift through numerous threads in search of specific
posts that reflected one or more of the keywords. Before beginning my review, I also created a spreadsheet to help me collect and organize my data.

Using the list of terms and the spreadsheet, I closely followed the WPA-L from January 13th, 2010 to April 13th, 2010. For the first two months, I listed the subject lines of all threads under one column of the spreadsheet and the number of responses each thread received in a second column. I also stored relevant and ambiguous discussions in a separate email folder. This approach made it possible for me to keep track of all discussions and the number of threads and responses. Between January and February I found a total of 316 initial postings and 757 responses. Although I initially planned to review the WPA-L for only a month, I continued my observation from February 16th to April 13th listing only the subject lines of all threads resulting in a total of 517 topics within those two months.

Out of the 1,590 initial postings and responses that I reviewed, only three posts focused on diversity issues. More specifically, I came across two calls for proposals for a conference on social justice and writing, and a conference on writing across the curriculum and second language writers, and a postdoctoral diversity fellowship at the University of New Mexico. My informal review of the WPA-L furthered my interests in pursuing the pilot study and contributed to the development of the research questions.
The Pilot Study

Research Questions

I developed the following research questions to explore the experiences of Latino students in higher education and in FYW, and to create a survey for questioning WPAs about their FYW programs:

1) How and why are Latinos struggling in higher education?

2) What problems confront Latinos when they encounter higher education?

3) What happens to Latinos' identities when they realize that their family or home culture differs from the academic or school culture?

4) Do FYW programs show awareness of diverse populations? For instance, do they emphasize language diversity in their curricula and policies?

5) Do FYW programs address the needs of Latinos and/or other minorities? For instance, do they offer a support group for Latino students and/or other groups?

6) How successful are FYW programs for minorities and Latino students? For instance, are Latino students and/or other minorities doing well in their writing courses?

In “Teachers of Composition and Needed Research in Discourse Theory,” Lee Odell suggests that “to survive as teachers, we need to know what is and is not going on so we can make intelligent choices about what to start doing, stop doing, or do differently” (italics in original 91). The research questions listed above aim to do what Odell suggests. They seek to find out “what is and is not going on” (91) in higher education and in FYW programs.
The first two questions focus on identifying what kinds of problems Latino students encounter, why they encounter them, and how they deal with them. The third question considers the impact of Questions 1 and 2, and examines the problematic effects on Latino students' cultural identities. I sought to answer these questions by examining published research in composition studies and in other disciplines. Lauer and Asher explain that “[in] order to know which problems are unresolved, a researcher must be aware of the literature” (9). They also note that rhetorical inquiry involves “engaging in heuristic search (which composition studies has often [done] by probing other fields)” (Lauer and Asher 5). In other words, my decision to evaluate scholarship beyond composition studies helped me “[look] for ways in which similar problems had been addressed” in the context of other disciplines (Lauer and Asher 5). As a result, Chapters 1 and 2 addressed the first three questions. The first chapter offered an introduction to some of the problems that Latino students face in higher education and FYW, while the second chapter further elaborated on these issues.

The last three research questions focus on how FYW is serving Latinos and other underrepresented groups. I formulated Questions 4, 5, and 6 by drawing from student affairs scholars Raechele L. Pope and Amy L. Reynolds. In “Student Affairs Core Competencies: Integrating Multicultural Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills” they explain what it means to gain multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills (271). I apply these concepts to the assessment of FYW programs. More specifically, Pope and Reynolds note that multicultural “awareness consists of the attitudes, beliefs, values, assumptions, and self-awareness necessary to serve students who are culturally different from oneself” (270). This means that program assessment
must include an evaluation of values that guide FYW to work with diverse student populations. Multicultural awareness can enable FYW to learn and know more about students, which leads into the next category, multicultural knowledge. In this category FYW continues to gain valuable information about the diverse student population through research (270). Lastly, multicultural awareness and knowledge leads to multicultural skills. This is where FYW programs put theory into practice through progression of the curriculum to meet all students' needs. In other words, FYW programs gain the ability to “effectively communicate across those differences” and challenge and intervene oppressive pedagogies (Pope and Reynolds 271). Based on these core competencies, Questions 4, 5, and 6 investigate FYW programs' multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills. Specifically, Question 4 centers on the program's awareness of diverse student populations, and whether this awareness appears through curricula and policies. The next question focuses on how FYW applies awareness and knowledge to address the needs of marginalized groups. And, the last question examines if the progression of FYW programs show through the success of Latinos and/or other minorities. These research questions guided me in developing the survey-based questionnaire for WPAs.

Data Collection

As I mentioned in the beginning of this chapter, the survey-based research for the pilot study helped me gather a substantial amount of data from a large population. I drafted several sets of questions for the survey. Early drafted questions failed to address my research questions and seemed “[inappropriate] and [invalid] for gaining the desired information” (Lauer and Asher 66). Because open-ended questions, as Lauer and Asher advise, can become time-consuming for
both the participants and the researcher, I obtained assistance from Bowling Green State University's Department of Applied Statistics and Operations Research to “edit questions for directness, simplicity, and clarity” (65). The final draft of the survey consisted of multiple choice and some open-ended questions. The following multiple choice questions allowed me “to compare responses with those of other” participants, while the open-ended questions offered me the opportunity to access “more variable responses and provide less predetermined, more basic types of responses” (Lauer and Asher 65):

1) Select the region that your university is located.
   _____ Northeast (CT, ME, MA, NH, RI, VT, DE, MD, NJ, NY, PA)
   _____ Southeast (AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN, VA, WV)
   _____ Midwest (IL, IN, IA, KS, MI, MN, MO, NE, ND, OH, SD, WI)
   _____ Southwest (AZ, NM, OK, TX)
   _____ West (CO, ID, MT, NV, UT, WY, AK, CA, HI, OR, WA)

2) Select the best description of your institution.
   _____ Small 4-year private university/college without graduate programs
   _____ Small 4-year private university/college with graduate programs
   _____ Small 4-year public university/college without graduate programs
   _____ Small 4-year public university/college with graduate programs
   _____ Mid-size 4-year private university/college without graduate programs
   _____ Mid-size 4-year private university/college with graduate programs
   _____ Mid-size 4-year public university/college without graduate programs
3) Which of these scenarios reflect your program's approach to teaching writing?
Select one choice for each scenario: strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree.

___ Karen insists that students must learn correct English grammar.
___ Mark includes readings from a diverse group of authors.
___ Adam advises students that learning academic discourse will help them succeed.
___ Lauren encourages students to reflect on how they use language.
___ Rita reflects on her own social biases and teaching approaches.

4) Does your program offer training for teachers? ____ Yes ____ No

5) If you answered “Yes” for Question 4, does your training program emphasize any issues that involve working with Latino/a or other minority students? Check all that apply.
___ Diverse student population
___ Home versus school language
___ Race and class issues
____ Teacher self-reflection (on things on this list, social biases, student learning, teaching approaches, etc.)

____ Other __________________ Please explain ______________________________

6) Do you know the approximate percentage of minority students at your university?
   ____ Yes ____ % (approximately)
   ____ No

7) Do you know the approximate percentage of Latino/a students at your university?
   ____ Yes ____ % (approximately)
   ____ No

8) Does your writing program have any accommodations for minority students?
   ____ Yes
   ____ No

9) If you answered “Yes” to Question 7, what kinds of accommodations does your program offer?

10) Does your writing program have any accommodations specifically for Latino/a students?
    ____ Yes
    ____ No

11) If you answered “Yes” to Question 9, what kinds of accommodations does your program offer? Check all that apply.
    ____ Tutoring in addition to/other than the writing center
    ____ Opportunities for students to display/show their work
Support group for Latino/a students

Other ______________ Please explain ________________________________

12) How successful is your writing program for Latino/a students? Very successful, successful, neutral, unsuccessful, very unsuccessful.

13) Are there things that you would like to do for Latino/a students that your program is not currently doing?

Yes/Please explain ________________________________

No

Through several revisions and with the assistance of Bowling Green State University's Department of Applied Statistics and Operations Research, I designed these survey questions specifically for experienced WPAs who were not only currently administrating or coordinating a FYW program, but who were also teaching or have taught FYW courses. As Lauer and Asher advise, “It is also wise to gather information about each person in the sample in order to be able to check possible deviations of nonrespondents from the known characteristics of the population, in order to suggest how these deviations might influence the overall results” (67). Since I developed an anonymous questionnaire, making it difficult to gather specific information about each participant, Questions 1 and 2 asked WPAs to identify themselves by their institution's location and description. Using multiple choices for these questions offered participants several options, and allowed me to compare responses and to get a sense of each WPA's institution. I thought that gathering this type of information would be valuable since every institution is different in its makeup of the student body.
Question 3 is included to get a better sense of the program's approach to the teaching of writing. WPAs were asked to select either “strongly agree,” “agree,” “neutral,” “disagree,” or “strongly disagree” for each statement. This approach allowed them to rate all of the scenarios based on their program's values without misleading or influencing them to a specific answer. The scenarios themselves reflect issues that I have discussed in previous chapters, such as the ability for Latino students to possess fluency in English and the importance of educators to reflect on their own beliefs and values.

Questions 4 and 5 asked about teacher training, emphasizing linguistic and cultural issues discussed in previous chapters. These questions allowed me to get a sense of what WPAs are doing in preparing their teachers to work with diverse student populations.

Questions 6 and 7 asked WPAs if they knew the percentage of Latino and/or minority students at their institution. These questions allowed me to get an estimate of the institution's diverse student population, especially since these percentages influence the program's approach to the teaching of writing.

Questions 8-11 focused on accommodation. I defined the term in the beginning of the survey as:

a process of mutual adaptation where students maintain their own identities and cultures. It involves a two-way relationship where there is understanding, where power is eliminated, and where conflict is minimized/eliminated as well. Accommodation opposes assimilation—a process of forced adaptation pressuring students to abandon their own identities and cultures.
These questions are important because they seek to find out if and how FYW programs are meeting the needs of Latino and/or minority students. Specifically, Question 11 provided participants with examples and choices to find out in what kinds of ways their programs might be helping Latino students.

Question 12 functioned as a follow up, asking WPAs to identify (based on what they know and what they are doing) if their programs are successful for Latino students. Lastly, Question 13 allowed participants to voice their concerns regarding things that they would like to do for these students. I designed all of these questions to allow WPAs to select from multiple choices, and provide them with opportunities to offer different responses and to explain them.

The survey-based method made it possible for me “to collect data from [a] large [group],” specifically from a total of 188 administrators (Lauer and Asher 65). To recruit WPAs, I first gathered a list of 57 members from the Council of Writing Program Administrators' (CWPA) website. While reviewing the WPA-L, I also looked at the signature information available toward the end of the threads and responses from participants to determine whether they were WPAs who met the criteria for the study. I also used the University of Texas at Austin's website to gather more contacts, specifically examining a list of U.S. universities by state to search for FYW programs and their WPA's contact information. Before contacting these WPAs, however, I went through the Human Subjects Review Board's (HSRB) application process in the spring of 2010. HSRB approved the pilot study in May 2010. Shortly after obtaining approval, I immediately started collecting data on May, 14th 2010 and ended my collection on September 7th, 2010. I referred to my contact list and emailed the WPAs inviting
them to take the survey, which I made available electronically through Kwik Surveys, a free online search engine. The email provided a brief welcoming invitation and overview of the study, as well as the consent letter with an in-depth description of the study, including its purpose, procedure, voluntary participation, confidentiality, risks, benefits, contact information, and the link to the survey's website, informing the participants that their completion of the questionnaire confirmed their consent (see Appendix A). During the four-month period that I made the survey available, I sent backup emails to all contacts thanking them for their time/participation and asking them to complete the survey if they were still interested in participating. I ended my data collection for the pilot study on September 8th.

**Variables and Limitations**

Several variables and limitations have affected the results of the pilot study. Variables include demographics, institution description, different definitions of accommodation, and differences in questionnaire responses and interpretations.

1. **Demographics.** One variable is the location of the WPA's institution, including the Northeast, Southeast, Midwest, Southwest, and West regions. The Latino or minority population varies in each of these regions. Therefore, the percentage of diverse student populations will depend on the institution's locality. This means that participant responses will differ depending on their student population, making it an important feature to keep in mind when analyzing the data.

2. **Institution Description.** Another variable is the type of institution, including small, mid-size, or large, public/private, undergraduate/graduate 4-year universities/colleges. Similar
to demographics, the percentage of diverse student populations will depend on the institution's size. The institution's description also impacts the writing program's curriculum and available resources. Participant responses will differ in terms of this important variable.

3. Different Definitions of Accommodation. Although in the beginning of the survey several key words were defined for participants, including the use of the term “accommodation,” another notable variable is their own perception of the term. Specific questions regarding accommodation of Latino and/or minority students will differ not only in what the program or institution offers, but also in how the WPA perceives and defines the term “accommodation.”

4. Differences in Questionnaire Responses and Interpretations. Lastly, another important variable to consider is differences in questionnaire interpretations and responses. The use of open-ended questions allowed WPAs to further develop their responses to certain multiple choice questions. As a result, some participants did not offer answers to these questions, while others did. One participant contacted me for clarification further clarification regarding one of the questions. This might be one reason why participants started the survey, but did not complete it. These discrepancies are significant to the analysis and outcome of the study because valuable information will be missing from some of the responses.

In addition to the impact of those variables, certain limitations affected the overall results of the study, including the data collection tool and the sample size. The first potential limitation
is that the use of an anonymous online questionnaire did not allow opportunities for follow up questions or further discussion. However, the survey still made it possible for me to gather information from a larger group of participants. While the survey offered the opportunity to recruit a large group of participants, another limitation of the study is the sample size, which also affects the results. Out of 188 participants contacted, 78 completed the survey, making the response rate 41%. On one hand, the Institutional Assessment Resources (IAR) notes that the average response rate for online questionnaires is 30%, making a 41% response rate above average. On the other hand, Lauer and Asher point out “that a 40-50% rate to a mailed questionnaire is” unacceptable even though it is a “typical … response [rate] in the field” (67). The reason for this, they explain, is “because the accuracy (lack of bias) of the results of a sampling procedure is based on the sample's being representative of the entire population—the result of a strictly random sample of the population” (67). But since they also note that “[n]o matter how large the return, a haphazard sample may be unrepresentative of the population of interest” (67), I see the data provided by the questionnaire contributing enough information for the pilot study.

In this chapter I described the descriptive research design that allowed me to gather information about the administration of FYW programs. The last three research questions—Do FYW programs show awareness of diverse populations? Do FYW programs address the needs of Latinos and/or other minorities? How successful are FYW programs for minorities and Latino students?—relate most directly to the pilot study. In turn, Chapter 4 will summarize the survey responses and provide an analysis of the data by using student affairs scholars Pope and
Reynolds' core competencies—multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills—as a frame of reference. The analysis in Chapter 4 will also evidence that FYW programs show awareness of diverse student populations and value reflection of instructional approaches.
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS OF THE STUDY

Prompted by these current demographic shifts and by institutional initiatives to increase diversity and diversity-related awareness, many college teachers are beginning to reconsider the implications of their instructional practices for students who come from various ethnic, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds. Those who teach composition courses are no exception.

Matsuda, et al., Second-Language Writing

As Paul Kei Matsuda, Michelle Cox, Jay Jordan, and Christina Ortmeier-Hooper point out in their introductory chapter to Second-Language Writing in the Composition Classroom, changing demographics and literacies have influenced writing teachers to reflect on their pedagogies. An awareness of changing demographics and literacies in the writing classroom led me to investigate if and how first-year writing (FYW) programs are meeting the needs of Latino students. To accomplish this, I decided to use survey-based research, and designed a questionnaire specifically for Writing Program Administrators (WPA) who have taught FYW and who were currently directing a FYW program. The survey method enabled me to find information from a larger population. My survey included 13 questions, which are listed in Chapter 3, and their responses, which are included in the appendix. This chapter will focus on the survey responses most directly relevant to three of my study's research questions:

1) Do FYW programs show awareness of diverse populations? For instance, do they emphasize language diversity in their curricula and policies?
2) Do FYW programs address the needs of Latinos and/or other minorities? For instance, do they offer a support group for Latino students and/or other groups?

3) How successful are FYW programs for minorities and Latino students? For instance, are Latino students and/or other minorities doing well in their writing courses?

The research questions, as Chapter 3 discusses, are based on student affairs scholars Raechele L. Pope and Amy L. Reynolds' core competencies—multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills.

The first category in Pope and Reynolds’ competence model is multicultural awareness. In the case of FYW, awareness involves an evaluation of values and goals that guide the program. This type of assessment can increase awareness of diverse student populations. Multicultural awareness enables FYW to learn more about diverse student groups, which leads to the next category in the competence model, multicultural knowledge. Through research FYW can continue to gain valuable information about diverse student populations. Lastly, a combination of awareness and knowledge leads to multicultural skill, which means putting theory into practice. These skills, encompassing awareness and knowledge, can guide FYW programs toward the progression of the curriculum to meet the needs of all students.

In the four sections of this chapter, I will use concepts from Pope and Reynolds’ competence model as a frame of reference to analyze survey responses bearing on the effectiveness in multicultural awareness and multicultural knowledge of FYW programs in serving Latino students, and WPA desires about serving Latino students better in the future. The data evidences the awareness of diverse student populations and reflection of instructional

---

2 Full data is available in the appendix.
approaches in the administration of FYW. This chapter provides the findings and analysis of the data.

**Multicultural Awareness in First-Year Writing Programs**

In *Multicultural Competence in Student Affairs* Pope, Reynolds, and Mueller explain that “the ability to be aware of […] values, attitudes, and assumptions, is a significant aspect of multicultural awareness. Without such self-evaluation, individuals may not realize that they hold inaccurate or inappropriate views of a particular culture in the form of stereotypes, biases, or culturally based assumptions” (15). In other words, self-reflection is the first step to achieve multicultural awareness, and is essential when working with diverse student groups. Therefore, an evaluation of the values and goals that guide FYW can help identify possible “values, attitudes, and assumptions” (Pope et al. 15) that may interfere with the program's ability to meet Latino students' needs. The survey questions discussed in this section seek to evaluate the values and goals that guide FYW programs according to the directors who participated in the study for the purpose of determining to what extent multicultural awareness exists.

*Survey Questions 6, 7, and 3 Findings and Analysis*

Research Question 4 asked if FYW programs show awareness of diverse student populations through, for instance, an emphasis on language diversity and/or their curricula and policies. The sixth and seventh research questions explore the awareness of diverse student populations by directors of FYW. Question 6 asked WPAs if they know the approximate percentage of minority students at their university (see the left side of Figure 3). Participants selected “Yes” or “No” and those who answered, “Yes” provided the approximate percentage.
Fifty-one WPAs responded, “Yes” (65%) and 19 responded “No” (24%). Similarly, Question 7 asked WPAs if they knew the approximate percentage of Latino students at their university (see the right side of Figure 3). Thirty-nine WPAs selected “Yes” (50%) and 31 selected “No” (40%). Eight (10%) participants for both of these survey questions did not provide an answer. The 8 participants who did not respond either did not finish the survey or skipped Questions 6 and 7.

![Figure 3: Survey Questions 6 and 7](image)

The participant’s ability to offer an estimate suggests an awareness of the diverse student population at their university. The majority of participants (65%) indicated that they knew the approximate percentage of minority students. However, only 50% said that they knew the approximate percentage of Latino students, a figure that could be higher since 10% of respondents did not answer the question. The fact that so many respondents did not know the percentage of Latino students at their university may suggest that some programs view Latinos as part of a broad group of “minority” students, rather than viewing them in their specific cultural and linguistic context. To the extent that this is true of FYW programs (something deserving
further research), it may signal problematic attitudes about Latinos and other groups similarly thought of as minority students. As discussed in Chapter 2, the use of “generic categories such as 'immigrant,' 'non-native,' or 'minority’” (Roberge 3) is problematic. Margaret A. Gibson's use of “the term minority [refers] to groups that are racially, culturally, or linguistically distinctive from the majority group and that occupy a subordinate position in terms of their power” (32). Gibson's definition recognizes that privilege and power contribute to the status of minorities, but some educators may associate the term with ethnic stereotypes. Some educators may also identify the term “minority” with “other.” Compositionist Elaine Freedman Fredericksen explains, “To most whites, race means anybody different from them, anybody nonwhite, anybody 'other' (9) and “[t]eachers have been taught to view minority students as 'other’” (10). Sociologist Allan G. Johnson adds, “The 'Americans' are assumed to be white, and the 'other races' are assumed to be races other than white” (96). Having “misinformed attitudes” like these and/or misconceptions about students' identities can lead some educators to make false assumptions and groupings regarding their students (Newman 23). Social grouping labels placed on students can affect the way educators view them, and can also affect the way students view themselves.

However, it is important to acknowledge that the demographics and institution type, variables described in Chapter 3, might explain the reason many respondents did not know the percentage of Latino students at their university in Survey Questions 6 and 7. The Latino population varies in each U.S. region. In turn, the percentage of Latino students depends on the institution's location. Additionally, the type of institution can also affect the student population for several different reasons, such as budget and resources, admission requirements, courses or
programs offered, etc. For instance, a small, public 4-year university/college without graduate programs may have a low percentage of Latino students as opposed to a large, public 4-year university/college with graduate programs. Even so, a large, public 4-year university/college located in a region where a small number of Latinos reside might have fewer Latino students. Therefore, the directors whom did not know the percentage of Latino students may work in a university where the Latino population and/or the university itself are small. In either case, there may not be a need for the WPA to know the percentage of a particular student group at his/her institution.

Survey Question 3 also provides insight into specific ways that FYW programs show awareness of diverse student populations. This question asked participants about their program's approaches to teaching writing by offering five different scenarios that reflect important pedagogies to consider when working with diverse student populations (see Figure 4). Participants selected from “Strongly Agree” to “Strongly Disagree” to identify if their program's approach to teaching writing reflects one or more of the scenarios given, including:

1) Karen insists that students must learn correct English grammar.
2) Mark includes readings from a diverse group of authors.
3) Adam advises students that learning academic discourse will help them succeed.
4) Lauren encourages students to reflect on how they use language.
5) Rita reflects on her own social biases and teaching approaches.
6) Figure 4 illustrates the number of responses for each of the five teaching approaches.
The “Karen” scenario emphasizes the importance of having students master correct English grammar. Seventy-three participants responded to the first scenario: five participants selected “Strongly Agree;” 27 selected “Agree;” 28 selected “Neutral;” 11 selected “Disagree;” and two selected “Strongly Disagree.” These results suggest that 32 FYW programs (44%) take the approach that students must learn correct English grammar. However, 22% of responses show less emphasis on correctness in writing programs. This is clearest with the 11 participants who disagreed, and the 5 who strongly disagreed with the scenario.

Including readings from a diverse group of authors into lessons is the emphasis in the “Mark” scenario. Seventy-five participants responded to the second scenario: 31 selected “Strongly Agree;” 33 selected “Agree;” 7 selected “Neutral,” and 4 disagreed. These results suggest that the majority of FYW programs (85%) require students to read literature from a diverse group of authors by taking the approach to include various literary works in their
curriculum. This is evident with the 31 participants who strongly agreed, and the 33 participants who agreed.

The “Adam” scenario stresses the importance of learning academic discourse. There were 74 responses for this scenario. More specifically, 31 participants strongly agreed; 38 agreed; 4 remained neutral, and 1 disagreed. These results suggest that 69 FYW programs (93%) take the approach that students must learn academic discourse to succeed, while just 1 program shows less emphasis on academic discourse, and 4 programs stay neutral.

Encouraging students to reflect on how they use language is the emphasis in the “Lauren” scenario. Seventy-two participants responded to this scenario: 44 selected “Strongly Agree;” 25 selected “Agree;” 2 selected “Neutral,” and 1 disagreed. These results suggest that 69 FYW programs (96%) take the approach that students need to reflect on their language use, while just 1 program does not take this approach, and 2 programs remain neutral.

Lastly, the “Rita” scenario emphasizes the importance of teacher self-reflection about social biases and teaching approaches. There were 75 responses for this scenario. More specifically, 21 participants strongly agreed; 34 agreed; 17 selected neutral; 2 disagreed, and 1 strongly agreed. These results suggest that 3 writing programs (4%) do not stress that teachers reflect on their own social biases and pedagogies. However, 73% of responses place more emphasis on the need for teacher reflection. This is clearest with 21 participants who agreed, and 34 who strongly agreed with the scenario.

The positive and negative responses to most of the scenarios are complicated by fairly high numbers of neutral responses, which might mean uncertainty, a modest degree of support,
or mild disagreement. But taken as a whole, a sense of multicultural awareness does exist in the coordination of FYW programs. On the one hand, the high emphasis on having students use correct English grammar and learn academic discourse might suggest that the majority of programs have a complex, perhaps contradictory view of multicultural awareness. These skills are necessary for all students to succeed in college and beyond, but forced, rigid language use and standardization can also cause possible negative complications on some Latino students' cultural and linguistic identities. Raul Ybarra, as discussed in Chapter 1, points out that learning academic discourse is not a smooth transition for Latino students, “but rather a hostile and invasive course of action which ultimately leaves a negative impression […] about writing” (43). For example, in Ybarra's Learning to Write as a Hostile Act for Latino Students he describes one of Pat's lectures, the teacher who Ybarra observed for his study. Pat “stressed to her students that they must start practicing how to use academic language early in the semester” (23). She said, “Even if you don't know anything. Act like the authority /?/. It's the mask that you got to put on” (24). By telling her students to put on a mask, Pat encouraged them to cover their cultural identities and pretend to be someone else in their use of language. Dora Ramírez-Dhoore and Rebecca Jones explain that “the students' language and their comfort within or against an academic discourse force them to wear multifaceted masks” (69). Students alter their language use—whether they know other languages other than English or speak non-standard variations of English. They put on a mask to either hide their frustrations or in an attempt to demonstrate their writing abilities. Latino students can feel alienated and frustrated when they are encouraged to
mask their cultural and linguistic identities to learn academic writing, which may contribute to their poor academic performance and high dropout rates.

On the other hand, a majority of programs seem to reflect multicultural awareness in the way they encourage teacher and student self-reflection, and the inclusion of diverse readings in FYW. More specifically, 73% FYW directors emphasize the need for teachers to reflect on their beliefs and assumptions, student learning, and the teaching of writing, which suggests that there is an awareness of language diversity and pedagogies that come into play when working with diverse student populations. In addition, 96% of WPAs also stress the need for students to consider their language use. FYW teachers may encourage students to ask themselves what persuades, informs, and/or inspires, as well as “How do our rhetorical choices affect different groups?” In addition, while the majority of the writing programs emphasize student reflection, 85% also stress the importance for students to gain varying perspectives from multiple fiction/non-fiction authors with different cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Through self-reflection and exposure to various perspectives, students can gain awareness of writing and language use among different groups.

**Multicultural Knowledge in Addressing Latino Students' Needs**

Multicultural awareness leads to the next category in Pope and Reynolds' competence model, multicultural knowledge, through which writing teachers can draw on to address the needs of Latino students in their classrooms. But as Pope, Reynolds, and Mueller explain such knowledge “about various cultural groups that is *typically not taught in many preparation programs*” (15, emphasis added). Such knowledge—influencing teachers as they work with
students on a daily basis—is important to a FYW program's efforts to address the needs of
Latino students. For this reason, the next sub-section of this chapter analyzes two survey
questions that center on teacher preparation. After that, another sub-section considers three
survey questions about program accommodations for minority students and for Latino students.
Together, these five survey questions provide information about Research Question 5: “Do FYW
programs address the needs of Latino students and other minorities?”

Survey Questions 4 and 5 Findings and Analysis

Survey Questions 4 and 5 asked participants if their writing program offers teacher
training (see the left side of Figure 5). In addition, the survey questions seek information about
the kinds of topics emphasized in the training (see the right side of Figure 5). Participants
selected “Yes” or “No” in response to Question 4. Sixty-three responded “Yes” (81%) and 10
responded “No” (13%). Five (6%) participants did not provide an answer. These results suggest
that 81% of FYW programs offer teacher training, while 10% do not. The 6 participants who did
not respond either did not finish the survey or skipped Question 4 and 5.

![Figure 5: Survey Questions 4 and 5](image-url)
Survey Question 5 asked participants who responded “Yes” to Question 4 to provide information about the content of their training program. The question asked about several important topics: working with diverse student populations, reflecting on home versus school language, addressing race and class issues, and encouraging teacher self-reflection. Question 5 also offers an “Other” category with which participants can provide detailed information about their training programs. The results suggest that 47 FYW programs (75%) offer teacher training that focuses on working with diverse student populations. Two participants noted, however, that the focus of the training depended on student demographics, which is an important variable of the pilot study mentioned in Chapter 3: “We have very few Latino students so most of our training focuses on [African-American] students” and “We have very few Hispanic students. We address these issues primarily in relation to other ethnic groups.”

The participant's explanations suggest that FYW writing programs show awareness of student demographics, and offer training to help teachers address the specific needs of diverse groups. Fifty-two programs (83%) encourage teachers to reflect on their social biases, student learning, teaching approaches, etc. This suggests that the majority of programs value the need for self-reflection, a necessary approach as Lilia I. Bartolome's humanizing pedagogy, introduced in Chapter 1, advocates. However, the results also suggest that there is less emphasis on language differences and race and class issues. This is clearest with only 35 FYW programs (56%) have teachers reflect on home versus school language, and only 36 programs (57%) address race and class issues. It is important to acknowledge, however, that inexperienced teachers, limited resources, demographics and institution type among other factors might explain the reason for
training programs to show less emphasis on language differences and race and class issues. Furthermore, one participant explained that although his/her writing program does not offer training, the university, English Department, and writing program faculty address such issues:

Our university offers faculty workshops that deal with [race], class, and diversity, and our English Department has sponsored one such workshop. Our writing program has several faculty who are working on issues of home vs. school language, but we haven't incorporated that work very extensively into our training.

Similarly, another participant pointed out that the university offers training, rather than his/her writing program: “My university offers such training, but it is not done in our department but rather in an education department, so I am not familiar with the issues emphasized.” While the participant's university offers training, his/her response suggests that he/she is unaware of diversity-related issues. As mentioned in Chapter 1, it is important for the WPA to have knowledge of language and diversity issues, regardless if the university and/or other department offer workshops and/or training.

Survey Questions 8, 10, 9 and 11 Findings and Analysis

Survey Questions 8 and 10 asked participants if their writing program offers any accommodations specifically for minority students and for Latino students (see Figure 6). As mentioned in Chapter 3, I defined the term “accommodation” for participants in the beginning of the survey as a process of mutual adaptation, involving a two-way relationship without power and conflict and opposing assimilation. Although I offered participants this definition, their responses varied based on their own perception of the term, which is an important variable of the
pilot study discussed in Chapter 3. Participants selected “Yes” or “No” in response to Questions 8: thirty-one responded “Yes” (40%) and 39 responded “No” (50%). Similarly, participants selected “Yes” or “No” in response to Questions 10: three responded “Yes” (4%) and 66 responded “No” (85%). The results suggest that 40% of FYW programs offer accommodations for minority students, while 50% do not. Also, only 4% of FYW programs offer accommodations specifically for Latinos, while 85% do not. Eight (10%) participants did not provide an answer for Question 8, while 9 (12%) did not provide an answer for Question 10. Participants who did not respond either did not finish the survey or skipped Questions 8 and 10. Results for Question 10 are significantly less than the percentages in Question 8.

![Figure 6: Survey Questions 8 and 10](image)

Participants who responded “Yes” to Question 8 described accommodations offered to minority students in Question 9. There were 32 open-ended responses to Question 9 (see the Appendix). Out of them, one described a program's philosophical approach to the teaching of writing:
Our program emphasizes that no overall standard for writing correctness exists. Rather, writing entails sets of options which depend upon the persons or the communities to whom the writing is being addressed, upon the purposes of the writing, and upon the persona the writer wishes to convey. While this philosophy of teaching writing does not address minority students specifically, it nonetheless provides them with useful accommodations.

This particular approach differs from all of the other FYW programs surveyed because it suggests a philosophy that challenges Douglas Downs and Elizabeth Wardle's description of the teaching of writing, as discussed in Chapter 2. Downs and Wardle explain that FYW “is usually asked to prepare students to write across the university” (552), and advise that the problem with this approach is that it “assumes the existence of a 'universal educated discourse' […] that can be transferred from one writing situation to another” (552). However, the participant's response suggests that his/her writing program focuses on the writer's purpose and audience, rather than on a standardization or formulaic approach.

Most responses suggest that the university, rather than FYW, offers accommodations for minorities. The “Minority Student Services program, which offers a range of services, support and activities to students from ethnic and racial minority groups; TRIO Program for first-year students—offered to low-income first-generation students who are primarily from ethnic and racial minorities […] Upward Bound outreach program for high-school and incoming freshman from economically disadvantaged and cultural/ethnic minority students offers summer college-readiness programs;” the Office of Multicultural Affairs and the Office on Minority Affairs offer
support for minorities. Although these programs are useful, I wonder if they address language diversity issues in FYW. In addition, one response suggests the reliance on university programs to address the needs of native speakers: “As far as native speakers, our writing program doesn't do anything to target minority students, but other programs within the university do.” This further supports Patricia Gándara and Frances Contreras' point, discussed in Chapter 1, that there may be a focus on students who are ESL (English as a Second Language) to attain language proficiency, rather than a focus on all students.

Although in the beginning of the survey, I explained that the “study does not focus on students who are learning English as a Second Language (ESL),” some participants who discussed accommodations for minorities specifically in FYW focused on ESL students, and relied on the academic and institutional labels to describe their program's approach and student population:

“… We offer an ESL class and are trying to get a dedicated ESL tutor in our writing center.”

“We offer alternative ESL comp courses for ESL students.”

“ELL / [ESL related] needs and language contexts.”

“We have ESL classes for non-native speakers …”

“Extra time for struggling second-language students to fulfill the entry-level requirements.”

“We have no special accommodations, but we have such a large percentage of minority students that our curriculum is directed toward the success of all students.”
As discussed in Chapter 2, academic labels can have negative effects on students' identities and performance in the classroom. More importantly, as Ortmeier-Hooper explains, these labels become status markers that may cause some writing teachers and instructors outside of the field of composition studies to have misconceptions about students' literacy skills. These misconceptions, as mentioned in the first section of this chapter, can lead some educators to make false groupings and assumptions, when in fact students' experiences vary and do not necessarily reflect the labels assigned to them (Newman 23).

In Chapter 2, I also highlighted Mark Roberge's explanation that the uses of “educational and institutional labels” continue to be used to “understand and describe the diversity of students from multilingual/multicultural immigrant families” (3). While there may be a need to classify students' literacy skills, sometimes students' cultural differences and identities may also be overlooked. This is evident in Question 9 where one participant noted, “Our instructors [...] are trained in ESL, Generation 1.5 in particular. We do not identify students by ethnic or language status but by assessment.” In Asao B. Inoue's “Engaging with Assessment Technologies: Responding to Valuing Diversity as a WPA” he calls for a need to recognize “‘diversity's' role in writing assessment efforts” by paying attention to “racial formations and racism in assessment” (135). This approach involves addressing issues of race, ethnicity, language diversity, etc.

Nonetheless, the possible resistance to examine students' cultural and linguistic identities is clearest when comparing Questions 8, 9, 10, and 11 open-ended responses. There are significantly more responses for Questions 8 and 9 than Questions 10 and 11. The disparity in
the number of responses signifies the need for us to increase our understanding of Latino students' cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

Participants who responded “Yes” to Question 10 had the opportunity in Question 11 to indicate whether their programs offered accommodations for Latinos, for instance tutoring in addition to/other than the writing center, opportunities for students to display/show their work, and/or support groups in Question 11 (see Figure 7). In addition, Question 11 also allowed participants select “Other” to further elaborate on their choices and/or provide an explanation. One participant responded “No” to Question 10, but still completed Question 11. The results show that 1 FYW program offers tutoring in addition to/other than the writing center; 3 writing programs offer opportunities for students to display/show their work, and 4 offer a support group.

![Figure 7: Survey Question 11](image)
There are only six responses to the “Other” option compared to the 32 responses in Question 9. Most participants discussed accommodations offered by the university, including student organizations and academic services, such as the Writing Center, while only one participant pointed out having “peer mentoring and peer advising,” although it is unclear if the university or writing program offers this. It is important to note that the low number of open-ended responses concerning accommodations for Latino students may stem from a number of limitations, such as limited resources due to institution type, a low percentage of Latino students, inexperienced or non-specialized teachers in diversity issues, varied perceptions of accommodation, etc.

**Multicultural Skills in Curriculum Progression**

A combination of multicultural awareness and knowledge leads to the last category in the competence model, multicultural skills, where theory gets put into practice. Pope, Reynolds, and Mueller describe multicultural skills as “those behaviors that allow us to effectively apply the multicultural awareness and knowledge we have internalized” (15). Such skills encompass “the ability to communicate across” differences (Pope et al. 15), and can guide FYW toward the progression of the curriculum to meet Latino students' needs. For this reason, this section centers on the effectiveness of FYW programs for Latino students.

*Survey Question 12 Findings and Analysis*

Survey Question 12 answers the last research question (see Figure 8): How successful are FYW programs for minorities and Latino students? Participants were asked to choose from “Very Successful” to “Very Unsuccessful.” The results suggest that out of 62 responses, 2
participants think that their programs are very successful for Latino students, 29 (47%) are successful, and only 2 participants think that their programs are unsuccessful. Although 31 (49%) directors consider their programs effective for Latino students, it does not necessarily mean that the programs are effective. Twenty-nine participants (47%), however, selected “Neutral.” The participants who selected “Neutral” for survey Question 12 may work at universities where the Latino student population is small. Therefore, they might not know how successful their writing program is for Latinos.
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**Figure 8: Survey Question 12**

**WPAs Seek Multicultural Competence**

A professional becomes multiculturally competent by working toward achieving all of the three core competencies—awareness, knowledge, and skills. Pope, Reynolds, and Mueller advise that multicultural competence is “a necessary prerequisite to effective, affirming, and ethical work in student affairs” (13). Responses to Survey Question 13 suggest that multicultural
competence is a value or aspiration for WPAs, many of whom want their programs to do more for Latino students than they currently do.

Survey Question 13 Findings and Analysis

Survey Question 13 asked participants if there are things that they would like to do for Latino students that their writing program is not currently doing (see Figure 9). Participants selected “Yes” or “No” in response to Question 13: thirty-four responded “Yes” (44%) and 26 responded “No” (33%). The results suggest that 44% of WPAs want to learn more about or do more for the Latino population at their university. Thirty-three percent most likely “want to help Latino/a students in general but […] do not have a specific need within their own departments,” to borrow words one participant used in his/her response. This may be because they have a small population of Latino students. Eighteen participants (23%) did not provide an answer for Question 13. Participants who did not respond either did not finish the survey or skipped Question 13.

Figure 9: Survey Question 13
Forty-one participants responded to the open-ended section of Question 13, which allowed them to explain what they wanted to do for Latino students. Some participants noted wanting to increase multicultural awareness through the celebration of linguistic and cultural diversity:

“"We need to do more to recognize 'English' in its many varieties. Although we have very few [Latino/a] students and those we have tend to do well, we need to do more to foster multicultural awareness with our student body and staff."

“Provide cultural support and appreciation for writing that these students perform.”

“… Some of the options listed on the previous question – opportunities specifically for [Latino/a] students to show their work, or specific organizations/clubs – are interesting.”

Several participants called for an increase in multicultural knowledge through further research, faculty development, and collaboration:

“Note: In question 12, when I said 'successful,' that is just a guess. I have taught writing at least once a year since coming here, and the Latino/a students I have had seem to me to have been as successful as other students. But I don't have empirical evidence and want to investigate this further. That would be a start. I'd also like to have some focus groups with various groups of students who have been through our writing program, including Latino/a students. And I would like to encourage faculty discussion of these issues and a sharing of strategies that help all students succeed: to become effective writers but also to celebrate all their language abilities, not just mainstream academic English.”
“… To my knowledge we have no data on the relative success of different minority groups in our composition program. So I would like to see if there are specific programmatic issues that need to be addressed.”

“I would like to have more faculty who are educated in second language writing issues. None of our tenured/t-t faculty have this as a specialization, and only a few of our lecturers have any background whatsoever in second language issues.”

“… Changing the perceptions of faculty regarding bilingual & ESL students – or those who may speak a non-standard dialect – seems key to more successful instruction for Latino/a students (among other groups). Specifically, encouraging instructors to address language issues directly in the classroom, to incorporate discussion of language diversity and diverse texts, and to accept a certain degree of language variation in first-year course work would be a big step.”

“I would like us to do more work with students to help them negotiate their home literacy practices and their school literacies …”

“There are things I’d like to be doing for minority students and for first-generation college students including faculty development that focused on ways to help minority students in writing classes …”

“Better trained teachers, more sensitive curriculum, and more small group or one-on-one support.”
“I would like the Writing Program to have closer ties to the various diversity organizations on campus so as to better determine the needs of our students of color, including our Latino/a students.”

Other participants noted a need to increase multicultural skills through the reform of assessment and pedagogies:

“[Elective] placement in sections for multilingual/[multicultural] writers.”

“Incorporating more Latino/a readings and scholarship. Addressing [Latino/a] language issues.”

“Fund tutoring services within the department, not just at the Writer's Workshop, which is not dedicated to minority students, though is available to them. Devise more curriculum that validates and harvests Latino/a students' respective funds of knowledge, heritage language and cultures for learning.”

“We'd like to serve bilingual and generation 1.5 students more effectively—first by identifying them and then by tailoring teaching to their specific needs. We are beginning discussions with the ESL department to brainstorm ways of better serving students who are not ESL but who are struggling with the conventions of academic language, with moving between two languages &/or dialects, and with navigating the waters of college in general.”

**Brief Summary of Major Issues**

Taken as a whole, the survey results suggest that WPAs seek multicultural competence. In other words, they aspire to having programs that serve Latino students better. More
importantly, they see the value in celebrating linguistic and cultural diversity, continuing faculty development and collaboration, and advancing reform efforts in assessment and pedagogies as the responses presented in the previous section show.

To raise multicultural awareness, however, it is necessary for FYW programs to continue the research on diverse student populations. The majority of WPAs (65%) indicated that they knew the percentage of minority students at their university. Only 50% said that they knew the approximate percentage of Latino students at their university. The unknown percentages of Latino students may suggest that some FYW programs view Latinos as part of a broad group of “minority” students, rather than viewing them in their specific cultural and linguistic context. If this is the case, it may signal problematic attitudes about Latinos and other groups similarly thought of as minority students. In addition, the high emphasis placed on learning correct English grammar and academic discourse seems to suggest that some programs might overlook students' cultural and linguistic backgrounds, and might be unaware of how forced language use and standardization can negatively impact some Latino students' identities.

The survey results also suggest that there is room for improvement, specifically in FYW training programs. Although the majority of programs encourage teachers to reflect on their social biases, student learning, and teaching approaches, there is less emphasis on language differences and race and class issues. Without training programs that emphasize these issues, FYW may lack valuable information about students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds. This lack of knowledge can prevent programs from progression. Further research is necessary to guide FYW programs toward advancing curricula and policies that address Latino students' needs.
Because it is evident that more research is necessary, Chapter 5 will conclude with important recommendations for future research after detailing the conclusions drawn from the pilot study and their implications for FYW programs. More specifically, the final chapter will include a discussion regarding possible improvements in diversity training, a look at different perspectives on the term “accommodation,” and the effects of academic and social grouping labels, such as ESL.
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

Bridges are thresholds to other realities, archetypal, primal symbols of shifting consciousness. They are passageways, conduits, and connectors that connote transitioning, crossing borders, and changing perspectives. Bridges span liminal (threshold) spaces between worlds, spaces I call nepantla, a Nahuatl word meaning tierra entre medio. Transformations occur in this in-between space, an unstable, unpredictable, precarious, always-in transition space lacking clear boundaries […] Though this state links us to other ideas, people, and worlds, we feel threatened by these new connections and the change they engender.

Anzaldúa, “(Un)natural bridges, (Un)safe spaces”

I began this dissertation introducing the university as Gloria Anzaldúa calls a borderland. Once again I conclude with Anzaldúa, but this time, her discussion of bridges reflects an option, a possibility for Writing Program Administrators (WPA) and composition teachers to meet the needs of all students in first-year writing (FYW). What if the university, along with its dormitories, classrooms, cafeterias, lounges, etc. became bridges, what Anzaldúa describes as, “passageways, conduits, and connectors that connote transitioning, crossing borders, and changing perspectives” (1)? These bridges, although “unstable” and “unpredictable,” can possibly become stepping stones to connect students to each other, their teachers, and the family and friends that they may have left behind. These bridges represent, what Margaret A. Gibson calls, “accommodation without assimilation” because such pathways allow for students and teachers occupying both sides to cross paths, share paths, and/or meet in the middle.
As described in Chapter 1, this dissertation is a starting point, a bridge toward understanding that explores if and how FYW programs in the United States address the literacy skills of second generation Latinos who speak either Spanish or variations of Spanish and English, or who speak only English. I hypothesized in the beginning that the contributing factors to Latinos' poor academic performance, such as the effect of labels, lack of support, the focus on English as a Second Language (ESL), and the push for students to quickly learn English (Gándara and Contreras 124-127), may stem from educators, policy makers, and political leaders overlooking students' cultural differences. This hypothesis led me to explore the following research questions in Chapter 2: Why are Latinos struggling in higher education? What factors contribute to the problems that they face? How do they confront these problems? How do these problems affect their identities? An examination of published research, focusing on academic, linguistic, and cultural issues in higher education and FYW helped identify specific problems that Latino students encounter in U.S. colleges/universities.

With background exploration of Latino students' issues in higher education and FYW, Chapter 3 described 13 survey questions for WPAs intended to provide evidence about these research questions: Do FYW programs show awareness of diverse populations? For instance, do they emphasize language diversity in their curricula and policies? Do FYW programs address the needs of Latinos and/or other minorities? For instance, do they offer a support group for Latino students and/or other groups? How successful are FYW programs for minorities and Latino students? For instance, are Latino students and/or other minorities doing well in their writing courses? Chapter 4 focused on those research questions as it analyzed responses using concepts
from student affairs scholars Raechele L. Pope and Amy L. Reynolds' competence model as a frame of reference. More specifically, I examined the effectiveness in multicultural awareness and knowledge of FYW programs in serving Latino students, and WPA desires about serving Latino students better in the future. In addition, in Chapter 3 I detailed several variables that have impacted the results of the pilot study, including demographics, institution description, different definitions of accommodation, and differences in questionnaire responses and interpretations. This final chapter details conclusions, discusses implications for FYW programs, and provides recommendations for future research, while noting the variables mentioned.

**Conclusions from the Study**

*Diversity Training for Teachers*

It is important for FYW programs to offer training or faculty development opportunities because such training can enhance multicultural knowledge “about various cultural groups that is *typically not taught in many preparation programs*” (Pope, Reynolds, and Mueller 15, emphasis added). For this reason, Survey Questions 4 and 5 asked participants if their writing program offered training, and the kinds of topics emphasized in the training. The results show that 63 FYW programs (81%) offer teacher training. More specifically, 47 of them (75%) emphasize working with diverse student populations, and 52 programs (83%) encourage teachers to reflect on their social biases, student learning, pedagogies, etc. It is notable that a high percentage of FYW programs surveyed emphasize diversity in their training. However, responses show less emphasis on the kinds of issues discussed in Chapter 2, including language skills and instruction, cultural differences, and students' identities. Thirty-five FYW programs (56%) have teachers
reflect or discuss home versus school language issues, and 36 of them (57%) address issues of race and class. This suggests that there is less emphasis than there might be on language differences and on race and class issues. Therefore, while the majority of FYW programs offer training on diversity matters, there is room for improvement, especially in the emphasis given to language, race, and class issues. However, it is important to note that factors, such as inexperienced trainers, limited budget and resources, student population, institution type, etc. may restrict what programs can do or need to do.

*Varying Perspectives on Accommodation*

One notable variable of the pilot study, as pointed out in Chapter 3, was the operation of different definitions of the term “accommodation,” which was defined in the beginning of the survey as a process of mutual adaptation involving a two-way relationship without power and conflict that opposes assimilation. Participants seem to have had varying perceptions of the term as they responded to Survey Questions 8, 9, 10 and 11, which asked participants if their writing program offered accommodations specifically for minority students and for Latino students. The results show that 31 FYW programs (40%) offer accommodations for minority students and 3 of them (4%) offer accommodations for Latino students. Thirty-nine participants offered open-ended responses in Questions 9 and 11.

1. University Accommodations
Twelve participants described accommodations offered by the university, such as the Upward Bound outreach program\(^3\), the Office of Multicultural Affairs, and the “Latina/o club.” It is hard to tell based on the responses if some of the university accommodations mentioned address the academic, linguistic, and cultural issues discussed in Chapter 2.

2. FYW Program Accommodations

Twenty-four participants described accommodations offered within their program. Their responses varied based on their own understanding of accommodation. Some participants discussed general pedagogical approaches for minority students, such as encouraging student self-reflection on language practices, and “building on the knowledge and language experience” of students. Other participants described specific programs, courses, and/or services for minority students and for Latino students, such as the EOF program\(^4\), the Academic Writing Program\(^5\), the Learning Center, and the Writing Center. Follow-up questions would have provided the opportunity to seek further details about the accommodations mentioned in FYW.

3. Language Diversity Accommodations

Survey Question 3 asked participants about their program's approaches to teaching writing, by offering five different scenarios that reflect important pedagogical approaches to consider when working with diverse student populations. Two of those scenarios

---

3 The “Outward Bound outreach program for high-school and incoming freshman from economically disadvantaged and cultural/ethnic minority students offers summer college-readiness programs.”
4 The “EOF program […] offers an intensive 6 [week] summer program that has developmental writing and the 1 semester [First-Year Composition].”
5 “The Academic Writing Program is a two-semester Composition I course, with lower student cap on class size and offering a two-course sequence with an additional one-on-one weekly tutoring component.”
focused on learning standardized English: 32 FYW programs (44%) take the approach that students must learn correct English grammar, and 69 of them (93%) take the approach that students must learn academic discourse to succeed. As mentioned in Chapter 4, the high emphasis on having students use correct English grammar and learn academic discourse might suggest that the majority of programs have a complex, perhaps contradictory view of multicultural awareness. These skills are necessary for students to acquire, however, as discussed in Chapter 1, for some Latino students learning these skills can become “a hostile and invasive course of action which ultimately leaves a negative impression […] about writing” (Ybarra 43). For mainstream students academic discourse is a part of learning about their own culture, but for some Latino students it becomes an acculturating process, as they “are attempting to grasp a new and different—that is, dominant—culture” (Pai and Adler 40). However, open-ended responses to Question 9 about accommodations for minority students indicate that FYW programs show awareness of language diversity issues and address them. For instance, one participant explained that his/her program “expect students to do their final draft writing in standardized written English,” but also added that the program focuses “on writerly behaviors and [questions] for self-reflection that writers need to ask themselves, so issues of language and dialect are addressed all of the time.” Another participant mentioned “that most sections see grammatical and mechanical correctness as an appropriate goal,” but also added that “there is room for exploring cultural (and to a lesser extent) linguistic differences through readings and writing topics.”
English as a Second Language

As I discussed in Chapter 2, academic labels can have negative effects on students' identities and performance in the classroom. Out of the 33 open-ended responses to Question 9, five participants used academic labels in their description of accommodations for minority students. For instance, one participant explained, “We offer an ESL class and are trying to get a dedicated ESL tutor in our writing center.” Another mentioned, “ELL/ESI [related] needs and language contexts,” and another participant noted, “Our instructors [for the extra workshops offered] are trained in ESL, Generation 1.5 in particular.” Additionally, in the beginning of the survey, I explained that the “study does not focus on students who are learning English as a Second Language (ESL).” Yet, these participants referred to ESL students. As mentioned in Chapter 1, Patricia Gándara and Frances Contreras highlight that one “critical aspect of language learning that [contributes] to [Latinos’] underachievement” is the focus on students who are ESL to attain language proficiency (124-127). However, the majority of participants did not use academic labels in their responses. And, for the five participants that did, it is important to acknowledge that, “scholars have become aware that” these labels “can serve to highlight or conceal, validate or invalidate, and define or convolute the histories, experiences, and educational needs of individual students” (Roberge 4).

Implications for First-Year Writing Programs

Diversity Training – Room for Improvement

One conclusion drawn from the pilot study involves the emphasis that FYW programs place on diversity training. As highlighted in Chapter 4, several WPAs expressed the need for
“[better] trained teachers,” and an increase in faculty development opportunities. More specifically, one participant wanted “more faculty who are educated” or who specialize “in second language writing issues.” Such diversity training can begin, as Mark Roberge points out, “in […] Composition graduate programs” (7).

Another participant commented on the need to change “perceptions of faculty regarding bilingual & ESL students” by “encouraging instructors to address language issues directly in the classroom, to incorporate discussion of language diversity and diverse texts, and to accept a certain degree of language variation in first-year course.” One participant also mentioned wanting teachers “to do more work with students to help them negotiate their home literacy practices and their school literacies.” These participants desire training and/or opportunities that can help teachers have a dialogue with their students in the classroom. For a teacher-student dialogue to occur, training would require a discussion of language differences. Improving diversity training may increase multicultural awareness and knowledge, and help WPAs and composition teachers develop or add accommodations for Latino students. Although there is room for improvement, it is also important to keep in mind that many limitations may restrict what programs can do or need to do.

**Accommodations – Learning about Varying Perspectives**

Another implication of the pilot study for FYW involves the varying perspectives educators have on accommodation, such as university services, FYW support, and language diversity awareness. Learning about varying perspectives of accommodation may help answer a future research question: “How can FYW programs accommodate Latino students?” Scholars,
such as Deborah M. Sanchez, Eric J. Paulson, Jonathan Alexander, and Jacqueline Jones Royster, describe possible teaching practices that may serve to accommodate Latino students in FYW programs. Sanchez and Paulson suggest adopting a Critical Language Awareness (CLA), which “is one literacy tool that students need in order to examine limit-situations or 'what went wrong’” (166). They explain that “[the] purpose of CLA is to encourage students to uncover ways that the language of texts is socially constructed and how language may position students in negative ways, both purposefully and inadvertently” (166). While students learn academic discourse, they “also learn to critique the issues related to power, access, and equality that are entrenched in language practices” through CLA pedagogy (167). Sanchez and Paulson's approach encourages Latino students to talk and think critically about how mainstream ideologies and expectations regarding education, language, and culture may affect their multiple identities. In addition, Sanchez and Paulson advise that students must be able to relate to the texts being read in order to assume a voice within the discourse (171). Thus, having a diverse selection of readings may help Latino students find their voice and strengthen their writing.

Johnathan Alexander, in “Literacy and Diversity: A Provocation,” takes a similar stance proposing “that the proper subject of composition should be discourse of othering . . . that is, the discursive and rhetorical strategies through which people are positioned within larger systems of categorization” (166). Alexander further explains that educators must “move beyond including, to understanding” (168) by helping students “[analyze] how dominant discourses contribute to the construction of particular privileged—and under-privileged—identities in the first place” (167). Similarly, Royster believes in having a dialogue with students “about the truths and
consequences of disclosure, about ethos . . . as a situated identity and an invented or negotiated identity” (27). She also suggests that the teacher and students discuss “the importance of assessing, [and] not just using, personal knowledge and experience in making good decisions about what is private, what is social, what is public, what should be written or said, [and] recognizing in explicit ways that classrooms are not private spaces” (Royster 27). The teaching practices described by Sanchez, Paulson, Alexander, and Royster can not only occur in the classroom, but can also take place in support groups and workshops for Latino students.

*English as a Second Language – A Collaborative Dialogue*

A final conclusion drawn from the pilot study involves the use of academic labels and the emphasis on ESL. As highlighted in Chapter 2, Roberge explains that these labels have been used, and continue to be used, to “understand and describe the diversity of students from multilingual/multicultural immigrant families” (3). However, Roberge adds that scholars realize how these labels cloud educators' understanding of students' individual experiences (4). A collaborative dialogue involving these scholars, composition teachers, and educators from other disciplines can increase recognition of how and why these labels may affect some Latino students. In turn, an open dialogue may also help prevent some educators from making false assumptions and groupings.

**Future Research**

This dissertation is the beginning of my research into, what a recent news article in *The Huffington Post* described as, the “Latino Education Crisis.” As the number of Latino students in U.S. colleges/universities and in FYW increases, future research will be necessary. Because of
this, I highlight a few aspects of the pilot study that I would refine and build on the spirit of Janice M. Lauer and J. William Asher's statement that “[i]mprovements in instruction and advancements in knowledge about writing will stem from communication among composition theorists, writing instructors, and empirical researchers, who come to respect and value each other's efforts” (ix). Toward this end, my future research will include interviews with a group of participants to, hopefully, engage in a dialogue about certain issues that are raised in this dissertation.

Interviews with WPAs and composition teachers will help me gather more information and increase my understanding on the conclusions drawn from the pilot study, including diversity training, the term “accommodation,” and the use of academic labels and emphasis on ESL students. Because I concluded from the pilot study that there is room for improvement in diversity training, especially in the emphasis given to language, race, and class issues, I will ask future recruits to describe the training that is available to their graduate students and/or faculty. This will also allow me to ask participants about any limitations that may prevent their FYW program from having or improving diversity training. I also concluded from the pilot study that participants had different perceptions of the term “accommodation.” In future research I will ask participants to define the term and discuss how their FYW program accommodates Latino students. In doing so, I will also take the opportunity to answer my future research question: “How can FYW programs accommodate Latino students?” To do this, I will encourage participants to share specific pedagogical strategies, syllabi, writing assignments, assessment techniques, etc. that they think reflect an “accommodation without assimilation” approach.
Additionally, during the interview process, I will ask participants about their views on the use of academic labels and emphasis on ESL. This will allow me to have a collaborative dialogue with participants about important terms and issues that are central to this dissertation.

Building on some of the survey questions, I will clarify ambiguous questions for interview purposes. As I pointed out in Chapter 3, one participant contacted me for clarification specifically on Survey Question 3, which asked participants about their program's approaches to teaching writing. I also struggled with my analysis of Question 3 due to the fact that it offered five different scenarios in one question that reflect important pedagogies to consider when working with diverse student groups. Two of these scenarios stood out the most. More specifically, I concluded from the pilot study that the high emphasis on correct English grammar and academic discourse might be problematic for Latino students. In future research I will ask participants to share their thoughts about teaching standardized English to Latino students. During these discussions I will have the opportunity to ask follow-up questions to further my understanding on standardized writing and its effects on Latino students' identities.

I will also use data from the pilot study that I did not analyze in Chapter 4, including Survey Questions 1, 2, 6 and 7. Question 1 asked participants to identify the regional location of their university, and Question 2 asked them to select the choice that best described the type of institution. Questions 6 and 7 asked participants if they knew the approximate percentages of minority students and Latino students at their university. By analyzing the administrators’ individual responses and examining each of their responses that describe the regional location, type of institution, and the approximate percentages of the diverse student population, I might
further my understanding of the kinds of answers participants offered or not offered in the pilot study. I have already categorized some of this data\(^6\) for future use.

Given the sample size, however, I did not see any discernible patterns, especially for Question 3 that I could have used to analyze the data by region, institution type, and/or the approximate percentages of minority and Latino students. As I noted in Chapter 3, the survey offered the opportunity to recruit a large group of participants. Out of 188 participants contacted, 78 of them completed the survey, making the response rate 41%. This number does not reflect, however, the participants who did not finish the survey, which may have been partially due to the number of questions and the ambiguity of some questions. For this reason, in the future I will try to reduce the number of incomplete surveys by having each survey focus on fewer questions, which are phrased and contexted to make them more detailed.

The final pages of this dissertation are not the end of my study but a beginning reflected by Gloria Anzaldúa's words that began this chapter:

> A bridge, such as this [dissertation], is not just about one set of people crossing to the other side; it's also about those on the other side crossing to this side. And ultimately, it's about doing away with demarcations like 'ours' and 'theirs.' It's about honoring [students'] otherness in ways that allow us to be changed by embracing that otherness rather than punishing others for having a different view, belief system, skin color, or spiritual practice. (Anzaldúa 4)

\(^6\) Additional data is available in the appendix.
As data from my pilot study suggests, FYW programs in the United States show awareness of students' diverse backgrounds. My hope is that this dissertation and future scholarship involving Latino students in higher education and FYW will continue raising awareness that, to use the words of composition scholars Kim Brian Lovejoy, Steve Fox, and Katerine V. Wills, “it no longer makes sense to teach writing as though all students share a common language or dialect” (262). This awareness will, hopefully, lead all educators, policy makers, and political leaders toward “embracing [Latino students’] otherness” (Anzaldúa 4).
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APPENDIX A:
INFORMED CONSENT AND QUESTIONNAIRE

Informed Consent for Writing Program Administrator

Latino/a Students in Higher Education: Modes of Accommodation in First-Year Writing

Introduction

You are invited to participate in a research study. The study is being conducted by Vanessa Cozza from the Bowling Green State University Department of English as part of her dissertation. This study aims at investigating the current state of Latino/a students in higher education and first-year writing programs, while arguing that accommodation rather than assimilation is necessary for the success of Latino/a students in education and the writing classroom. Your participation in this study will consist of completing one brief survey/questionnaire.

Purpose

The purpose of this research study is to understand if and how first-year college writing programs accommodate Latino/a students. Specifically, I am investigating the current state of Latino/a students in higher education and first-year writing programs. In addition, this study includes a brief questionnaire for Writing Program Administrators (WPAs) who are currently directing first-year writing and who are currently teaching or have taught first-year writing courses. Furthermore, I argue that accommodation rather than assimilation is necessary for the success of Latino/a students in education and the writing classroom.

Although there is no compensation for your participation, the study will benefit your work as a WPA and/or composition instructor. Specifically, it can help WPAs become aware of Latino/a students' struggles and needs, aid composition instructors in learning how to accommodate all students in the writing classroom regardless of race and class, and inform society as a whole to better understand the problems in education.

Procedure

Because you are a WPA, you are receiving this email asking you to complete the electronic survey anonymously. By completing and submitting this survey you are indicating your consent to participate in the study and giving permission to use your responses, which will help to answer if and how your writing program is accommodating Latino/a students. The total amount of time you will spend on this survey would be no more than 10 minutes.
Voluntary Participation

Your participation in this research study is completely voluntary. You are free to withdraw at any time. You may decide to skip questions or discontinue participation at any time without penalty. Your decision to participate or to not participate will in no way impact your relationship with BGSU.

Confidentiality

Your participation in the survey will be anonymous. Because email is not a confidential means of communication, I will only use email to inform you about the study. Please note that email is not 100% secure, so it is possible that someone intercepting your email will gain knowledge of your interest in the study. I will protect the anonymity of you as a respondent and your responses. I plan to use direct quotes from your responses, but neither I nor anyone else will know which responses belong to you. Only I will have access to the information you provide, and your identity will not be revealed in any published results unless you specifically request identification by contacting me at (610) 505-3623 or vcozza@bgsu.edu.

All data will be maintained off-campus and stored in a locked filing cabinet when not in use by me. I will destroy all data at the conclusion of the research study.

Risks

There are no foreseeable risks associated with this study that would be greater than those normally encountered in daily life.

Benefits

This study will benefit WPAs, composition instructors, as well as the greater society. Specifically, this study can help WPAs because missing from the scholarship is much attention to the role of WPAs in helping first-year writing programs to address Latino/a students' needs. WPAs have the responsibility to coordinate their programs and train their teachers to meet the needs of all students. As Kim Brian Lovejoy, Steve Fox, and Katerine V. Wills mention, “it no longer makes sense to teach writing as though all students share a common language or dialect” (262). It is also necessary for WPAs to become aware of how dominant ideologies clash with the values of Latino/a students and how cultural conflict hinder their ability to learn. WPAs “are in the positions to lead and support efforts toward 'unleashing' the literacies of linguistically diverse students” (Lovejoy, et al 261). Also, this study can aid composition instructors because they “continue to struggle with the implications of home and community languages as part of classroom pedagogy, and most composition programs do not have explicit language policies or
program initiatives that address linguistic diversity in the classroom” (Lovejoy, et al 262). Lastly, this study can also inform society as a whole to recognize the problems that exist in education and realize the need for improvement.

Contact Information

Should you have any questions about the study or need clarification, please contact me at (610) 505-3623 or vcozza@bgsu.edu, or contact the chair of my dissertation committee, Dr. Richard Gebhardt at (419) 372-7212 or richgeb@bgsu.edu. If you have questions about the conduct of this study or your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Chair of BGSU’s Human Subjects Review Board at (419) 372-7716 or hsrb@bgsu.edu.

Consent

By completing and submitting the electronic survey, link below, you agree that you have read and understood the above information and hereby consent to voluntarily participate in this study. Some employers use tracking software to monitor and record keystrokes, mouse clicks, and web sites visited. This could impact the anonymity of your responses. Therefore, you may wish to complete the survey on your home computer or a public computer. Do not leave the survey open if using a public computer or a computer others may have access to. Upon completion of this survey, please clear your web browser’s cache and page history after you submit the survey in order to protect your privacy.

---

Questionnaire

Brief Background Information: This study does not focus on students who are learning English as a Second Language (ESL), rather this study focuses on Latino/a students who are bilingual (speak both Spanish and English), but are struggling in remedial/basic writing and first-year composition courses.

For the purpose of this study, accommodation is defined as a process of mutual adaptation where students maintain their own identities and cultures. It involves a two-way relationship where there is understanding, where power is eliminated, and where conflict is minimized/eliminated as well. Accommodation opposes assimilation—a process of forced adaptation pressuring students to abandon their own identities and cultures.

Instructions: Please complete all of the questions below. Some questions may be answered with “yes” or “no” followed by brief information or explanation. Feel free to use as much space as you like to complete your responses. Upon completion of this survey, please remember to clear your web browser’s cache and page history. Please contact me if you have any questions. And thank you for taking the time to help me in my research.

Vanessa Cozza (vcozza@bgsu.edu)

1) Select the region that your university is located.
   ____ Northeast (CT, ME, MA, NH, RI, VT, DE, MD, NJ, NY, PA)
   ____ Southeast (AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN, VA, WV)
   ____ Midwest (IL, IN, IA, KS, MI, MN, MO, NE, ND, OH, SD, WI)
   ____ Southwest (AZ, NM, OK, TX)
   ____ West (CO, ID, MT, NV, UT, WY, AK, CA, HI, OR, WA)

2) Select the best description of your institution.
   ____ Small 4-year private university/college without graduate programs (2,000 students)
   ____ Small 4-year private university/college with graduate programs
   ____ Small 4-year public university/college without graduate programs
   ____ Small 4-year public university/college with graduate programs
   ____ Mid-size 4-year private university/college without graduate programs (2,000-12,000 students)
   ____ Mid-size 4-year private university/college with graduate programs (2,000-12,000 students)
   ____ Mid-size 4-year public university/college without graduate programs (2,000-12,000 students)
   ____ Mid-size 4-year public university/college with graduate programs (2,000-12,000 students)
   ____ Large 4-year private university/college without graduate programs (over 12,000)
   ____ Large 4-year private university/college with graduate programs (over 12,000)
3) Which of these scenarios reflect your program's approach to teaching writing? Select one choice for each scenario: strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree.

   ____ Karen insists that students must learn correct English grammar.
   ____ Mark includes readings from a diverse group of authors.
   ____ Adam advises students that learning academic discourse will help them succeed.
   ____ Lauren encourages students to reflect on how they use language.
   ____ Rita reflects on her own social biases and teaching approaches.

4) Does your program offer training for teachers? ____ Yes  ____ No

5) If you answered “Yes” for Question 4, does your training program emphasize any issues that involve working with Latino/a or other minority students? Check all that apply.

   ____ Diverse student population
   ____ Home versus school language
   ____ Race and class issues
   ____ Teacher self-reflection (on things on this list, social biases, student learning, teaching approaches, etc.)
   ____ Other  __________________ Please explain ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________

6) Do you know the approximate percentage of minority students at your university?

   ____ Yes ____ % (approximately)
   ____ No

7) Do you know the approximate percentage of Latino/a students at your university?

   ____ Yes ____ % (approximately)
   ____ No

8) Does your writing program have any accommodations for minority students?

   ____ Yes
   ____ No

9) If you answered “Yes” to Question 7, what kinds of accommodations does your program offer?
10) Does your writing program have any accommodations specifically for Latino/a students?
_____ Yes
_____ No

11) If you answered “Yes” to Question 9, what kinds of accommodations does your program offer? Check all that apply.
_____ Tutoring in addition to/other than the writing center
_____ Opportunities for students to display/show their work
_____ Support group for Latino/a students
_____ Other __________________ Please explain ________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

12) How successful is your writing program for Latino/a students? Very successful, successful, neutral, unsuccessful, very unsuccessful.

13) Are there things that you would like to do for Latino/a students that your program is not currently doing?
_____ Yes __________________ Please explain ________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____ No
APPENDIX B:

ADMINISTRATORS’ CUMULATIVE RESPONSES

Total Responses Received: 78

Question 1: Select the region that your university is located.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total # of Respondents</th>
<th>Total % of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 2: Select the best description of your institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Total # of Respondents</th>
<th>Total % of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small 4-year private university/college without graduate programs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small 4-year private university/college with graduate programs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small 4-year public university/college without graduate programs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small 4-year public university/college with graduate programs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-size 4-year private university/college without graduate programs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-size 4-year private university/college with graduate programs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-size 4-year public university/college without graduate programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mid-size 4-year public university/college with graduate programs
12 15%
Large 4-year private university/college without graduate programs
0 0%
Large 4-year private university/college with graduate programs
15 19%
Large 4-year public university/college without graduate programs
1 1%
Large 4-year public university/college with graduate programs
28 36%

Other (please explain)

2200 students

**Question 3: Which of these scenarios reflect your program's approach to teaching writing. Select one choice for each scenario.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total # of Respondents</th>
<th>Total % of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karen insists that students must learn correct English grammar.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark includes readings from a diverse group of authors.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam advises students that learning academic discourse will help them succeed.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren encourages</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
students to reflect on how they use language.

Rita reflects on her own social biases and teaching approaches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 4: Does your program offer training for teachers?</th>
<th>Total # of Respondents</th>
<th>Total % of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 5: If you answered “Yes,” does your training program emphasize any issues that involve working with Latino/a or other minority students? Check all that apply.</th>
<th>Total # of Respondents</th>
<th>Total % of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diverse student population</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home versus school language</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and class issues</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher self-reflection</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please explain)

Training is quite limited, as we have very few adjunct instructors and no TAs. However, since the majority of participating instructors teach Basic Writing, we do discuss how the diversity of our student body influences placement, program goals, and approaches to teaching writing.

We have very few Latino students so most of our training focuses on African-American students.

Not enough--but we're in the process of addressing some of these needs right now.

Our university offers faculty workshops that deal with race, class, and diversity, and our English Department has sponsored one such workshop. Our writing program has several faculty who...
are working on issues of home vs. school language, but we haven't incorporated that work very extensively into our training.

Training may not be the best term to describe what we do. Most faculty are tenure-track; we meet to discuss course goals and how we approach them. This is the first year we've ever had meetings among the faculty, and we are in the midst of assessment, so that's been the focus of our meetings. As the program builds momentum, I imagine we'll diversify the topics. We have university-wide training on working with a diverse student population, as well as activities sponsored by the president's office that encourage teacher self-reflection on race and class issues, social biases, and student learning.

My university offers such training, but it is not done in our department but rather in an education department, so I am not familiar with the issues emphasized.

To date, the "training" is less formal, and has focused on revision pedagogy.

We have very few Hispanic students. We address these issues primarily in relation to other ethnic groups.

Home vs. school values

Some of these questions are difficult to answer, because our tenured faculty rarely attend faculty development events, so it is our younger teachers who tend to reflect on diversity issues, language acquisition, academic language as learned, and so on.

first-generation status (i.e., first in family to attend college; low-income status

**Question 6: Do you know the approximate percentage of minority students at your university?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total # of Respondents</th>
<th>Total % of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you answered “Yes,” what is the approximate percentage?

27
10  
65%  
30  
65%  
90%  
25  
25%  
14%  
3%  
12  
50  
20%  
30%  
34  
15%  
5  
~15%  
15  
12%  
70%  
10%  
about 10%  
30  
38%  
90  
47%  
20%  
8  
11  
60
73% undergrads; 52% graduate students

Question 7: Do you know the approximate percentage of Latino/a students at your university?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total # of Respondents</th>
<th>Total % of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you answered “Yes,” what is the approximate percentage?

56

16% of graduate students; and I'm guessing here—maybe 30% of undergrads

35%
45%
0.08
Question 8: Does your writing program have any accommodations for minority students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total # of Respondents</th>
<th>Total % of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 9: If you answered “Yes,” what kinds of accommodations does your program offer?

Text Answers (33)

1. ACT 101 program for students from PA in need of support
2. Three support programs: Program for Success, PACE program, and Summer Bridge program
3. Coordinator of Learning for Students with Learning Disabilities
4. Recipient of a national grant to support diverse learners by initiating major curricular changes, including the hire of a Director of Developmental Education, and hire of an aide for the director.
5. Creation of a support program for athletes

Much work is being initiated, and we have just begun discussion of support for students whose first language at home may be other than English. This support may come under the federal grant, and yet another, called a Teagle foundation grant.

Minority Student Services program, which offers a range of services, support and activities to students from ethnic and racial minority groups; TRIO Program for first-year students--offered to low-income first-generation students who are primarily from ethnic and racial minorities, offers intensive support and special college-core courses in the first college year; Upward Bound outreach program for high-school and incoming freshmen from economically disadvantaged and cultural/ethnic minority students offers summer college-readiness programs. Writing Center and Student Success Center offer tutoring and general academic support for all students.
We have no special accommodations, but we have such a large percentage of minority students that our curriculum is directed toward the success of all students.

sections offered through the Office of Multicultural Affairs

...although I'm not entirely comfortable with what "accommodations" might mean, so I'm answering here even though I answered "no" for #8. We do expect students to do their final draft writing in standardized written English. However, we also focus *a lot* on writerly behaviors and *questions* for self-reflection that writers need to ask themselves, so issues of language and dialect are addressed all of the time.

Many (though certainly not all) students are enrolled through HEOP and receive intensive preparation prior to the start of the term, as well as weekly tutoring sessions throughout the semester. In addition, when a large number of students whose home language is not English enrolled in my section of CMP 101 this term, we arranged to embed a student coach (from the Learning Center) in the course, in order to provide additional assistance.

Our university has a program for first-generation college students--to give them opportunities to meet with each other and receive tutoring as desired. It is voluntary and almost all participants in the program are members of minority groups. The program pays for several sections of FYC each semester in which all members of the class are in the program and teachers work with leaders in the program.

Bridge program for minority students, which is voluntary and takes place in the weeks before classes begin in the autumn (offered by Office on Minority Affairs, but focus is on writing and staff come from the writing program).

I'm answering a very qualified "yes." Virginia does not allow for "developmental" courses, but we do have one course for students "underprepared" for FYW. While in this course (as well as our FY course) there is room for exploring cultural (and to a lesser extent) linguistic differences through readings and writing topics, I think that most sections see grammatical and mechanical correctness as an appropriate goal.

I answered "yes" only so I could enter a response. I'm not sure what you mean by accommodations. Our program encourages students to reflect on language practices in context. _All_ students (especially here) bring varied experiences with this.

We offer an ESL class and are trying to get a dedicated ESL tutor in our writing center. As far as native speakers, our writing program doesn't do anything to target minority students, but other programs within the university do.
While we don't have accommodations for minority students per se, we do have offer a developmental writing course to help students succeed in the mainstream writing course and future academic endeavors. A good portion of the students who take this course are minorities, but it is not billed or perceived as a specific accommodation for minorities.

There is an EOF program that offers an intensive 6 wk summer program that has developmental writing and the 1 semester FYC (students place into one or the other). Most in the program are minority students from the inner cities (Newark, Patterson, Asbury Park, NJ).

I don't know that we have any official, policy-based accommodations. However, as a faculty we are committed to helping students become good writers, building on the knowledge and language experience they bring with them. We try to encourage the teaching of writing as decision making, as situational, as varied. But I think we have a ways to go here.

We offer alternative ESL comp courses for ESL students

Not exactly. However we have an English language institute for international students, most of whom are Asian. Those students can take courses there that substitute for our first-year composition courses.

The Academic Writing Program is a two-semester Composition I course, with lower student cap on class size and offering a two-course sequence with an additional one-on-one weekly tutoring component. This is available to all AWP students, not only those from minority backgrounds. The one-semester, Rhet 105 Comp I does not have a tutoring component. Rhetoric curriculum includes a cultural studies approach to rhetorical principles of argument and analysis and certain designated classes offer an ethnographic research-writing rhet class that focuses on race at the university.

Our program emphasizes that no overall standard for writing correctness exists. Rather, writing entails sets of options which depend upon the persons or the communities to whom the writing is being addressed, upon the purposes of the writing, and upon the persona the writer wishes to convey. While this philosophy of teaching writing does not address minority students specifically, it nonetheless provides them with useful accommodations.

Special classes for language minority students that they can talk alongside Composition courses; peer tutors, learning skills counselors

We don't have specific accommodations for minority students, but we do have bridge programs for first-generation college students and supplemental instruction for any student whose high school education has left them underprepared.
Conversation groups

I am not sure what this question is asking for, but I would presume the answer would be no.

ELL / ESL related needs and language contexts. If accommodate signifies placement and instruction variances.

We have ESL classes for non-native speakers, and our Writing Center staff works with all students, regardless of background, and addresses whatever issues are relevant to an individual student’s situation. Also, our instructors are all encouraged to explore, through our common reader, issues that affect various minorities.

We have a developmental program for students from underfunded Chicago public schools, with a "stretch’ version of FYComp. It’s not strictly for minority students, but most of the students from these schools are minority students.

The majority of our students are minority, so although technically we do not have special accommodations our entire program is geared toward them. We recently developed a second level of development writing in order to help the students (almost all of whom are minority) who struggled moving from developmental composition to freshman composition. We wanted to better serve the students who made progress in developmental comp but were not yet ready to succeed in freshman comp. So far, the program has proven very successful, and the number of academic dismissals resulting from inadequate progress in the composition sequence have fallen sharply.

Through grant funds, we operate a summer "bridge" program for students who would not otherwise qualify for admission. Nearly all the students who participate are Latina/o. We also sponsor learning communities for these students during their first two years of college, and assign a peer mentor to each student.

Technically, the answer here should be "no" because our writing program does not single out minority students so as not to stigmatize them; however, we do have specific writing classes aimed at helping students who are struggling with writing, for whatever reasons. These classes allow for much one-on-one work with instructors and tutors, both of whom are trained to be sensitive to issues of diversity. Many of these students are from bidialectal, multilingual, or minority backgrounds.

Extra time for struggling second-language students to fulfill the entry-level requirements.

Primarily we offer extra services to the students in question (tutoring in academic discourse, for instance) and additional support for faculty (workshops in prioritizing content
over grammar, for instance)

We offer extra workshops for students who place in the bottom 10% on a writing pre-test. Our instructors for those courses are trained in ESL, Generation 1.5 in particular. We do not identify students by ethnic or language status but by the assessment.

We have a Learning Center and Writing Center available for all students.

Accommodations for students who are differently abled, in learning styles and physically. Also a cohort program for first gen college students.

**Question 10: Does your writing program have any accommodations specifically for Latino/a students?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total # of Respondents</th>
<th>Total % of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 11: If you answered “Yes,” what kinds of accommodations does your program offer? Check all that apply.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total # of Respondents</th>
<th>Total % of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring in addition to/other than the writing center</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for students to display/show their work</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support group for Latino/a students</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please explain)

The students in the Latina/o club host a special dinner before Thanksgiving each year, and this is a major success. This club is most active on campus. Its advisor does much to represent diverse Hispanic American culture, language, and art.

While not singling out Latina students, my Writing Program has a set of strategies, including students using the Writing Center, for students who are struggling in a writing course. In
addition, my/the Writing Program is located in a Hispanic-serving institution, Woodbury University.

I wasn't sure how to answer this question. While our program does not single out Latino/a students nor provide them with accommodations that are earmarked for "Latino/a students only," we pay attention to the fact that some of them may have specific needs and try to address those needs. When we recently discovered that a Latina student was living in a migrant community and needed assistance, our program provided her with a laptop and arranged for special tutoring. Of course, we would have done the same for a student with those needs regardless of ethnicity.

Our campus has a student organization, but our writing program doesn't have any student organizations. Our university has an academic services program (including a writing center); it's faculty are concerned with any aspects that might affect student performance, including race, class, first-generation-college student status...The first-year writing program is pretty—30 sections a year.

Recent grant proposal submitted to fund such accommodations

Peer mentoring and peer advising

**Question 12: How successful is your writing program for Latino/a students?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total # of Respondents</th>
<th>Total % of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Successful</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unsuccessful</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 13: Are there things that you would like to do for Latino/a students that your program is not currently doing?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total # of Respondents</th>
<th>Total % of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If you answered “Yes,” please explain.

I do not track performance by a student's race; however, the university does, as one of the federal grants has identified that of those students who perform less successfully, males seem to need much more support, especially males from minority populations.

I would like to have more faculty who are educated in second language writing issues. None of our tenured/t-t faculty have this as a specialization, and only a few of our lecturers have any background whatsoever in second language issues.

Coming from a small college, many of our CMP instructors are full-time faculty members. Changing the perceptions of faculty regarding bilingual & ESL students -- or those who may speak a non-standard dialect -- seems key to more successful instruction for Latino/a students (among other groups). Specifically, encouraging instructors to address language issues directly in the classroom, to incorporate discussion of language diversity and diverse texts, and to accept a certain degree of language variation in first-year course work would be a big step.

Not considered a pressing issue at this time. Latino/a students I have worked with are succeeding quite well.

We really have a very small Latino/a population at the university. Most Latino/a students from the area attend one of the area community colleges instead of our institution.

As I said before, the population is very small. I don't have statistics on how well they do, although my own personal experience with Latino/a students in my classes suggest that they do ok.

I would like us to do more work with students to help them negotiate their home literacy practices and their school literacies. Because many of our Latino/a students are first-generation college students (and sometimes first-generation Americans), the school programming pays a good deal of attention to those issues without attending to what this means in terms of the students' linguistic skills and development.

elective placement in sections for multilingual/multicultural writers

Not really sure. We have such a small population that it's not clear what their needs are.

Incorporating more Latino/a readings and scholarship. Addressing latino/a language issues.

We are in the process of doing a needs analysis of minority and L2 learners to see how we might better serve them. We realize that we could be doing much more.
There are many areas I would like to improve . . . but my college is eliminating my line (and also doesn't currently have a director of the writing center/wac program)

Note: In question 12, when I said "successful," that is just a guess. I have taught writing at least so none of my visions for once a year since coming here, and the Latino/a students I have had seem to me to have been the writing program will happen. It's sad on a # of levels. as successful as other students. But I don't have empirical evidence and want to investigate this further. That would be a start. I'd also like to have some focus groups with various groups of students who have been through our writing program, including Latino/a students. And I would like to encourage faculty discussion of these issues and a sharing of strategies that help all students succeed: to become effective writers but also to celebrate all their language abilities, not just mainstream academic English.

I'm just stepping into this role as WPA. To my knowledge we have no data on the relative success of different minority groups in our composition program. So I would like to see if there are specific programmatic issues that need to be addressed.

Please note, as I make the next remarks, that my professional background and training has always been "split" between composition studies and sociolinguistics/TESOL. While not making a formal or organized research study of our Latin/a student population, I find the review of literature on first-generation students and on Hispanic/Mexican American students to be helpful, i.e., applicable. At Woodbury University, in particular, I find that the Latino/a students are bilingual, i.e., speaking English and Spanish with great fluency. The greatest problem these and other students face is inadequate or inconsistent instruction in writing at the area high school and community colleges.

Fund tutoring services within the department, not just at the Writer's Workshop, which is not dedicated to minority students, though is available to them. Devise more curriculum that validates and harvests Latino/a students' respective funds of knowledge, heritage language and cultures for learning.

Don't know.

Language-specialized tutors or classes

There are things I'd like to be doing for minority students and for first-generation college students including faculty development that focused on ways to help minority students in writing classes. Because this is the first year there has ever been a writing coordinator here or ongoing faculty development, and because of our attention to assessment this year, I doubt we will get to these concerns until next year or the year after. Programs are permeable here--the faculty
who teach our FYW courses are from other departments. Maybe because of this and because the university is small, all faculty development tends to be dispersed across the university and sponsored by university-wide offices, like the Center for Teaching and Learning.

Best essay awards. A grant proposal seeks funding to gather and showcase minority student writing

I think our Latina/o students feel comfortable. One of our first-year writing classes is linked to a class called "Borderlands" that includes reading in Latin American history and literature. These readings form the basis for their first-year writing.

There is an academic support program for Latino/a students at my university that includes advising, peer support, and regular meetings to track academic success. The program is called Proyecto Pa'Lante. If you're interested in reading more about it, the website is http://www.neiu.edu/~ppalante/ This program supports Latino/a students in all of their coursework, which is why I feel accommodations in the writing program specifically are less necessary.

As I am new to this position, I am interested in improving the experiences of students from a broader variety of backgrounds. Some of the options listed on the previous question - opportunities specifically for latino/a students to show their work, or specific organizations/clubs - are interesting.

Provide cultural support and appreciation for the writing that these students perform.

We need to do more to recognize "English" in its many varieties. Although we have very few Lation/a students and those we have tend to do well, we need to do more to foster multi-cultural awareness with our student body and staff.

Assuming Latino/a students have a unique set of challenges that affect their success as college students, I would like to help in whatever way possible. Based on my experience as an instructor and as teaching supervisor, I believe that our Latino/a population is very small. In my 22 years of teaching at this university, I have taught and interacted with very few Latino/a students.

Better trained teachers, more sensitive curriculum, and more small group or one-on-one support.

I would like to have a more organized and sustainable way of attending to and supporting the needs of minority groups of students, including Latino/a students. No particular infrastructure was in place when I arrived at my institution a year ago, and because I am new in my position, I am still working on building such structures.
I would like the Writing Program to have closer ties to the various diversity organizations on campus so as to better determine the needs of our students of color, including our Latina/o students.

I want to implement a teaching writing as advocacy curriculum program-wide, because I think it reinforces Latino/a community values rather than conflicts with them. So far I have only done that at the course level.

We'd like to serve bilingual and generation 1.5 students more effectively--first by identifying them and then by tailoring teaching to their specific needs. We are beginning discussions with the ESL department to brainstorm ways of better serving students who are not ESL but who are struggling with the conventions of academic language, with moving between two languages &/or dialects, and with navigating the waters of college in general.

We need better policies and accommodations for Latina/o students who "stop out" social/financial/personal reasons. We should also have a more robust support system for parents and siblings since relatively few are familiar with the challenges of attending college and the competing demands of family responsibilities.

Yes, we'd like to have a more systematic grasp of the full range of linguistic patterns in English that are sometimes created as a result of students' home language being Spanish.

we are working on making minority students comfortable visiting our writing center and providing tutoring opportunities for minority students.

Our first-year classes are thematic, and students can choose. We have faculty teaching courses focused on some ethnic/race themes (Asian-Amer. Experience, Black Dialects, Caribbean Writers, Islam & the US) but nothing specifically for Latino/a students.

Provide adequate support for Latino students just as the university is doing for its ESL students. Latino/a students are a minority among our minorities. We have higher levels of African-American students, but our largest population is Muslim/Indian/Middle Eastern. Overall, we are recognized nationally for our diversity and consider it one of our greatest assets.

We have a two-sequence comp program but some of our students are not ready for Comp I and need more preparatory work.
We are an HSI and are currently exploring what this identity means for our writing program, in terms of teaching, assessment, placement, curriculum, etc.

My university does not have a large Latino/a population, so my response of "yes" more accurately indicates my desire to do more for all minority and "non-traditional" students. You've created a bit of a false choice in your question, especially for WPAs who may want to help Latino/a students in general but who do not have a specific need within their own departments. Said another way, replying "no" to this question gives a false impression of callousness or disregard.

I would like more detailed information about the success of Latino/a students. Nothing in raw statistical studies shows much difference in achievement compared to the students as a whole. I do wonder whether other demographic information might explain that, but apparent non-problems have not been at the top of my research list.
APPENDIX C:

MAP OF PARTICIPANTS BY REGION
APPENDIX D:

SURVEY QUESTION 3 BY REGION

**Question 3 - Scenario 1**
Karen insists that students must learn correct grammar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 3 - Scenario 2**
Mark includes readings from a diverse group of authors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 3 - Scenario 3**
Adam advises students that learning academic discourse...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 3 - Scenario 4
Lauren encourages students to reflect on how they use language

Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>% of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 3 - Scenario 5
Rita reflects on her own social biases and teaching approaches

Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>% of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E:

SURVEY QUESTION 3 BY INSTITUTION TYPE (CUMULATIVE)

Question 3 - Scenario 1 (Cumulative)
Karen insists that students must learn correct grammar

Question 3 - Scenario 2 (Cumulative)
Mark includes readings from a diverse group of authors

Question 3 - Scenario 3 (Cumulative)
Adam advises students that learning academic discourse...
**Question 3 - Scenario 4 (Cumulative)**

Lauren encourages students to reflect on how they use language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Type</th>
<th>% of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cum.</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, Strongly Agree

**Question 3 - Scenario 5 (Cumulative)**

Rita reflects on her own social biases and teaching approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Type</th>
<th>% of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cum.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, Strongly Agree
APPENDIX F:
SURVEY QUESTION 3 BY INSTITUTION TYPE (DETAIL)

**Question 3 - Scenario 1 (Detail)**
Karen insists that students must learn correct grammar

**Question 3 - Scenario 2 (Detail)**
Mark includes readings from a diverse group of authors

**Question 3 - Scenario 3 (Detail)**
Adam advises students that learning academic discourse...
Question 3 - Scenario 4 (Detail)
Lauren encourages students to reflect on how they use language

Question 3 - Scenario 5 (Detail)
Rita reflects on her own social biases and teaching approaches
March 1, 2010

TO: Vanessa Cozza
ENG

FROM: Hillary Harms, Ph.D.
HSRB Administrator

RE: HSRB Project No.: H10D206GX2

TITLE: Latino/a Students in Higher Education: Modes of Accommodation in First-Year Writing

You have met the conditions for approval for your project involving human subjects. As of February 24, 2010, your project has been granted final approval by the Human Subjects Review Board (HSRB). This approval expires on February 7, 2011. You may proceed with subject recruitment and data collection.

The final approved version of the consent document(s) is attached. Consistent with federal OHRP guidance to IRBs, the consent document(s) bearing the HSRB approval/expiration date stamp is the only valid version and you must use copies of the date-stamped document(s) in obtaining consent from research subjects.

You are responsible to conduct the study as approved by the HSRB and to use only approved forms. If you seek to make any changes in your project activities or procedures (including increases in the number of participants), please send a request for modifications immediately to the HSRB via this office. Please notify me, in writing (fax: 372-6916 or email: hsrb@bgsu.edu) upon completion of your project.

Good luck with your work. Let me know if this office or the HSRB can be of assistance as your project proceeds.

Comments/Modifications:
Please put the text equivalent of the HSRB approval stamp at the 'footer' area of the informed consent document.

c: Dr. Richard Gebhardt

Research Category: EXEMPT #2
Informed Consent for Writing Program Administrator

Latino/a Students in Higher Education: Modes of Accommodation in First-Year Writing

Introduction

You are invited to participate in a research study. The study is being conducted by Vanessa Cozza from the Bowling Green State University Department of English as part of her dissertation. This study aims at investigating the current state of Latino/a students in higher education and first-year writing programs, while arguing that accommodation rather than assimilation is necessary for the success of Latino/a students in education and the writing classroom. Your participation in this study will consist of completing one brief survey/questionnaire.

Purpose

The purpose of this research study is to understand if and how first-year college writing programs accommodate Latino/a students. Specifically, I am investigating the current state of Latino/a students in higher education and first-year writing programs. In addition, this study includes a brief questionnaire for Writing Program Administrators (WPAs) who are currently directing first-year writing and who are currently teaching or have taught first-year writing courses. Furthermore, I argue that accommodation rather than assimilation is necessary for the success of Latino/a students in education and the writing classroom.

Although there is no compensation for your participation, the study will benefit your work as a WPA and/or composition instructor. Specifically, it can help WPAs become aware of Latino/a students' struggles and needs, aid composition instructors in learning how to accommodate all students in the writing classroom regardless of race and class, and inform society as a whole to better understand the problems in education.

Procedure

Because you are a WPA, you are receiving this email asking you to complete the electronic survey anonymously. By completing and submitting this survey you are indicating your consent to participate in the study and giving permission to use your responses, which will help to answer if and how your writing program is accommodating Latino/a students. The total amount of time you will spend on this survey would be no more than 20 minutes.
Voluntary Participation

Your participation in this research study is completely voluntary. You are free to withdraw at any time. You may decide to skip questions or discontinue participation at any time without penalty. Your decision to participate or to not participate will in no way impact your relationship with BGSU.

Confidentiality

Your participation in the survey will be anonymous. Because email is not a confidential means of communication, I will only use email to inform you about the study. Please note that email is not 100% secure, so it is possible that someone intercepting your email will gain knowledge of your interest in the study. I will protect the anonymity of you as a respondent and your responses. I plan to use direct quotes from your responses, but neither I nor anyone else will know which responses belong to you. Only I will have access to the information you provide, and your identity will not be revealed in any published results unless you specifically request identification by contacting me at (610) 505-3623 or vcozza@bgsu.edu.

All data will be maintained off-campus and stored in a locked filing cabinet when not in use by me. I will destroy all data at the conclusion of the research study.

Risks

There are no foreseeable risks associated with this study that would be greater than those normally encountered in daily life.

Benefits

This study will benefit WPAs, composition instructors, as well as the greater society. Specifically, this study can help WPAs because missing from the scholarship is much attention to the role of WPAs in helping first-year writing programs to address Latino/a students' needs. WPAs hold the responsibility to coordinate their programs and train their teachers to meet the needs of all students. As Kim Brian Lovejoy, Steve Fox, and Katherine V. Wills mention, "it no longer makes sense to teach writing as though all students share a common language or dialect" (262). It is also necessary for WPAs to become aware of how dominant ideologies clash with the values of Latino/a students and how cultural conflict hinder their ability to learn. WPAs are in the positions to lead and support efforts toward 'unleashing' the literacies of linguistically diverse students" (Lovejoy, et al 261). Also, this study can aid composition instructors because they "continue to struggle with the implications of home and community languages as part of classroom pedagogy, and most composition programs do not have explicit language policies or program initiatives that address linguistic diversity in the classroom" (Lovejoy, et al 262). Lastly, this study can also inform society as a whole to recognize the problems that exist in education and realize the need for improvement.

---

Contact Information

Should you have any questions about the study or need clarification, please contact me at (610) 505-3623 or vcozza@bgsu.edu, or contact the chair of my dissertation committee, Dr. Richard Gebhardt at (419) 372-7212 or richgeb@bgsu.edu. If you have questions about the conduct of this study or your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Chair of BGSU’s Human Subjects Review Board at (419) 372-7716 or hsrb@bgsu.edu.

Consent

By completing and submitting the electronic survey, link below, you agree that you have read and understood the above information and hereby consent to voluntarily participate in this study. Some employers use tracking software to monitor and record keystrokes, mouse clicks, and web sites visited. This could impact the anonymity of your responses. Therefore, you may wish to complete the survey on your home computer or a public computer. Do not leave the survey open if using a public computer or a computer others may have access to. Upon completion of this survey, please clear your web browser’s cache and page history after you submit the survey in order to protect your privacy.
May 12, 2010

TO:    Vanessa Cozza  
ENG

FROM:  Hillary Harms, Ph.D.  
HSRB Administrator

RE:    HSRB Project #: H10D206GX2

TITLE:  *Latina/o Students in Higher Education: Modes of Accommodation in First-Year Writing*

The Human Subjects Review Board (HSRB) has reviewed the requested modifications you submitted for your project involving human subjects. Effective May 7, 2010, the following modifications have been approved:

1. Modified amount of time spent on survey in consent document.
2. Addition of "Brief Background Information" in survey/questionnaire. In addition, all of questions have been changed in light of the statistical consulting service obtained from BGSU’s Center for Business Analytics.

You may proceed with subject recruitment and data collection.

The final approved version of the consent document(s) is attached. The consent document(s) bearing the HSRB approval/expiration date stamp is the only valid version and, if it is a revision to previously approved document(s), supercedes those versions. Copies of the dated document(s) must be used in obtaining consent from research subjects.

If you seek to make any additional changes in your project activities, complete the Request for Modifications/Addendum application and submit it to the HSRB via this office. Please notify me in writing upon completion of your project (fax: 419-372-6916 or email: hsrb@bgsu.edu).

Good luck with your work. Let me know if this office or the HSRB can be of assistance as your project proceeds.

COMMENTS:
Stamped consent documents are coming to you via campus mail.

C: Dr. Richard Gebhardt
Informed Consent for Writing Program Administrator

Latino/a Students in Higher Education: Modes of Accommodation in First-Year Writing

Introduction

You are invited to participate in a research study. The study is being conducted by Vanessa Cozzi from the Bowling Green State University Department of English as part of her dissertation. This study aims at investigating the current state of Latino/a students in higher education and first-year writing programs, while arguing that accommodation rather than assimilation is necessary for the success of Latino/a students in education and the writing classroom. Your participation in this study will consist of completing one brief survey/questionnaire.

Purpose

The purpose of this research study is to understand if and how first-year college writing programs accommodate Latino/a students. Specifically, I am investigating the current state of Latino/a students in higher education and first-year writing programs. In addition, this study includes a brief questionnaire for Writing Program Administrators (WPAs) who are currently directing first-year writing and who are currently teaching or have taught first-year writing courses. Furthermore, I argue that accommodation rather than assimilation is necessary for the success of Latino/a students in education and the writing classroom.

Although there is no compensation for your participation, the study will benefit your work as a WPA and/or composition instructor. Specifically, it can help WPAs become aware of Latino/a students' struggles and needs, aid composition instructors in learning how to accommodate all students in the writing classroom regardless of race and class, and inform society as a whole to better understand the problems in education.

Procedure

Because you are a WPA, you are receiving this email asking you to complete the electronic survey anonymously. By completing and submitting this survey you are indicating your consent to participate in the study and giving permission to use your responses, which will help to answer if and how your writing program is accommodating Latino/a students. The total amount of time you will spend on this survey would be no more than 10 minutes.
Voluntary Participation

Your participation in this research study is completely voluntary. You are free to withdraw at any time. You may decide to skip questions or discontinue participation at any time without penalty. Your decision to participate or to not participate will in no way impact your relationship with BGSU.

Confidentiality

Your participation in the survey will be anonymous. Because email is not a confidential means of communication, I will only use email to inform you about the study. Please note that email is not 100% secure, so it is possible that someone intercepting your email will gain knowledge of your interest in the study. I will protect the anonymity of you as a respondent and your responses. I plan to use direct quotes from your responses, but neither I nor anyone else will know which responses belong to you. Only I will have access to the information you provide, and your identity will not be revealed in any published results unless you specifically request identification by contacting me at (610) 505-3623 or vcozza@bgsu.edu.

All data will be maintained off-campus and stored in a locked filing cabinet when not in use by me. I will destroy all data at the conclusion of the research study.

Risks

There are no foreseeable risks associated with this study that would be greater than those normally encountered in daily life.

Benefits

This study will benefit WPAs, composition instructors, as well as the greater society. Specifically, this study can help WPAs because missing from the scholarship is much attention to the role of WPAs in helping first-year writing programs to address Latino/a students' needs. WPAs have the responsibility to coordinate their programs and train their teachers to meet the needs of all students. As Kim Brian Lovejoy, Steve Fox, and Katuren V. Wills mention, "it no longer makes sense to teach writing as though all students share a common language or dialect" (262). It is also necessary for WPAs to become aware of how dominant ideologies clash with the values of Latino/a students and how cultural conflict hinder their ability to learn. WPAs "are in the positions to lead and support efforts toward 'unleashing' the literacies of linguistically diverse students" (Lovejoy, et al 261). Also, this study can aid composition instructors because they "continue to struggle with the implications of home and community languages as part of classroom pedagogy, and most composition programs do not have explicit language policies or program initiatives that address linguistic diversity in the classroom" (Lovejoy, et al 262). Lastly, this study can also inform society as a whole to recognize the problems that exist in education and realize the need for improvement.

Contact Information

---

Should you have any questions about the study or need clarification, please contact me at (610) 505-3623 or vcozza@bgsu.edu, or contact the chair of my dissertation committee, Dr. Richard Gebhardt at (419) 372-7212 or richgeb@bgsu.edu. If you have questions about the conduct of this study or your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Chair of BGSU’s Human Subjects Review Board at (419) 372-7716 or hscr@bgsu.edu.

Consent

By completing and submitting the electronic survey, link below, you agree that you have read and understood the above information and hereby consent to voluntarily participate in this study. Some employers use tracking software to monitor and record keystrokes, mouse clicks, and web sites visited. This could impact the anonymity of your responses. Therefore, you may wish to complete the survey on your home computer or a public computer. Do not leave the survey open if using a public computer or a computer others may have access to. Upon completion of this survey, please clear your web browser’s cache and page history after you submit the survey in order to protect your privacy.
January 27, 2011

TO: Vanessa Cozza, ENG

FROM: Hillary Harms, Ph.D.
      HSRB Administrator

RE: Continuing HSRB Review For Project: H10D206GX2

TITLE: Latina/o Students in Higher Education: Modes of Accommodation in First-Year Writing

Thank you for providing continuing review information for the above listed project.

Federal regulations for research involving human subjects require continuing reviews to be substantive in nature and to consider all criteria required for initial approval. As the interpretation of requirements for approval change over time the HSRB may require updates to documents such as consent forms and introductory letters that had been approved when the project started.

The HSRB reviewed the continuing review information you provided. Your continuation request has been granted conditional approval. The following modifications/clarifications are required:

In the HSRB application you requested to enroll 20 participants, but you enrolled 78. Please tell the Board why you enrolled almost four times more participants than approved.

Please submit the requested modifications/clarifications to the HSRB at the Office of Research Compliance, 309A University Hall, before the project’s February 7, 2011 expiration date in order for them to be reviewed in time to prevent a lapse in approval. The HSRB will review the modifications and notify you when the continuation request has been given final approval.

If you have any questions, please contact the Chair of the HSRB or me at 372-7716 or hsrb@bgsu.edu.

C: Dr. Richard Gebhardt
February 4, 2011

TO: Vanessa Cozza
ENG

FROM: Hillary Harms, Ph.D.
HSRB Administrator

RE: Continuing HSRB Review for Project H10D206GX2

TITLE: Latino/a Students in Higher Education: Modes of Accommodation in First-Year Writing

This is to inform you that your research study indicated above has received continuing Human Subjects Review Board (HSRB) review and approval. This approval is effective February 8, 2011 for a period of 12 months and will expire on February 7, 2012. You may continue with the project.

Please communicate any proposed changes in your project procedures or activities involving human subjects, including consent form changes or increases in the number of participants, to the HSRB via this office. Please notify me, at 372-7716 or hsrb@bgsu.edu, upon completion of your project.

Good luck with your work. Let me know if this office or the HSRB can be of assistance as your project proceeds.

Comments:

C: Dr. Richard Gebhardt