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Chapter 1

Introduction to the Study of Emotion

In the 2011 February issue of *College Composition and Communication*, Marilyn Cooper presents a complex argument for individual agency as it relates to rhetoric. Embedded within Cooper’s argument is the most recent push toward understanding the function of emotion within the field of writing studies. According to Cooper, individual agency is “the process through which organisms create meaning through acting into the world and changing their structure in response to the perceived consequences of their actions” (p. 420). Cooper acknowledges the influence of emotions as an element that helps individuals prepare for actions. Emotions are “intentions to act a certain way” (Cooper, 2011, p. 430). While individuals cannot control their emotions, they can become aware of them and as emotions lead to intentions, intentions lead to action (Cooper, 2011). Awareness of emotions then leads to action. Drawing on Walter Freeman’s neuroscience research, Cooper concludes that conscious awareness of emotion is an asset for individuals, and that emotions can motivate individuals’ decisions for composing texts in certain ways. How individuals react emotionally depends on the context (Bamber, 1997; Wulff, 2007), environment (Milton, 2007), and awareness of acceptable reactions (Hargreaves, 1998; Callahan, 2004; Schutz, Hong, Cross & Osbon, 2006; Ehn & Lofgre, 2007), but nonetheless a reaction occurs. Ignoring or suppressing emotion is a
reaction (Hargreaves, 1998; Micciche, 2002; Sutton, Mudrey-Camion, & Knight, 2009). More attention should be paid to emotions within writing studies, because understanding what triggers emotions and how individuals respond to their emotions can provide a fuller picture of the ways emotions shape intentions and actions. Additionally, a fuller understanding of emotions could help explain how individuals behave in different ways, such as how writing teachers respond to student texts.

In addition to Cooper approaching emotion from a neurobiological perspective, writing studies research on emotion has included narrative and anecdotal accounts (Ray, 2000; Danielle, 2003; Robillard, 2007; Chandler, 2007). This dissertation continues to push the field of writing studies to embrace emotion from a neurobiological perspective and to see emotion as a productive site of inquiry through an understanding of how emotions function for teachers as they read and respond to student texts. In this chapter, I discuss the role of emotion research within writing studies while also acknowledging how emotion has been studied in the related field of education. Then, I present a limited discussion on the definition and approach to emotion that I am using in this study, which leads into an argument for why more research on emotion is needed within writing studies and teacher response research. I conclude this chapter with a discussion of the study’s design and outline of how the dissertation is organized.

Robillard (2007) analyzed blog posts of teachers venting after finding instances of plagiarism when grading student writing; in particular, she focuses on understanding teachers’ reactions to students who would plagiarize, looking specifically at the emotion of anger. Robillard finds that teachers experience anger when they find plagiarism and
that anger challenges teachers’ authority in the writing classroom. Using herself as an example, Robillard details the emotional struggle prompted by finding plagiarism in a graduate student’s essay. She is angry at the graduate student for lying about the plagiarism and thinking that the student could ‘get this by her’ thus challenging her teacher identity as “a teacher who doesn’t fall for such tricks” (p. 18). Robillard attributes the angry responses to the academic values of honesty and originality in writing. The academic community suggests that teachers should report and punish students who plagiarize their writing. For teachers trying to prevent plagiarism by discussing it in the classroom, part of their anger can be attributed to themselves; however, their anger is also “bound up in one’s need to maintain the identity of smart, productive member of the academy” (p. 21).

While the charged nature of plagiarism (and other student writing contexts such as grading) may bring out more emotional responses from teachers, Micciche (2007) moves beyond the classroom and argues that emotions express the values of a community and that “emotions are a central component in social relations” (p. 452). Focusing on understanding the role emotion plays in a writing program, Micciche discusses how Writing Program Administrators (WPAs) are expected to be many different professionals within one position: administrators, up-to-date theorists, quasi-business managers, authorities of power, and leaders for faculty. Micciche finds that within these various positions, WPAs experience anger, frustration, and disappointment on a daily basis. Disappointment in particular “can be one basis for exploring the relationship between work practices and emotional dispositions that contribute both to the larger discourse on
administration and to an understanding of those factors that create a culture of disappointment in the academy” (pp. 434-435). Micciche values emotions’ roles in the academy and the study of emotion as a productive endeavor that can promote conversations on emotions within the university.

Arguing for the importance of considering emotion in writing studies research, this dissertation asks and answers questions about teachers’ emotional experiences when reading and responding to student writing. Specifically, I focus on answering the following questions: (1) What emotions do teachers express verbally and nonverbally during audio and video recordings of think-aloud protocols? (2) What triggers teachers’ emotions? (3) What, if any, actions do teachers make in response to the emotions that emerge when they are reading and responding to student writing? Following Cooper’s move to include neurobiological perspectives on emotions and the field of education’s research agenda on teachers’ emotions, I consider the ways emotions shape teachers’ experiences when reading student texts. I situate the contribution of my study on teachers’ emotions within literature on the study of reading, responding, and evaluating student writing, and the concepts, terms, and research offered from the study of education and emotion. I use these literatures to understand how teachers’ emotion research fits within a higher education writing classroom. My use of response, education and emotion literatures form my understanding of how to construct an interdisciplinary dissertation that considers the social, neurobiological perspective of emotion for teachers engaged in reading and responding to student writing.

Writing studies often begins any study of emotion with Aristotle’s theoretical
category of *pathos*. For Aristotle emotions or *pathos*, are “the things on account of which the ones altered differ with respect to their judgments, and are accompanied by pleasure and pain: such are anger, pity, fear, and all similar emotions and their contraries” (Rhetoric 1378a20-23). It might seem that the field of writing studies has interpreted emotion as one available means for persuasion within the context of teaching students how to craft arguments. While researchers often consider the Aristotelian proofs (*ethos*, *pathos*, and *logos*) to be of equivalent persuasive importance (Moon, 2003), teachers focus more on teaching students to use *ethos* and *logos* effectively which may be best understood within an academic culture that privileged and still privileges scientific sources and ways of knowing (Moon, 2003; Ehn & Lofgren, 2007). Damasio (1994), a neuroscientist, accounts for the Western view of thought that privileges rational, logical thought and considers emotions to be of lesser importance in his book *Descartes’ Error: Emotion, Reason, and the Human Brain*. Usually, emotion is conceived as a supernumerary mental faculty, an unsolicited nature-ordained accompaniment to our rational thinking. If emotion is pleasant, we enjoy it as a luxury; if it is painful, we suffer it as an unwelcome intrusion. In either case, the sage will advise us, we should experience emotion and feeling in only judicious amounts. We should be reasonable. There is much wisdom in this widely held belief, and I will not deny that uncontrolled or misdirected emotion can be a major source of irrational behavior. Nor will I deny that seemingly normal reason can be disturbed by subtle biases rooted in emotion... Nonetheless, what the traditional account leaves out is [this]...
Reduction in emotion may constitute an equally important source of irrational behavior. (emphasis original, pp. 52-53)

The academy and much of Western thought has yet to agree with Damasio and the original relationship between the Aristotelian proofs that emotion is of equal importance to logical, rational thought (Neumann, 2006; Ehn & Lofgren, 2007). Emotions are viewed as irrational and are too touchy-feely to be scholarly (Damasio, 1994; Ehn & Lofgren, 2007; Micciche, 2007). With pathos appearing as an intrusion to rational thought (Damasio, 1994; Moon, 2003), emotions lost prominence as a valuable means of persuasion within the college classroom.

Moon (2003) documents the focus of ethos and logos and neglect of pathos through a subject analysis of twenty-five popular textbooks and handbooks published after 1998. Working from the premise that pathos appears in the classroom if it is a topic within the textbook, Moon’s analysis of pathos in textbooks concludes that Aristotle’s notion of pathos as a legitimate rhetorical appeal does not exist in every classroom. In her study, five textbooks made no reference to pathos, ten defined it in terms of an appeal to emotions with one or two examples, two briefly acknowledged pathos, and two listed it as fallacies. Five others mentioned pathos throughout the writing process, and one textbook was an exception. Within the twenty-five textbooks, pathos is only referred to as an appeal to emotions without the in-depth Aristotelian treatment of how appeals to pathos can be persuasive and useful in constructing arguments. Looking at the role of emotions in terms of their persuasive power within writing and the writing classroom helps contextualize pathos as a productive aspect of rhetoric, regardless of its declined
status in textbooks (Moon, 2003).

With traditional academic emphasis on more rational approaches to argument and teaching, emotions have not always been considered a serious site of pedagogical research. A few writing scholars (Brand, 1987; Ray, 2000; Danielle, 2003; Micciche, 2007) have turned to other disciplinary perspectives (education, sociology, and psychology) to help explore emotion as an important aspect of teaching and learning to write.

Education, closely related to writing studies, has for the last 10-15 years maintained a research agenda focused on emotion. For example, to explore his own emotions as a teacher, Winograd (2003) kept a personal teaching diary, using it to reflect on how emotions influenced his pedagogical decisions in the classroom. One example Winograd noticed was his ability to suppress his emotions and remain calm when dealing with disciplinary issues during class time; however, at times the anger Winograd felt when students were chatting during lessons drove him to yell and lose his calm demeanor. Outside of classroom management, Winograd noticed that students were more receptive to his curriculum when he was upbeat and positive during the lessons. Reflecting on the entries in his teaching diary, Winograd was able to name the emotions he experienced in the classroom and see what actions he took based upon those emotions. Similar to Winograd, the aim of this dissertation is to give teachers an opportunity to reflect on emotional experiences and to name the emotions that teachers experience when they are reading and responding to student writing.

Also in education, Zembylas and Schultz (2009) argue that (1) emotions are
inextricably linked to teachers’ well being, (2) teachers’ emotions influence student-teacher relationships, and (3) emotions are neither private nor universal and can become sites of resistance and self transformation. While Hargreaves (1998) argues that teaching is an emotional practice, he also contends that teachers are often considered “emotionally anorexic,” stemming from the traditional academic focus on logic. The focus on teachers’ emotions within the field of education offers this dissertation an understanding of how teaching is an emotional practice. This study extends the concept of teaching as an emotional practice into the specific context of writing teachers reading and responding to student writing. In addition, this dissertation contributes to the discussion of teachers’ emotions in education studies by naming the emotions college writing teachers experience when reading and responding to student texts. This dissertation also contributes to the field of writing studies by pushing against the traditional academic focus on logic and suggesting that teachers can learn from their emotions.

When considering the ways teachers can learn from their emotions, Hochschild’s (1979) cultural concept of feeling rules offers teachers a way to think about how and if emotions are expressed within the classroom. Feeling rules are unspoken cultural norms of acceptable emotions in social settings. Different social settings have different feeling rules. For example, it is acceptable for individuals to cry at funerals, weddings, or even movies, but traditionally unacceptable for individuals to cry at the workplace, or in other settings, or, as stated in the popular film A League of Their Own “there’s no crying in baseball.” Individuals learn social guidelines from others within the environment. Feeling rules are not explicitly taught to new teachers but are “collaboratively constructed in the
everyday work” of teachers and students (Winograd, 2003, p. 1647). Feeling rules force teachers to mask and/or control their emotions. When teachers mask or control their emotions they are engaging in emotional labor. Teaching is a form of emotional labor because of the social expectations for expressed emotions in the classroom (Hochschild, 1983; Hargreaves, 1998; Winograd, 2003). If teachers are continuously engaging in emotional labor, such as working to suppress or inhibit a display of emotion, then they may disassociate themselves from the actual teaching work within the classroom (Hochschild, 1983; Winograd, 2003). To avoid expressing socially unacceptable emotions in the classroom, teachers may mask their emotions. Cooper’s (2011) claim that emotions lead to action links to teachers’ efforts to suppress certain emotions in the classroom. While the actions teachers make to suppress emotions to do not help teachers compose written documents (the action Cooper explored in her research), it does maintain that emotions can lead to actions and reactions within various contexts, such as the classroom. Additionally, emotions are significant for teachers and researchers because individuals rely “on emotions to form social bonds and build complex sociocultural structures” (Turner and Stets, 2005, p. 1). Teachers and students construct sociocultural relationships in the classroom and on the page when teachers respond to student writing.

Literature focusing on emotion research is vast and is not limited to one field of study. Emotions are a social, cultural and biological occurrence studied in psychology, sociology, anthropology, and neuroscience, and also as a separate literature in education. Social models of emotions argue that they “arise and operate within social situations” (Milton, 2007, p. 199). Cultural models of emotions define emotions as emerging out of
social discourse and are variable cultural constructs (Milton, 2007). Biological models of emotions explore the physical feelings and changes within the body and explain emotions as innate features of humans (Milton, 2007). Neurological models of emotions trace the chemical pathways from the brain, hoping to unlock the physical, cognitive features of emotion (Damasio, 1999). While these three models are the most prominent in the study of emotion, a single definition of emotion does not exist. Even within each of these models, multiple definitions are the norm and the different models of emotions overlap. While it is not unexpected that emotions are complex and definitions of emotions are vast, trying to choose or even categorize the large range of definitions offered within the study of emotion is futile and unnecessary. Instead this dissertation aims to find a definition of emotion that helps explain the role of emotion within the writing classroom. Having a full understanding of the different emotion definitions provides writing studies a wealth of possibilities and choices to explore emotions in research and the teaching and learning of writing, and can inform what happens emotionally when teachers are reading and responding to student writing.

For this dissertation study, I draw from both socially situated definitions of emotions and biological definitions. Emotions are biological and social, because they can be traced and located in the brain and account for individual learned emotional displays (feeling rules). As previously discussed, the neurological model of emotion helps to dissolve the traditional western thought perspective that emotions and rational thought are separate entities; emotion cannot be separated from rational thought. Individuals struggle to make decisions if there is damaged to the prefrontal cortex (Damasio, 1994;
As such, emotions are a component of individuals’ decision-making skills, and emotions and rational thought both occur in the same part of the brain (Damasio, 1994).

A social approach to emotion considers the interaction of the individual and environment (Lazarus, 1991; Milton, 2007), and the emotional response “reflects the individual’s personality, motivations, as well as the social structure and culture’ (Winograd, 2003, 1643). Further situating emotion as an interaction between individuals and the environment, Chandler (2004) posits emotion as “cultural rather than individual and biological, and instances of perceiving, responding to, expressing, and containing emotions are (unconsciously) enacted in terms of discursive forms evoked by specific contexts and conditions.” (p. 53). Considering the social and cognitive act of writing, Richmond (2002) characterizes emotions “as part of a web of communication woven by interpersonal relationships, those shaped by our individual histories and an ever present part of how we construct relationships with others” (p. 68). Just as the student/teacher relationship is one influence on how teachers read and respond to student writing (Huot, 2002), emotions, as a biological and social phenomenon that help shape relationships, are another possible influence on the ways teachers read student writing.

Antonio Damasio (1995, 1999) is a neuroscientist whose research on emotion has been incorporated into education emotion research (dos Santos & Fleury Mortime, 2003; Callahan, 2004). Because of Damasio’s research on the neurological model of emotion, his work influences my study’s design to understand individual’s emotions within the social act of responding to student writing. Culture, environment and social interaction
can influence what triggers emotions for individuals. Here, I provide a limited overview of Damasio’s research on emotion. A fuller detailing of his approach to emotion occurs in Chapter 2.

There are five core elements that underlie Damasio’s understanding of emotion as a biological and neurological phenomenon. First, emotions are composed of chemical and neural responses that help the body process and respond to triggers. Second, while the environment and social setting can influence the expression of emotions, emotions are innate in the sense of being “biologically determined processes” (p. 51). Emotions evolved from natural selection as the body’s way of responding to environmental inducers and began as the body’s way of survival. Emotions would, and still do, help the body respond to triggers, similar to the fight or flight mentality in animals, and help individuals decide how to respond to triggers. Damasio’s third element locates emotion within the limbic system of the brain, which is helps to “regulate and represent body states” (p. 51) and is where emotions are activated and mediated. Fourth, some emotions can be automatically triggered initiating a chemical processes without an individual making a conscious decision. Finally, emotions are a full body experience including neuron circuits, the brain, the musculoskeletal system and individuals’ thoughts. These core-underlying concepts of emotion help to shape Damasio’s articulation of what specifically happens to the body when an emotion is experienced.

According to Damasio, emotions are composed of the body’s chemical and neural responses that respond to an emotional trigger. When the body experiences an emotion, there are two components to the biological function. First, there is the chemical process
that the body experiences when it encounters an emotion trigger. Triggers elicit an emotional response from an individual. Second, there is the change in the bodily state as the body and mind prepare to act (such as increased blood flow or heart rate, changes in breathing rhythm, and adrenaline). During the second part of the emotional episode, the individual’s body and brain process the emotion. The emotional episode (Figure 1) is the process from encountering a trigger to recognizing the emotion and reacting to it.

Figure 1. Emotional Episode Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Individuals encounter ‘something’ that triggers or induces emotion</th>
<th>(2) Individuals use senses to process trigger/inducer</th>
<th>(3) Individuals’ brains send out commands (emotion occurs)</th>
<th>(4) Individuals recognize shifts in body (feelings emerge)</th>
<th>(5) Individuals reflect on feelings (leading to action)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual encounters a snake.</td>
<td>Individual processes the snake through visual Cues of ‘seeing’ it.</td>
<td>The individual’s brain begins to send out chemical commands.</td>
<td>The individual senses that increased heart rate, breathing, and sweaty palms; and, Recognizes the changes as fear.</td>
<td>The individual either runs away, screams, stands still, or reacts in another manner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, in the first step of the emotional episode an individual could encounter a snake in the park. The snake, in this example, would trigger emotion. In the second step, the individual would use her visual cues to process the fact that she has encountered a snake. Next, as the individual is processing the visual cue of a snake, fear
(the emotion) is invoked and the brain sends commands through the chemical pathways. The individual recognizes the fear through changes in the body: increased heart rate and breathing and/or sweaty palms. In the final step, action, the individual runs away from the snake, screams, or keeps still. The entire emotional episode occurs within seconds, but the length of time the emotional episode can last varies from individual to individual because of the cultural and social aspect of emotions. Individuals’ cultural and social environment helps shapes the actions they take based on their emotions. Individuals learn how to respond to emotions based on their prior experiences and their environment (similar to Hochschild’s feeling rules where context helps shape the acceptable displays of emotion).

This dissertation is grounded in Damasio’s approach to understanding emotion as a balance between the biological and socio-cultural processes, providing a model for understanding how teachers respond to emotional triggers. I cannot assume that just because emotion is biological that teachers experience the same emotions, and I cannot assume the teachers express all the emotions they experience. Because emotion has an individual, socio-cultural component, teachers may experience different emotions and may express emotions differently. Approaching emotion from a biological and socio-cultural perspective, it is reasonable to assume that teachers experience the emotions they express and that the influences on how teachers read student writing – prior experiences, expectations of writing, context of the teaching moment, classroom environment, and ways of reading – as well as the type assignment, student language or topic choice and decision of grade, can all be potential triggers of emotions for writing teachers. In the
next two sections, I move away from focusing exclusively on emotion research and instead discuss why a study on writing teachers emotions while reading and responding to student writing is needed. Then, in the section that follows, I argue for why this specific study is needed and how it is designed.

**Statement of the Problem**

While research on response (Phelps, 1989; Zebroski, 1989; Murphy, 2000; Mathison-Fife & O’Neill, 2001; Kynard, 2006) has offered writing teachers descriptive accounts on how teachers respond to student writing and models/frameworks for response practices, little research has discussed how teachers read student writing within social and pedagogical contexts (Zebroski, 1989; Tobin, 1991; Sperling, 1994; Phelps, 2000; Edgington, 2005). Even more so, few studies (Tobin, 1991; Sperling, 1994; Edgington, 2005) have discussed how reading student writing can trigger emotions in teachers. What influences the ways that teachers read student writing seem endless -- prior experiences (Shavelson & Stern, 1981; Pula & Huot, 1993; Smith, 1997; Huot, 2002), expectations of writing (Zebroski, 1989; Smith, 1997; Huot, 2002), context of the teaching moment (Shavelson & Stern, 1981; Mathison-Fife & O’Neill, 2001; Huot, 2002; Edgington, 2005), classroom environment (Shavelson & Stern, 1981; Huot, 2002) and ways of reading (Flynn, 1989; Phelps, 1989; Zebroski, 1989; Sperling, 1994; Callahan, 2001; Kynard, 2006). Most authors agree (Tobin, 1991; Sperling, 1994; Edgington, 2005; Kynard, 2006) that emotion has an impact on teachers’ readings of student writing, but beyond that, any substantial study of the influence of emotions when teachers respond to student writing has yet to be conducted. Huot (1988) and Pula (1990) code for laughter in
their studies of how expert and novice teachers respond and use a holistic rubric to score student texts but do not connect laughter to emotion or focus on laughter or emotion as a factor in teachers reading and scoring student writing. In other research on response (Tobin, 1991; Sperling, 1994; Edgington, 2005; Kynard, 2006), emotions have been mentioned in passing, but currently there are no studies on emotions within the context of teachers reading student writing. We know the different ways that teachers read student writing (Zebroski, 1989; Carini, 1994; Edgington, 2005; Kynard, 2006), but we do not know how emotion fits into those ways of reading. This dissertation focuses on emotions, and uses research done on how teachers read student writing (Huot, 1988; Zebroski, 1989; Pula, 1990; Edgington, 2005) as a starting point for considering emotion as a component of the social act of responding to student writing (Sperling, 1994; Mathison-Fife and O’Neill, 1997; Murphy, 2000; Edgington, 2005).

I believe that any comprehensive or substantive query into emotions and writing assessment must focus on the individual (Schutz, Hong, Cross, & Osbon, 2006; Wulff, 2007), the social (Scherer, 2000; Milton, 2007) and the biological (Damasio, 1999) and that such a study must not value one model of emotion over the other. By acknowledging teachers experience chemical changes as individuals within socially constructed contexts, I examine how teachers read and respond to student writing. Instead of assuming that all teachers experience the same emotions, I consider individual moments of emotions when teachers are reading and responding to student texts. While Damasio’s research allows me to acknowledge the neurological component of teachers’ emotions, Schutz, Hone, Cross, and Osborn (2006) allow me to situate emotion within an educational context.
Schutz et al (2006) define emotion as: “socially constructed, personally enacted ways of being that emerge from conscious and/or unconscious judgments regarding perceived successes at attaining goals or maintaining standards or beliefs during transactions as part of social-historical contexts” (p. 344). In terms of teaching, Schutz et al focus on emotions as person-environment interactions where the socially constructed aspect functions as a way to explain how teachers learn how to ‘act’/express emotion in educational settings. Emotions are in part socially constructed because individuals inherently learn how to value, express and suppress emotion in different contexts by observing the behaviors of those around them. While Schutz et al provide a definition for understanding emotions in teaching, they do not offer the emotional framework for mapping out teachers’ emotions that Damasio’s research provides.

Because writing assessment is a powerful discourse (Huot, 2002; Steinberg, 2008) that can have positive and negative consequences for students, teachers should investigate “the emotions [they] have in relation to different aspects of assessment [that] can open up their beliefs and understandings of [writing] assessment practice in new ways” (Steinberg, 2008, p. 44). While referring to large-scale state mandated writing assessments in Australia, Steinberg argues that teachers are forced to downplay negative emotions toward teaching to the test and up-play positive emotions for students and parents. Steinberg analyzed research on teachers’ emotions that referenced assessments and found that mandated assessments evoked negative emotions from teachers. Steinberg considers reflective practice on emotions with regard to writing assessments as a way for teachers and scholars to point out “possibilities for teachers’ emotions as a site for
motivating the personal, pedagogical and structural changes necessary for improved approaches to assessment and teaching” (p. 61). Teachers can consider emotions as a form of reflective practice to understand why they do what they do (Schon, 1983; Phelps, 1989; Hillocks Jr, 1995). Hillocks Jr (1995) also argues that teachers need to reflect on their values and experiences as they relate to teaching. Embracing emotions as a component of teacher responses to student writing and acknowledging teachers as thinking and feeling individuals provides teachers options on how to reflect on their reading and responding practices. Responding to student writing is not an emotionally neutral act (Tobin, 1991; Sperling, 1994; Edgington, 2005; Kynard, 2006) and acknowledging emotions can be a way for teachers to reflect and improve their response practices. This dissertation seeks to answer Steinberg’s call for understanding emotions as a way to reflect and improve, when necessary, pedagogical approaches to responding to student writing.

Purpose of the Study

According to Edgington (2005), “How one chooses to read a text and the emotional responses he or she has while reading can be seen as an influence on what comments will eventually be written on that text.” (p. 142). Edgington’s research focused on understanding how teachers read student writing in their home environments; his analysis was an early consideration of the role emotions play in writing. Since Edgington was focused on the reading processes of writing teachers, he did not discuss the biological, social nature of emotion that informs this study. Consequently, Edgington did not
consider what triggered teachers’ emotions, but instead focused on how emotions are part of the interpretative act of reading and can influence how a reader understands a text. Although Edgington’s research allows us to understand that emotions occur when reading student writing, little is known about how the emotional responses influence teachers’ reading, what emotions teachers are experiencing and why emotions are influential when teachers are reading student writing. Focusing on the unasked and unanswered questions of how, what, and why emotions can influence teacher response, and this study provides an opportunity to explore the role of emotion within the teaching of writing and to generate discussion about the individual and social nature of response. As an exploration of emotions and their impact on teacher response practices, this dissertation research is driven by the following general research questions:

(1) What emotions do teachers express verbally and nonverbally during audio and video recordings of think-aloud protocols?

(2) What triggers teachers’ emotions?

(3) What, if any, actions do teachers make in response to the emotions that emerge when they are reading and responding to student writing?

Understanding what emotions teachers experience and express during audio and video recordings of think-aloud protocols furthers the field’s understanding of the process
of reading and responding, and of the function and importance of emotion within the
response act. Previously, scholars have acknowledged that emotions occur when teachers
read student writing (Brand, 1987; Sperling, 1994; Richmond, 2002; Edgington, 2005;
Chandler, 2007). But beyond that, emotions are considered too difficult (Goddard, 1995;
Parrott & Hertel, 1999) and too personal (Marsella, 1994) to study within research on
writing. I move beyond these research problems by using methods familiar to writing
studies and emotion research. This dissertation constructs a systematic method for tracing
teachers’ emotional responses based upon a contemporary, multi-disciplinary
understanding of emotion, and in doing so extends what we can know about teachers
reading and response practices. Factoring in three distinct literatures, the goal of this
study is to extend the field’s understanding of the way teachers read student writing and
of the role of emotion in teachers’ interpretation, evaluation and response to student text.
Combining what we know about the theoretical contexts of writing assessment/response,
teacher development and emotions, this study outlines a working theory of emotions
within the context of teachers responding to student writing.

Study Design

To answer the research questions (1) What emotions do teachers express verbally
and nonverbally during audio and video recordings of think-aloud protocols?; (2) What
triggers teachers’ emotions?; and (3) What, if any, actions do teachers make in response
to the emotions that emerge when they are reading and responding to student writing?,
this study uses two methods familiar to writing studies and emotion research: self-report
and observation (Marsella, 1994; Goddard, 1995; Reisenzein, 1996; Levine, Prohaska, Burgess, Rice, & Laulhere, 2001; dos Santos & Mortimer, 2003). Through surveys and video/audio think-aloud transcripts of teachers reading student writing, I provide teachers the opportunity to report what emotions they understand themselves to be experiencing and offer the opportunity for teachers to express emotions while responding to student writing. Each method addresses a different part of the research question: survey (emotions teachers articulate/self-report) and think-aloud protocols (emotions teachers express/observation) provide data sources for developing an inventory of the emotional episodes teachers’ experience. I use Damasio’s emotional episode as starting point for developing an inventory of emotional episodes teachers may experience while reading student writing. Using his emotional taxonomy allows me to delineate the different components teachers experience while reading student texts and to create a verbal coding system that I introduce in Chapter 3. Specifically, Damasio’s framework helps provide a list of emotion triggers that result when teachers are reading student writing. This framework also allows for understanding the actions teachers make based on emotions.

The data collected from the teachers reading student writing (and commenting) aloud, provides a “vivid illustration of thought process” that will offer an understanding for “why people perform as they do” (Smagorinsky, 1994 p. 12). Think-aloud methods supplement self-reports, generating data about the role of emotions during the act of responding to student writing. In addition to exploring how the teachers read the text (as suggested by Edgington), I provide a sense of the “lived experiences” (Denzin, 1984) of teachers and the possible triggers of teachers’ emotions through teachers’ observable
emotions during the think-aloud protocols. I follow the think-aloud data gathering procedures of Huot (1988) and Edgington (2004) while altering the coding procedures to account for video and audio recordings of emotional moments.

One serious limitation of case study research, even in a mixed methods research design, is the narrow sampling that cannot but reflect local, though generalizable informants. To move beyond a narrow focus, this study employs a varied sampling system designed to represent as wide a sample of teachers, student texts, and institutional contexts as possible. Because this is an exploratory study into the emotions teachers experience, it was important to design a sampling matrix that accounted for all the possible factors that could influence how teachers read student texts and not focus on a particular group of teachers. A further discussion of the creation of the sampling matrix occurs in Chapter 3.

Seven teachers consented to participate in video and audio recording of their thoughts while they were responding to their own students’ writing. Unique to this study is the addition of previously obtained think-aloud protocol data. Reanalyzing think-aloud transcripts for emotion provides additional demographic, teacher experience and assignment types for the subject population. Five think-aloud transcripts were obtained from a previous dissertation focused on teacher response. In Chapter 3, I detail further how and why the additional transcripts fit into the sampling matrix. Together, this study analyzes the thoughts’ of twelve teachers’ from varying educational backgrounds, teaching institutions (4-year, Community College, and For-Profit), as well as a range of assignments (peer reviews, final exams, portfolios, narrative essays, argumentative
essays, and multi-modal assignments). The Institutional Review Board at Kent State University has approved this study.

Case Study Narrative

Traditionally, the fifth chapter of a dissertation summarizes the findings, discusses possible implications, and calls for future research. While I ultimately accomplish those goals in chapter 5, I do so with a third data source: a mini-case study with first-time teachers. Throughout the Fall 2010 semester, I mentored first-time teachers as part of my assistant writing program administrator position. This dissertation study developed partly out of the conversations I had with these teachers, and since this study started with the group of teachers I was mentoring, it seems fitting to conclude my study with implications to be used with future first-time teachers.

The four new graduate MA-level teachers and myself met once a week for an hour (10 hours total) to discuss what they were experiencing in their classrooms and to provide support for one another as they worked through pedagogical challenges (student participation, assessing student writing, in-class activities). Frequently throughout the semester, I noticed them expressing emotional reactions and frustrations as they taught for the first time. For example, during our conversations one week the teachers expressed concern and frustration over their peer review sessions not going as smoothly as planned. Students found the peer review sessions to be unhelpful, and while my teachers valued bringing peer review into the classroom they were struggling with the best ways to do so. While researching for this study at the same time, I came to the conclusions that
participants’ emotional reactions and frustrations could be seen as a response to their developing classroom identity. Emotions derive from an individuals’ belief system – which is developed early on in their life or early in their professional career (Pajares, 1992; Berg, 2002; Kane, Sandretto & Heath, 2002). An individual’s belief system can shape how or what emotions a person feels.

I was also interested in how the teachers’ practices were enacting their theories since part of the goal of the mentor group was to help teachers become more aware of the relationship between their theories and practices. Our early semester meetings were focused on having teachers discuss the theories they were subscribing to in the classroom. Teachers learned about various writing theories in their Teaching College Writing course. Part of focus of the weekly meetings was reflective practice where teachers were asked to describe a classroom situation and explain why they made the decisions they did in the classroom. According to Beauchamp and Thomas (2009), teacher identity is not static and not forced upon teachers. Teachers, especially novice teachers, are constantly negotiating their identity in relation to their experiences in the classroom. The participants in the mentor group were in the process of negotiating and developing their teacherly identities, and I believed that understanding the emotions they felt during the process would have helped with their development. Unfortunately, while our mentor group was meeting, I was unaware of how to incorporate an understanding of emotion to help the teachers navigate their developing teacherly identity.

After becoming aware of the emotions discussed during weekly meetings, I asked the group members permission to tape-record our final meeting that focused on
reflection. The transcript of this meeting indicates ways that emotion function for first-time teachers. For this particular study, the mentor group’s transcript will be used to understand what emotions teachers experience during their first-semester teaching, and while responding to student writing, and to suggest ways to use emotions to help first-time teachers (an understanding I wished I had to share with my mentor group when we were meeting). While the sample is small and the data is limited to a one-hour conversation, this aspect of the study supplements the survey and think-aloud methods because it does not focus exclusively on teachers responding to student writing and considers other contexts emotions occur for teachers. The overall meeting was focused on teachers in the process of reflective practice, and not articulating emotions they experienced while reading student writing. What the meeting did indicate though was that teachers are experiencing emotions in and out of the classroom, and are challenged to use those emotions as an opportunity to reflect on what will strengthen their abilities as teachers. The data from my mentor group is also more specific since they are first-semester teachers within a specific context. A thick-description of the implications of emotions and reflective practice with these first-semester teachers constitutes another more general and specific source of data for analysis and will occur in Chapter 5.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter, I have laid out the argument that the field of writing studies needs more research to understand how teachers experience emotions when reading student writing. The purpose of this dissertation is to answer the following research questions:
(1) What emotions do teachers express verbally and nonverbally during audio and video recordings of think-aloud protocols?; (2) What triggers teachers’ emotions and what do teachers do with the emotions that emerge when they are reading and responding to student writing?; and (3) What, if any, actions do teachers make in response to the emotions that emerge when they are reading and responding to student writing? I use Damasio’s emotional framework to create an inventory of what triggers teachers’ emotions, what emotions teachers experience and how teachers attend to those emotions. While teachers are reading student texts, I am curious about what or where teachers’ emotions are directed. Using think-aloud protocol video and audio transcriptions, surveys and a mentor group transcript, I code for emotional triggers and emotions expressed by teachers. I move beyond the narrative, anecdotal accounts of emotions by using a systematic, detailed coding scheme that accounts for Damasio’s (1995; 1999) scientific approach to emotion. The notion of teachers experiencing emotions within and outside the classroom is not new (Hargreaves, 1998; Richmond, 2002; Sutton & Wheatley, 2003; Ehn & Lofgren, 2007), but detailing the emotional episodes of teachers is a new approach to discussing emotions. Such an approach calls for more research to help teachers develop professionally as they navigate their emotions in the workplace. This study argues that emotions are a serious site of study, and pushes for teachers to cultivate an environment where emotions are acceptable to discuss and research. Using reflective practice, emotions help teachers learn from their emotions while reading student writing.

In the next chapter, I review relevant literature from response theory to situate this study within writing studies. While framing this study in response research, I also
incorporate research on emotion and research on teachers’ emotions from the field of education. Chapter 3 provides an in-depth and focused account of the methods for this study. In Chapter 4, I provide an analysis of the data as it is relevant to the research questions. Finally, in Chapter 5 I introduce a thick-description of first-semester teachers’ emotions as a small component of the conclusions of the study. As a whole, this dissertation begins to illustrate emotion as a new productive practice for teachers, and creates space within writing studies for a different view of emotions.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

In Chapter 1, I argued for a dissertation study focused on understanding what emotions teachers experience when reading and responding to student writing, what triggers those emotions, and what, if any, actions teachers make based on their emotions. Because my study addresses those three questions, this literature review focuses on teacher response, emotions, emotions within writing and emotions within education scholarship. This chapter has two primary purposes. The first purpose of this chapter is to familiarize readers with research done on response, focusing on where response research started and the push toward more social, holistic approaches to student writing. Since I am interested in answering (1) What emotions do teachers express verbally and nonverbally during audio and video recordings of think-aloud protocols?; (2) What triggers teachers’ emotions and what do teachers do with the emotions that emerge when they are reading and responding to student writing?; and, (3) What, if any, actions do teachers make in response to the emotions that emerge when they are reading and responding to student writing?, the focus on response research helps to articulate the ways teachers read student writing so emotion can be situated within the context of teachers reading student writing.

The second purpose of this chapter is to introduce readers to emotion research and research done on teachers’ emotions in the classroom to demonstrate how a study on
teachers’ response practices can draw from other fields. Research (Ray, 2000; Micciche, 2002; Daniell, 2003) within writing studies has approached emotion from afar, but no study has focused exclusively on emotion. Within response research, few scholars (Tobin, 2004; Edgington, 2005) have considered emotions as a potential site of study, but no study has grappled with the function of emotions for teachers responding to student writing. With emotions having the ability to impel individuals to action (Cooper, 2011), it is important to know what emotions teachers experience and how teachers react to those emotions. This chapter reviews relevant research for conducting a study addressing the research questions: (1) What emotions do teachers express verbally and nonverbally during audio and video recordings of think-aloud protocols?; (2) What triggers teachers’ emotions and what do teachers do with the emotions that emerge when they are reading and responding to student writing?; and, (3) What, if any, actions do teachers make in response to the emotions that emerge when they are reading and responding to student writing?

Overview

Because my study is focused on the emotions teachers experience when reading and responding to student writing, I first review the prominent scholarship within response paying particular attention to the dire call for more socio-contextual research on response since emotion is a biological, neurological, social, and cultural construct (Damasio, 1994; Scherer, 2000; Milton, 2007). The beginning of response research is mainly attributed to Sommers’ (1982) article “Responding to Student Writing” and
Brannon and Knoblauch’s (1982) “On Students’ Rights to Their Own Texts: A Model of Teacher Response” which focused on understanding the types of comments teachers left students. In Edgington’s 2004 dissertation *Think Before You Ink: Reflecting on Teacher Response*, he explained how little research considered the social act of responding and instead focused on the practical/practice-driven research that Sommers (1982) and Brannon and Knoblauch (1982) brought to the field. That claim still holds true. Few studies (Carini, 1994; Edgington, 2005; Kynard, 2006) have taken up the call for more research on understanding teachers’ experiences with response. Traditionally, research on teachers’ response focuses on the types of responses teachers make as well as the describing the practice of responding to student writing (Sommers, 1982; Connors & Lunsford, 1993; Straub, 1996, 1997, 2000).

In order to understand teachers’ textual response practices, I begin with Sommers’ (1982) article to discuss how teacher response was originally viewed and then move to discuss early response research that discusses teachers’ practices. Following teachers’ textual practices, more recent response research calls for the social and contextual understandings of teachers reading student writing (Carini, 1994; Sperling, 1994; Mathison-Fife & O’Neill, 1997; Murphy, 2000; Edgington, 2005; Kynard, 2006). The social and contextual understanding of response research provides and connects to emotions as a factor in how teachers are reading student writing. Later response research (Sperling, 1994; Edgington, 2005; Kynard, 2006) superficially incorporates emotion within the conversation. The brief discussion of emotion within response research was
the starting point for the development of a study focused on the emotions teachers experience when reading and responding to student texts.

With an understanding of the two strands of response research (textual practices and socio-contextual understandings), I then review literature about the varying definitions of emotion. This dissertation focuses on what emotions individual teachers are experiencing when reading and responding to student writing, what triggers those emotions, and what responses teachers have to their emotions. My approach to emotion includes the connections between the brain and social notions of emotion. The social and biological nature of emotion relates to research done on teachers’ emotions within the field of education, as well as connecting to research on the social nature of teachers’ responses. Using Damasio (1995, 1999) as the central contemporary emotion scholar to understand the neurological aspect of emotion, I define emotion as socially and biologically constructed with individually enacted ways of being that result from the emergence of a trigger (Damasio, 1994; Sutton, Mudrey-Camino & Knight, 2009). Emotions are social in the sense that cultural context help shape how individuals learn to express and suppress emotions (Hochschild, 1983). Emotions are biological and neurological because research has demonstrated where in the brain individuals experience emotion and have traced the chemical pathways of emotions within the brain (Damasio, 1994). However, emotions are not strictly social, biological, or neurological, the individual is influenced by his or her personal values. What triggers an emotion in one individual may not trigger an emotion in another individual. Emotion is an overarching
framework for understanding how teachers’ read and respond to student writing and emotion research will be reviewed in the second section of this literature review.

Since the focus of this dissertation is also on teacher emotions, the end of this literature review considers on how teachers’ emotions function within the classroom. I begin by reviewing the few studies within writing studies and then focus on studies from the field of education. Research on teachers’ emotions has primarily come from the field of education with an emphasis on K-12 classrooms. The approach to teachers’ emotions is a fairly new site of study because a significant amount of research approached emotion from the perspective of the students. While understanding the emotions of students is valuable, it is just as important to consider the emotions of teachers who are responsible for shaping the learning environment. Hargreaves (1998) claims that teaching is an emotional practice and researchers (Winograd, 2003; dos Santos & Mortimer, 2003, Zembylas, 2005) explore claims made by Hargreaves and seek to not only name the emotions teachers experience, but also understand why. The studies reviewed explore how emotions shape teachers’ experiences in the classroom.

Response Literature

In 1982, Nancy Sommers’ article “Responding to Student Writing” found the purpose of response on student writing to “demonstrate the presence of a reader, to help our students to become that questioning reader themselves, because ultimately, we believe that becoming such a reader will help them to evaluate what they have written and develop control over their writing” (p. 148). Driven to understand if the comments
teachers provide students help students improve their writing, Sommers collected comments thirty-five teachers placed on their students’ first and second drafts. After analyzing the types and style of comments teachers placed on student writing, Sommers concluded that teachers’ comments can distract a student from improving their writing and students focus on what the teacher wants. Secondly, teachers’ comments are vague and not text-specific leaving students little advice to work with during revision. This article brought the field’s attention to the importance of response research. Sommers believes the focus on teacher response as a site of research draws from the professional and personal attachment teachers have: “we feel a weighty responsibility when we respond to our students’ words, knowing that we, too, have received comments that have given us hope – and sometimes made us despair – in our abilities as writers” (Sommers, 2006, p. 248). Sommers’ article was, in a way, the beginning of response research that would focus on how teachers responded to student writing.

Almost 25 years later in “Across the Drafts” (2006), Sommers revisits and revises ideas presented in her 1982 article. To incorporate the voices of students, in Sommers’ new study on teachers’ responses, 400 students were followed over a four-year period at Harvard University. Sommers’ goal was to understand how students read and interpret comments, and how feedback assists students in writing development. Sommers collected student writing, teacher comments, interviews and survey data. After analyzing teacher comments on student writing and student interviews, Sommers argues that feedback plays a role in undergraduates writing development “when, but only when, students and teachers create a partnership through feedback – a transaction in which teachers engage
with their students by treating them as apprentice scholars, offering honest critique paired with instruction” (p. 250). Almost 90% of the students interviewed reported that they valued and sought specific feedback from instructors’ comments as well as comments that showed or explained how to improve their writing – not just to do “x.” The Harvard study demonstrates that feedback is important to students’ abilities to improve as writers. Sommers calls for further research on teacher response that includes student voices, and seeks to understand the student-teacher relationship built through language.

Focusing on the types of responses that teachers provide students, Connors and Lundsford’s (1993) article “Teachers’ Rhetorical Comments on Students Papers” presents research on the largest-scale study of teachers’ responses to student writing. Connors and Lunsford analyzed 3,000 essays categorizing the “global comments” teachers placed on student writing. These global comments could be found at the end, beginning or throughout the paper, but did not refer to grammatical or mechanical problems in the writing. Connors and Lunsford were interested in “the ways in which teachers judge the rhetorical effectiveness of their students’ writings, and the sorts of teacher-student relationships reflected in the comments that teachers give” (p. 206). 77% of the papers had global/rhetorical comments, and 75% of the papers had grades. 59% of the comments were teachers justifying the grade on the paper. While the extensive work and contribution of this analysis cannot be denied, the lack of context surrounding these types of comments teachers place on student writing creates a limited view of response within current understanding of the social context of response.
Continuing the focus on textual comments, Smith (1997) studies the end comments teachers wrote on student writing as a genre in “The Genre of the End Comment: Conventions in Teacher Responses to Student Writing.” Drawing from an analysis of 208 end comments from ten teaching assistants at Penn State and a second sample of 105 end comments from Connors & Lunsford’s sample, Smith categorized end comments into 16 genres of response. The 16 primary genres that fell into three larger groups (1) judging (evaluation of development, style, entire paper, focus, effort, organization, rhetorical effectiveness, topic, correctness, audience accommodation, justification of grade), (2) reader response (reading experience and identification) and (3) coaching (suggestions for revision, suggestions for future papers, offer of assistance).

Working from the premise “teachers create a history of practice” for a recurrent rhetorical situation that consists of the relations “between the teacher, students, their papers, and the educational institutions that sanction and encourage the interchange” (p. 250), Smith argues that teachers create patterns in their responses and the patterns form a genre of teachers’ end comments.

Richard Straub also conducted a series of studies focusing on the textual comments teachers place on student writing and how students respond to the textual comments. In his 1996 article, “The Concept of Control in Teacher Response”, Straub uses a historical concept of control to address students’ rights to their own texts. Straub analyzes the responses of teachers in the field (Edward White and Jane Peterson). Through his comment-based analysis, Straub finds that teachers do not directly take control over student writing, but that the structure of the responses have various degrees
of control. He concludes that “more than the general principles we voice or the theoretical approach we take into class, it is what we value in student writing, how we communicate those values, and what we say individually on student texts that carry the most weight in writing instruction” (p. 246). Arguing teachers need to consider what comments will best help the student in his/her writing, and what level of control and direction will be the best for the student, Straub suggests that the best responding styles are those that “create [teachers] on the page in ways that fit in with [their] classroom purposes, allow [teachers] to take advantage of [their] strengths as teachers, and enable [them] to interact as productively as [they] can with [their] students” (p. 248).

The following year, in “Students’ Reactions to Teacher Comments: An Exploratory Study”, Straub (1997) analyzes students’ reactions to his comments as a way to reflect on his own practices more. In hopes of bringing students’ voices to response research, Straub considers how students respond to different types of teacher comments through a 40-question survey given to first-year students about their preferences for teacher responses. Students’ responses to the survey indicated they wanted comments both on global matters and wording issues; additionally, students indicated a preference for comments on organization and development, and specific comments. Overall Straub found that “students wanted comments that are clear and understandable and that, in their eyes, are valid and appropriate to subject, point of view, and purpose” (p. 111). While this research does include the perspective of the student, it still focuses on the textual comments of teachers and does not contextualize response within a classroom.

A few years later, Straub (2000) in “The Student, the Text and the Classroom
Context: A Case Study of Teacher Response” continues to reflect on his own response practices and develops a list of “best practices” for teachers to use when responding to student writing:

(1) Turn your comments into a conversation. (2) Create a dialogue with students on the page. (3) Do not take control over the text: instead of projecting your agenda on student writing and being directive, be facilitative and help students realize their own purposes. (4) Limit the scope of your comments. (5) Limit the number of comments you present. (6) Give priority to global concerns of content, context, and organization before getting (overly) involved with style and correctness. (7) Focus your comments according to the stage of drafting and the relative maturity of the text. (8) Gear your comments to the individual student behind the text. (9) Make frequent use of praise. (10) Tie your response to the larger classroom conversation. (p. 23-24)

With these guiding principles of response, Straub analyzes the comments he placed on one student’s essays and reflects on how context shaped his responses. Straub found that 65% of his comments focused on her content, 30% on her ideas and assertions, 14% on detail within the writing, 21% on the need for development, 10% on organization, 11% on other higher order concerns and 14% on lower order concerns. Straub comments that reflecting on the work teachers do in the classroom can demonstrate ways teachers can engage with theory and learn about their practices in the classroom.

Pushing against the strict focus on what teachers say and how they say it in terms of responding to student writing, Sandra Murphy (2000) in “A Sociocultural Perspective
on Teacher Response: Is there a Student in the Room?” considers the perspective of the students. Appearing in a special issue focused on response, Murphy uses her professional background and experiences to discuss the perspective that she brings to responding to student writers in conjunction with the other articles published in the special issue.

Murphy considers students as active learners who are constructing meaning through social encounters and views writing from a sociocultural perspective. Murphy approaches teacher response as part of “an ongoing exchange with the student writing, and both teacher and student have roles in the interactive process of knowledge construction” (p. 81). Teachers’ comments are a means of communicating to student writers where student writers use the comments to further learning. Murphy advocates for more research to consider how students interpret and make use of the comments placed on their writing by teachers. Understanding students’ needs and their level as writers may shift the comments a teacher provides students; however, articles on the best practices of responding to student writing does not consider contextual student-centered information. Murphy argues that while response principles help guide teachers’ practices, to know the value of comments teachers need to understand the ways students’ interpret comments.

Mathison-Fife and O’Neill (2001) also begin to break away from the focus of textual comments and call for more socio-contextual research that includes student voices and contexts where students are receiving feedback. In “Moving Beyond the Written Comment: Narrowing the Gap Between Response Practice and Research”, they argue that research on response has not kept up-to-date with the pedagogical shifts within the classroom. While previous research on response focused mostly on the textual responses
teachers provide students, these studies ignored the context of the classroom and considered textual response as the only response students received (p. 301). However, even with the shift to “classroom practices fostered by social construction theory,” response research neglects to incorporate the social act of response. Specifically, Mathison-Fife and O’Neill argue that “the texts that teachers write in response to student writing are influenced and informed by the contexts in which they function; consequently, any interpretation of these teacher-written texts needs to consider the texts’ particular contexts, not just a generic one” (p. 307). By considering comments devoid of context, researchers assume “comments have a ‘true’ meaning inherent in the text and not influenced by the classroom context” (p. 306). Pushing for more contextual research on response that also incorporates students’ voices, Mathison-Fife and O’Neill call for research that addresses “how commenting practices construct roles for teachers and students” (p. 311) and for research that looks at larger conversational moves within the classroom. Both calls should work to improve student writing by acknowledging that textual comments are not the only way teachers responds to student writing.

Edgington (2005) answers Mathison-Fife and O’Neill’s call for research that moves beyond the textual comments by considering how teachers read student writing in his article “What are You Thinking?: Understanding Teacher Reading and Response Through a Protocol Analysis Study.” Curious about how context influences teachers’ responses and how teachers read student writing, Edgington asked eight teachers to read and respond to student papers from classes they were currently teaching and in their natural environment (home or other places that normally work). Combined, the teachers
responded to 65 papers and made 1,052 verbal comments. While transcribing and coding the protocols, Edgington noticed that teachers’ comments were influenced by how the instructor was reading students’ papers. Thus, focusing on how teachers were reading the writing, Edgington created codes to account for the reading strategies of teachers. Edgington concludes that reading and responding to student writing is a contextual act and teachers draw on different reading strategies to understand students’ work. At times, Edgington found that teachers “were often emotionally moved by the events discussed in the texts, student language use, and student progress (p. 141). Although Edgington does not code for emotion, he is the first to use verbal protocols to discuss teachers’ emotions.

An earlier article that focuses on how teachers read student writing and not textual comments was James Zebroski’s (1989) “A Hero in the Classroom.” Zebroski uses a Bakhtinian perspective to discuss the multiple voices (Simon Newman, John Crowe Redemption, Mina Flaherty, and Mikhail Bakhtin) he hears when he reads student writing. During each voice Zebroski hears when he is reading, he has a different focus (the errors in the paper, the paper’s structure and meaning, the logic of the writer’s choices and the intertextuality of the writing). When Zebroski listens for the voices within student writing, he states that he is not searching out a “single, truthful, honest, consistent, coherence, inspired, authentic soul of the student, somehow embodied, even degraded in the humble materiality of writing” (p. 36). Instead, Zebroski seeks to hear the “twists and turns and confusions of the text that often point to ‘voice’” (p. 36). Specially, Zebroski seeks the hero in student writing: “The hero is that super-addressee who is
infinitely distant from immediate participation in a dialogue, but whose responsive understanding of it is assumed, someone animating and vitalizing the word” (p. 37).

Faigley (1989) in “Judging Writing, Judging Selves” continues to bring attention to the student voice and the self within student writing. Faigley analyzes a 1929 English test and essays from a collection of best student essays as an attempt to understand what is valued in writing since he finds discussions and definitions of good writing vague: “an ‘A’ paper is an ‘A’ paper” (p. 395). He argues, “each judgment of value is made from some notion of value, usually a notion that is widely shared within a culture” (p. 395). After analyzing student writing, Faigley found that these essays were considered good writing because they were honest writing with students’ authentic voices. In an argument for teachers asking students to write autobiographies and narratives, Faigley posits that “those who encourage ‘authentic voices’ in student writing often speak of giving students ‘ownership’ of a text or ‘empowering’ students” (p. 410). Implicit within Faigley’s discussion on ‘good writing’ and student self is the role of the reader and cultural definitions of self. Zebroski and Faigley both present strong arguments for reading for student voices within texts, emphasizing the ways teachers can read student writing before responding to their writing.

Elbow¹ (1993) in “Ranking, Evaluating and Liking: Sorting Out Three Forms of Judgment” continues to suggest ways teachers read student writing in terms of

¹ Elbow has contributed numerous texts to the field of writing studies. Writing Without Teachers and “The Believing Game” are two influential texts on how the field conceives of the theory and practice of teaching writing. To review all of Elbow’s studies could comprise its own literature review and is not within the scope of this literature review or
assessments that help to frame judgments – ranking, evaluating, and liking. Of these three, Elbow argues evaluating is the most important for students because it goes beyond a first reaction and explains to students the strengths and weakness of the writing. Ranking is defined as the act of delineating a judgment into a single score, which also implies a scale or continuum. The three problems Elbow sees with ranking are (1) it is inaccurate, (2) it provides no feedback, and (3) it is harmful for teaching and learning. Elbow does not argue against judgment, but does argue against an “over simple way of representing judgment – distorting it, really – into a single number” (p. 191). While evaluating also has limitations, Elbow presents the idea of liking; liking is not the same as ranking or evaluation, and liking leads to student improvement. To bring more liking judgments into the classroom, Elbow suggests to offer students more chances for private writing and less evaluate writing, and to have students share more writing with each other. By liking student writing instead of ranking and evaluating it, Elbow argues students have the opportunity to grow as writers.

While Zebroski, Faigley, and Elbow move beyond textual comments and focus on the ways teachers are reading and assessing student writing, Phelps (1989) in “Images of Student Writing: The Deep Structure of Teacher Response” moves beyond textual comments to present teachers of writing a way to further understand the theory behind their practice with the practice to theory and back arc (PTP). This arc allows teachers to “look beyond behavior per se to define the underlying conceptual schemas that shape the study. Instead, I focus on Elbow’s research that relates to how teachers are reading and assessing student writing.
attitudes and choices of both teachers and students” (p. 37). There are 4 phases to the PTP arc: (1) methodology, (2) transition, (3) theory, and (4) metatheory. Within the first phase, methodology, teachers and researchers are interested in finding a teaching method that is considered a best practice for a particular problem. In the second phrase, transition, researchers look for the theory behind the practice-based research presented within the first phase. The third phase, theory, is where teachers and researchers try to “characterize what people do in terms of underlying beliefs or attitudes that motivate them and serve to explain behavioral choices and differences” (p. 43). Within the final phrase of the PTP arc, metatheory, researchers place theories within larger theoretical frameworks (cultural, historical, and philosophical). While the arc may appear to be a linear progression from one phase to the next, it is more of a dialectical relationship where new theory and practice inform each other and call for further development and understandings of practices within particular contexts. Research on teacher response practices continues to move dialectically through the arc as teachers more to more deeply understanding the social act of response.

In 2000, Phelps continues to explore teacher response in “Cyrano’s Nose: Variation on the Theme of Response”, and again, challenges the strict focus on teachers’ textual comments by arguing that teachers need to look at the full view of response, not just a focused tip (such as best practices). Phelps is interested in a holistic view of response that includes all activities, purposes and artifacts for profitable research. As demonstrated thus far, early response research focused on individual teachers’ comments
as isolated views of responses. Phelps also pushes against the notion that response is individual and isolated, by asserting responses

“are coherence and interactive because they are embedded in a common classroom context and history of learning; because teachers’ readings and writings to individual students reflect educational purposes selected of the set (the occasion, the assignment); because teachers comprehend, interpret, and judge groups of student writings comparatively and contrastively; because commentaries written serially for a group of teachers tend to synchronize (and progressively influence how subsequent texts are read) as they are composed” (p. 95).

Ultimately, Phelps argues that teachers need to consider what they are trying to change as teachers of student writing, and question what guides their reading and perceptions of texts.

Carini’s (1994) essay, “Dear Sister Bess: An Essay on Standards, Judgment and Writing”, continues to focus on assessment and reading student writing with a non-tradition research essay. Her essay employs a personal framework for understanding the importance of reading student writing as fully as possible, advocating an understanding of student growth over time. Using an old letter from her father to his sister discovered only recently, Carini constructs an argument for context through reader-writer relationships. Carini argues that “a lot of talk about language and writing, and about language and writing assessment, stresses efficient, correct, useful, standard communication. This is also, of course, the dimension of language and writing that most
readily lends itself to measurement” (p. 44). As teachers and readers of student writing, the primary value “must be given to the recognition and development, not the stripping away, of contexts that expand the possibilities for words to be made (written) and understood and the possibilities of the person to be a maker of works – for example, a writer” (p. 63-64). By focusing on the value of contexts, Carini believes discussions of standards and assessment will shift to include more than efficient and correct notions of assessment. While not the main emphasis on Carini’s essay, Carini expresses emotions throughout her reading of her father’s old letters.

Similar to Carini’s non-traditional study, Kynard (2006) considers her experience of responding to student writing as insight into a contextual argument where her practice is meeting her students where they are at with their own language, thoughts and writing. In “‘Y’all are Killin Me Up in Here’: Response Theory From a Newjack Composition Instructor/Sistahgurl Meeting her Students on the Page”, Kynard contends that while most teachers lament grading because of the poor writing of students, her problem was how to respond well to students who “really take this writing thang to heart and start writing!” (p. 363). Students would bring non-assigned writing for Kynard to respond to, and she reflects on the writing students did in the classroom throughout the article. Kynard lends insight to how she responds to student writing by providing readers with an introduction and analysis of the comments she leaves students. Kynard responds to students in three places that extend from her classroom pedagogy: journals, drafts and final essays. Each places requires a different form of response, and Kynard uses the journals to help her and her students create a language of response where her and her
students converse about writing. The comments Kynard makes to her students are honest reader-based comments:

If I want to know more, I say that and why. If I am confused, I explain why. If I disagree with some, I explain why and try to socially situate my own readership and ask the student to do the same. If I am reminded of something, I tell them about it – even my own personal stuff. If something makes me sad, I tell them why. If I was cracking up at their wit and humor, I say that too. Essentially, I treat their writing as texts and respond as a reader. (p. 366)

What Kynard demonstrates is that by knowing and understanding students, reader based responses that engage students can help students in ways that evaluative, standard-based comments cannot. Kynard also does not explicit discuss emotion, but does express emotion to her students and in her discussions of response.

While Carini and Kynard personally express emotions in their research, Sperling (1994) studies how the cognitive/emotion dimension may influence how teachers respond to student writing within social-contextual framework. In “Constructing the Perspective of Teacher as Reader: A Framework for Studying Response to Student Writing”, Sperling argues that researchers and teachers do not know “about the social processes in the classroom through which a developing writer integrates readers’ perspectives” (p. 175). Specifically focusing on Ms. Vance and eight students of her 11th grade American Literature class, Sperling used ethnographic methods and attended every class for 1 semester collecting notes on classroom activity, video and audio recordings of class
sessions, interviews with Ms. Vance, and the students writing with Ms. Vance’s comments. Using a high school English classroom, Sperling’s study looks at how a teacher’s written comments on students’ writing reflects how the teacher reads their writing, and how a teacher changes perspectives depending on the student or text. Sperling develops a framework of response based on the five perspectives Ms. Vance used to read student writing (interpretative, social, cognitive/emotive, evaluative and pedagogical). The different teacher-as-reader perspectives Ms. Vance used to read and response to student writing were shaped by the students’ needs and strengths. Sperling concludes that students received difference comments that embodied different social processes.

Response research has begun to move beyond describing and name the response practices of teachers (Sommers, 1982; Connors & Lunsford, 1993; Straub, 2000) to consider more of the theoretical concepts behind practices (Phelps, 1989; Mathison-Fife & O’Neill, 2001; Edgington, 2005). By using the response research that addressed the social nature of response and asks teachers to move beyond naming their practices, my dissertation helps to answer the calls of many researchers. In addition to Carini (1994) and Kynard (2006) expressing emotion within their research on teachers responding to student writing, Sperling (1994) considering emotion as a component of a teachers’ response framework, and Edgington (2005) noticing teachers’ emotional responses to student writing, this dissertation considers emotion as a component of how teachers read and respond to student writing in a social-contextual framework.
Emotion Research

As mentioned in Chapter 1, literature written on emotion is vast, and it is not within the scope of this study to review specific emotion studies. However, my particular research questions do allow for an overview on where emotion is situated within the brain and a definition of emotion. Relying on a series of publications from Damasio, I discuss the neurological, biological and social components of emotion that are useful for understanding how emotions influence the ways teachers read and respond to student writing. The emerging field of educational neuroscience argues that emotions are important in “guiding successful learning” for students (Immordino-Yang and Faeth, 2010, p. 69). Emotions matter because research shows that “emotions guide cognitive learning” both consciously and unconsciously (Immordino-Yang and Faeth, 2010, p. 72). Immordino-Yang and Faeth (2010) in “The Role of Emotion and Skilled Intuition in Learning” posit the importance of emotions through the connection to cognitive learning: “Though [emotion] and its influence may not be visible, it provides a force that stabilizes the direction of a learner’s decisions and behaviors over time. It helps the learner recognize and call up relevant knowledge” (p. 73). Through education and learning, a student’s “emotional reaction to the outcome of his efforts consciously or nonconsciously shapes his future behavior, either inciting him to behavior in the same way the next time or to be wary of situations that are similar” (Immordino-Yang and Faeth, 2010, p. 75).

Emotion is located within the brain and can enhance the neurotransmitters that help students learn and retain information within memory. To begin understanding emotion, it is important to have a foundational knowledge of the neurobiological aspect of the brain
as it relates to emotion. The neurobiological understanding of emotions helps to connect emotion with rational thought as opposed to considering them as two separate entities. Damasio’s (1994) research on damage to the ventromedial prefrontal cortex of the brain demonstrates the connection between rational thoughts and emotion. Damasio presented two subject populations (one with damage to the ventromedial prefrontal cortex and one non-damaged) a simple decision making task. The gambling card task asked individuals to make a profit on a loan of play money. The task used four decks of cards that were arranged so that two decks paid out more money and had higher penalties at varied intervals while the other two decks paid out less and had lower varied penalties. During the experiment, individuals had to rely on instinct or “gut feelings” to not lose money since there was no mathematical way to measure the randomized deck of cards. The subjects with damage to the ventromedial prefrontal cortex lost more money than the normal functioning brain group because they were unable to rely on “gut feelings.” This led Damasio to conclude that individuals make decisions and judgments not only based on logic (or assessing the situation) but also on their emotional quality. In other words, emotion is a component of rational thought and emotion and rational thought occur in the same part of the brain. In what follows, I present a limited overview of the brain anatomy here to help familiarize readers with the neurobiological aspect of the brain. I rely on Antonio Damasio’s (1994, 1999) texts *Descartes Error: Emotion, Reason, and the Human Brain* and *The Feeling of What Happens: Body and Emotion in the Making of Consciousness* to describe the anatomy of the brain.

The brain controls the human experience and is the central component to the central
nervous system; it is in charge of human motor functions (breathing, heart rate, sleep, movement, senses), as well as memory and learning (Brand, 1989; Damasio, 1994; Cornelius, 1996). For humans, the brain is central to life. The brain is comprised of several regions: the brainstem, cerebellum, limbic system\(^2\), diencephalon and cerebral cortex (Damasio, 1994). Each region is responsible for a different aspect of the body. For example, the brainstem links the brain to the spinal cord, and is responsible for the basic functions of life such as breathing, heart rate, eating (Damasio, 1994; Brand, 1989, Cornelius, 1996). Muscle movements, posture and balance are controlled within the cerebellum, while the diencephalon, which contains the thalamus and hypothalamus, regulates sensory input (Cornelius, 1996). The cerebral cortex controls an individual’s senses, thought process as well as his or her ability to communicate through language (Cornelius, 1996).

Emotion is controlled within the limbic system (Brand, 1989; Damasio, 1994; Cornelius, 1996). The limbic system is comprised of a group of structures: the amygdala, hippocampus and cerebral cortex. It is within this section of the brain that emotions are activated, mediated, and recognized. The amygdala helps individuals recognize and process emotions such as fear and anxiety, while other emotions are activated within the hypothalamus and prefrontal cortex (Brand, 1989; Damasio, 1994; Cornelius, 1996).

Neurons connect the different components of the brain and help the brain send emotion

---

\(^2\) Damasio chooses to use the limbic system as a “catch all” term for this section of the brain while other neuroscientists choose to refer to the separate components. For the purpose of this study, only a basic understanding is needed of brain anatomy, and thus the label limbic system works effectively.
signals to the rest of the body. When neurons are activated, they send chemical signals to other neurons until the signal is received in the proper location of the body (Damasio, 1994). Understanding the brain autonomy and system of emotions helps to explain and support how emotion is a biological and neurological function of individuals.

According to Damasio, when the body experiences an emotion, there are two components to the biological function. First, there is the chemical process that the body experiences when it encounters an emotion inducer. Secondly, there is the change in the bodily state as the body prepares to act (such as increased blood flow or heart rate, and changes in breathing rhythm and adrenaline). As previously mentioned in Chapter 1, there are 5 steps to Damasio’s articulation of the emotional episode (Figure 2).

**Figure 2. Damasio’s Emotional Episode**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Individuals encounter ‘something’ that triggers or induces emotion</th>
<th>(2) Individuals use senses to process trigger/inducer</th>
<th>(3) Individuals’ brains send out commands (emotion occurs)</th>
<th>(4) Individuals recognize shifts in body (feelings emerge)</th>
<th>(5) Individuals reflect on feelings (leading to action)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Damasio, 1995; 1999)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When an individual experiences an emotion, the first step is an encounter with ‘something’ that triggers, induces or cues emotion. Triggers are words, smells, music, or environments that elicit a response from an individual after being instantaneously evaluated by the individual (Scherer, 2005). The trigger could be a physical item in environment, a conjured image in the individual’s mind, or any other object or situation
that brings about physical, biological changes in the body. Sometimes, individuals are conscious of the triggers and other times not. Individuals can also be unaware of the trigger because they subconsciously observed it. According to Damasio, emotion triggers can also occur because of changes in an individual’s chemical profile (hormones, stress, illness), and not from a particular physical trigger. In the first step of the emotional episode, it does not matter which emotion is triggered, just that an emotional process is occurring in the individual’s body when an individual encounters a trigger.

During the second part of the emotional episode, the individual’s body and brain is processing the emotion. Specifically, the brain induces emotions from the subcoritical, located below the cerebral cortex. Emotion is a chemical change in the body that is induced in one of two ways. The brain sends a command either through the bloodstream (a chemical command) or through the neuron pathways (an electrochemical command) (Damasio, 1999, p. 67). The third step of the emotional episode occurs after the command from the brain is sent and causes change in the body. These changes could be release of tears or other facial expressions, skin blanching or flushing, shift in body posture, sweaty/clammy hands, or a change in heart rate (racing or slowing) – the changes that others are able to become aware of (Damasio, 1999, p. 59). Or, the changes could be less noticeable such as release of different chemicals (monoamines or peptides) or a shift in the muscle fibers (Damasio, 1999, p. 68). Emotions are the biological, neurological, internal changes.

During the final two steps of the emotional episode, Damasio differentiates between emotions and feelings. Feelings are linked to consciousness and awareness:
Damasio writes, “we know that we have an emotion when the sense of a feeling self is created in our minds” (1999, p. 279). Unlike the in-depth neurological and biological activity with emotion, “feeling an emotion is a simple matter” (1999, p. 280). According to Damasio, when mental images arise in individuals’ consciousness, “from the neural patterns which represent the changes in the body and brain that make up an emotion” individuals are “feeling” the emotion (1999, p. 280). The fourth step is when the individual becomes aware of the emotion. Feelings make an individual aware of the changes within his/her body – because of the emotion – and feelings encourage the individual to “heed the results of emotion” (either counteract the negative or enhance the positive) (Damasio, 1999, p. 284). The final step of the emotional episode is when the individual reflects on the feelings and is moved to action. The emotional episode is a process from encountering an emotional trigger to experiencing the emotion and then reflecting and acting on the feeling. Feelings are the awareness of the emotion whereas emotion is the physical body changes.

While Damasio differentiates between emotion and feeling, I do not in this study. Because of my limited access to neurological equipment and limited training in neurology, I focus on the emotional episode as a whole. I use the term emotion to mean emotion and feeling, and I consider the emotional episode as the process from which an individual encounters a trigger to the individual acting on the emotion. In the next section, I review emotion research within writing studies.
Emotion and Writing Research

Within writing studies, Brand (1987) and Cooper (2011) acknowledge the neurological approach in their research on emotion while the rest of the field of writing studies focuses more on the rhetorical function of emotion as a pathetic appeal. As a component of the rhetorical appeals, Aristotle argued that emotions could be used to persuade people to particular actions. While Aristotle’s idea about emotions is not currently prevalent in the emotion literature, some of Aristotle’s statements resonate and provide insight within contemporary ideas about emotion.

Referencing the current cultural notions of emotion, Nussbaum (1996) in “Aristotle on Emotions and Rationale Persuasion” refers to how Aristotle linked emotions to beliefs of individuals and how emotions are learned from families. Additionally, Rowland and Womack (1985) in “Aristotle’s View of Ethical Rhetoric” point out how Aristotle said that emotions are not rational but can be persuasive using reason. Similar to Cooper’s (2001) argument that emotions lead to actions, Micciche (2007) in Doing Emotion: Rhetoric, Writing, Teaching furthers Rowland and Womack’s claim that rhetors can use emotions to impel people to action. According to Micciche (2007), emotions are not experienced by individuals as isolated episodes, but rather they help individuals construct or enact behaviors based on the situation they are in. Combined these ideas resonate within the emotion framework that Damasio sets forth. Emotions are culturally situated and individuals can learn how to display and manage their emotions while also experiencing the innate chemical changes within their body. Emotions compelling individuals to action is one way that emotions are rhetorically situated.
Focusing on the persuasive aspect of emotion, Moon (2003) in “The Pathos of Pathos: The Treatment of Emotion in Contemporary Composition Textbooks” works off the premise that *pathos* appears in the classroom if it is a topic within the textbook. Moon’s analysis of *pathos* in twenty-five modern day textbooks published after 1998 drew her to the conclusion that Aristotle’s notion of *pathos* is just a shadow in terms of rhetorical appeals taught in the classroom. Of her analysis, five textbooks made no reference to *pathos*, ten defined it as an appeal to emotions with one or two examples, two provided less than a definition and examples, and two referenced pathos as a fallacy. Five textbooks mentioned *pathos* throughout the writing process and one textbook was an exception. Within the twenty-five textbooks, *pathos* is only referred to as an appeal to emotions without the in-depth treatment that Aristotle provides. In fact, modern definitions of emotions did not enter into the discussion. Moon proposes three assertions for why *pathos* is treated in such a way. (1) Textbooks reflect culture, and authors place information in basic terms so students can understand the concepts. (2) As a field, writing studies does not have the language to talk about emotion in a way that expands our understanding and gives an in-depth treatment of *pathos*. And, (3) To the university community, composition is considered a service course. Thus, textbooks need to reflect the institutional structure for which they function which tends to place emphasis on the rational aspect of rhetoric (pp. 38-39).

Alice Brand was an early proponent arguing for more attention to the psychological aspect of writing, specially the affective experience as it relates to the neurobiological aspect of emotion. Her articles and book length treatment of emotion spurred her central
argument that the psychology of writing must include the emotional experiences of writers. She argues that while the cognitive movement constructed models that explain the “intellectual acts” (1989, p 2) of writers, it did not acknowledge the emotional acts. In “The Why of Cognition: Emotion and the Writing Process”, Brand (1987) analyzes how emotions function within the writing process and cognition by linking emotion/cognition and writing to intention and interpretation -- referring to both what the writer wants to accomplish and what the readers take from writing. Brand argues that teachers and students should be viewed as rational and emotional beings that have conscious awareness of the persuasive role of emotions within their lives: “Whether we like it or not, the mind-body relationship is so powerful that it is humanly impossible to dissociate the two without grave consequences. We make a serious mistake by not helping students to address their psychological lives, to continually humanize themselves.” (2000, p. 217)

In The Psychology of Writing: The Affective Experience, Brand (1989) develops an emotional scale for writers. The Brand Emotions Scale for Writers (BESW) is a self-report instrument used to account for the emotions writers experience before, during, and after a writing session. Brand administered the BESW to college writers in English and psychology courses, advanced expository writing students, professional writers, English teachers and student poets. Twenty-two English teachers participated in the study and were asked to fill out a pre-writing emotion form and a post-writing emotion form. In between the forms, the participants were asked to compose a 2-3 double-spaced page document on a specific prompt: one group assigned a free-writing method, and the other assigned a structured method. Brand found that neither emotions nor intensity of
emotions differed based on the pre-writing method teachers used. Overall, teachers tended to be less anxious about writing as compared to the other samples, and more satisfied with their writing.

Richmond (2002) positions her article, “Repositioning Emotions in Composition Studies,” on the recent trends in research to focus more attention on emotion. Richmond suggests that scholars (such as Brand) whose research focuses on emotion are often marginalized and that “those who might opt to pay attention to emotions tend to be labeled instantaneously as expressivists, regardless of how emotions are related to their pedagogies or research” (p. 70). Richmond argues that “an examination of cognitive or social processes in the writing classroom would not be complete without considering how the emotions are involved in every thought, decision, and related action” (p. 76).

Richmond considers the role of emotions in terms of relationships. Since relationships are so important within writing classrooms (peer review groups, small class discussions, teacher/student relationship), Richmond suggests it is time the field begins to see how emotions help shape these relationships. Empathy is one emotion that shapes the interpersonal relationships between teachers and students, and helps students develop their perceived selves as writers. Richmond suggests, “a teacher’s beliefs or feelings about students could influence students’ writing in ways that we are only beginning to understand” (p. 76).

While Brand and Richmond concentrate on how emotions influence students and teachers, Chandler (2007), in “Fear, Teaching Composition, and Students Discursive Choices: Re-thinking Connections Between Emotions and College Student Writing,”
explores the role of emotion for students and their writing. She analyzed students’ final reflective essays from her service-learning intermediate composition course after noticing students were using more clichés and conversational stories instead of the critical analytical approach asked for in the assignment. After being prompted by the clichés to look more closely to the relationship between students’ writing and emotion, Chandler found that she needed to think of students’ essays not in terms of “cognitive patterns associated with learning, but rather in terms of social and emotional context surrounding their composition” (p. 55). Chandler compared the formal characteristics of student writing with the findings of psychological studies of writing and healing. Chandler found that “writing assignments that press young adults toward critical thinking and identity shifts can evoke stressful emotions that, in turn, evoke discursive patterns inappropriate for the demands of critical, analytic writing” (p. 54). The anxiety and fear students felt (from the service-learning experience) pushed students to write more clichés, generalizations and pat conclusions, as well as a more conversational narrative instead of an analysis essay. She argues that students struggle to develop their writing in a new academic discourse when they are experiencing anxiety or fear. Chandler suggests teachers approach students’ writings as a “‘hybrid discourse’ where emotional discourses influence and sometimes overwrite the academic patterns students seek to produce” (p. 55).

Highlighting teachers’ emotions when reading student writing, Robillard (2007) in “We Won’t Get Fooled Again: On the Absence of Angry Responses to Plagiarism in Composition Studies” analyzes teachers’ anger in response to plagiarism within the composition classroom. Beginning with a personal anecdote of a graduate student who
plagiarized, Robillard analyzes her own emotional reactions. After noticing lighter text within one of her student’s essay, she asked the student about the essay. The graduate student claimed the difference in gray and black text was due to printer issues. After searching a few phrases in Google, Robillard found that the essay had plagiarized passages and immediately experienced anger. She justified her anger by feeling that she needed to maintain her identity as a teacher who doesn’t fall for tricks. She argues that since “composition studies persuades teachers to enact a particular kind of emotional relationship to students and their writing, teachers who respond angrily to plagiarism or suspected plagiarism find themselves defending conflicting values of their institution and their discipline” (p. 13). In essence, the emotions teachers feel toward plagiarism challenge teachers’ identities and teachers are placed in a position to ‘feel’ a particular way. Robillard, additionally, analyzes teachers’ anger toward plagiarism through teachers’ blogs. She argues that “teachers who represent themselves as angry in the scholarship risk identifying themselves as ‘bad’ teachers, but teachers who represent themselves as angry on their blogs represent themselves as too smart to be fooled by dishonest students” (p. 13).

This study is not grounded in communication theories of emotion, but is informed by their approaches to analyzing verbal emotion. Underlying communication emotion theory is the notion that emotion happens in conversations between two individuals. For this study, while communication is abstractly happening between the teacher and the student, the immediate context is the teachers’ engagement with the students’ texts. Planalp (1999) in Communication Emotion: Social, Moral, and Cultural Processes
distinguishes between two types of emotion communication. The first type, communication emotion, occurs when individuals name the emotion during conversation, “I am feeling sad.” Emotion becomes the substance of the message being communicated. Individuals can also communicate emotionally (the second type) by using emotion as a property of the message, such as talking about a new puppy in an excited manner.

Researchers can use cues to analyze ways that individuals communicate emotions. Cues are “specific observable behaviors (verbal or nonverbal)” that indicate emotion, and include facial cues, vocal cues, physiological cues, gestures and body movements, action cues and verbal cues (Planalp, 1999, p. 44). Little is known about how emotions cues work together, and the unique properties of each cue (Planalp, 1999). What is known is that there are an infinite number of possibilities on how individuals can communicate emotions and that for researchers emotions are observable. Planalp’s two ways to communicate emotion helps to distinguish the difference between teachers’ articulation of emotions and their expression of emotions. In the next section, I review studies on teachers’ emotions from the field of education and then conclude this chapter by drawing connections between the different literatures reviewed.

**Teachers’ Emotions Research**

According to Hargreaves (1998) in “The Emotional Practice of Teaching” “emotions are at the heart of teaching. They comprise [teachers] most dynamic qualities, literally, for emotions are fundamentally about movement” (p. 835). Drawing from data collected from thirty-two 7th and 8th grade teacher interviews during a time of curriculum
change, Hargreaves found that the context of educational change influenced teachers’ emotions and their feelings about their students. During the interviews, teachers referred to the emotional relationship they built with students and that those relationships aid in successful learning. Teachers in the interviews discussed how the methods used in the classroom were based upon what they “felt” students “needed emotionally as well as intellectually” (p. 847). Hargreaves defines teaching as an emotional practice since “teaching activates, colors, and expresses teachers’ own feelings, and the actions in which those feelings are embedded,” (p. 838) and argues for more research on teachers’ collective emotions. Emotions helped shaped teachers decisions in the classroom, and in the larger school context. Hargreaves concludes, “teaching cannot be reduced to technical competence of clinical standards,” (p. 850) because of the emotional component.

In 2003, Sutton and Wheatley write in “Teachers’ Emotions and Teaching: A Review of the Literature and Directions for Future Research” that little research has been conducted on the emotional aspects of teachers’ lives. They account for the limited research due to the perspective that emotions are considered irrational: “Emotions, although sometimes thought of as a guide to our true selves, are often thought of as out of control, destructive, primitive, and childish, rather than thoughtful, civilized, and adult” (p. 328). Sutton and Wheatley reference the research of Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso (2000) which recognizes emotion as “one of three fundamental classes of mental operations” (p. 332). This classification helps push the argument that understanding teachers’ emotions is crucial to understanding teaching and teachers. Compiling the
research done on teachers’ emotions, the positive emotions that teachers reported in various interviews included love, affection, excitement and joy. The negative emotions included frustration and anger primarily, with reference to anxiety, helplessness, and guilt. Some of the positive influences of emotions on teachers include affecting teachers’ memory, teachers’ categorizing, thinking and problem solving, and teachers’ motivation. Because emotions can have such a range of influences on teachers, it is important to fully understand the role of emotion in the lives of teachers.

Continuing to define teaching as emotional, Winograd (2003) in “The Functions of Teacher Emotions: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly” uses a self-study to understand how emotions shaped his experience as an elementary teacher. Winograd kept a daily teaching journal for one year and through reflection after the school-year was over, Winograd noticed he emoted everything: “teacher guilt, joy, embarrassment, sadness, anxiety, depression, satisfaction, and anger” (p. 1641). In particular, Winograd noticed he suppressed some of his negative emotions and concluded that by doing so he was more focused on the inadequacies of teachers instead of his negative emotions. Using a narrative analysis method, Winograd was particularly interested in how emotions were functional or dysfunctional for him as a teacher. While overall Winograd noticed that emotions alerted him to teaching problems, he also observed four central concepts of emotions: (1) “There are rules that govern teachers’ emotion behavior in schools.” (2) “Teachers do emotion work, or emotional labor, in response to these emotion rules.” (3) “Teachers experience emotions that have functional uses; that is, the emotions alert teachers to problems in their work and then action to address those problems.” and (4)
“Teachers experience emotions that have dysfunctional uses; that is, the emotions lead to self-accusatory behavior by the teachers, or they lead to the blaming of others, such as students, parents, or administrators” (p. 1652). Teachers find themselves needing to mask emotions with some audiences to keep their jobs. And even if teachers are “astute at navigating the demands of emotion work, the task of emotion work still is enormously exhausting both psychically and physically” (p. 1668). Winograd concludes that teachers should reflect on their emotions within their educational environment.

Specific to how emotions are influencing teachers, Zembylas (2005) in “Beyond Teacher Cognition and Teacher Beliefs: The Value of the Ethnography of Emotions in Teaching” explores the concept of teacher identity and how developing a teacher identity requires a self-awareness of emotion. Zembylas conducted a 3-year ethnographic study on Catherine, an elementary school teacher, to understand how emotions were a component of her teaching. Through interviews, Catherine reveals that as a younger teacher there was not a place to discuss what she was feeling, and as she gained more experience, it was “not considered professional to talk about feelings” (p. 465). Drawing from Reddy’s theoretical framework of emotives, Zembylas argues that teachers’ “values, beliefs and emotions come into play as teachers make decisions, act and reflect on the different purposes, methods and meanings of teaching” (p. 467). Analysis of the ethnographic data revealed that the emotional rules within the school culture imposed roles on Catherine and while following those rules she felt emotional suffering. Emotional suffering emerged from the internal conflict Catherine experienced with standardized testing and learning, and standardization destroyed the excitement Catherine
tried to produce in her classroom. What Catherine valued as the goal of the classroom was at odds with what the school saw as the goal. The dissonance caused Catherine to feel shame, guilt and low self-esteem. Zembylas found that a teacher’s emotional development is influenced by the social, political and discursive practices of the school.

Also exploring the role of emotions for teachers, dos Santos and Mortimer (2003) in “How Emotions Shape the Relationship Between a Chemistry Teacher and her High School Students” use an ethnographic approach to analyze the teacher-student interactions within a high school chemistry classroom emphasizing how emotions contributed to or obstructed the dynamics of the class. Drawing from Damasio’s research, dos Santos and Mortimer analyzed eight months worth of video recordings and interviews with students and teachers in two chemistry classrooms. They looked at posture, gesture and voice intonation as evidence for emotion, and they focused on the positive and negative emotions to discuss the emotion events in the classroom and to explore how students develop their attitudes toward science. They conclude that emotions are a factor within chemistry classrooms and students react to the emotional climate set by teachers. dos Santos and Mortimer argue emotions are influencing the decisions teachers make within the classroom in significant pedagogical ways and should be researched further in different classroom environments and pedagogical situations.

Focusing on a specific pedagogical choice, Hawe (2003) in “It’s Pretty Difficult to Fail: The Reluctance of Lecturers to Award a Failing Grade” highlights the influence of emotions on university teachers’ pedagogical choices when grading. Hawe conducted structured and semi-structured interviews with instructors and students, and collected
field observations of the classroom. Using a grounded theory method to understand that actions of instructors, Hawe found that the instructors’ emotions were a strong force when they were faced with the decision to give students a failing grade. In the university’s handbook, criteria clearly sets the minimum standards for students to successful complete the courses. During interviews, teachers expressed several distressing and negative emotions, and concerns about the students’ emotional reaction to a failing grade. Some reasons teachers offered for not wanting to award failing grades included a commitment to affirmative action, a teacher’s notion that the student would make a good teacher, a teacher’s notion that seniors should not fail so late in their career, an administrator’s warning that students are paying for education and failing grades could create legal issues, and a sense of personal failing. Hawe argues that teachers need to confront their personal perceptions in regard to assessments, and reflect on the implications of their thoughts.

Wolfe (2006) in “The Role of Meaning and Emotion in Learning” further argues for more attention to be paid to emotions within the classroom. He posits the importance of emotion by grounding it within learning and retention. Wolfe argues that emotions within the classroom help facilitate more learning because of the connection to the brain. The neurons in the brain “encode, store and retrieve information,” as well as control learning (p.35). When individuals learn information, synapses are formed from neurons firing. Repetition or practice help to strengthen the synapses (Wolfe, 2006). Memory then, is the process of “storing and retrieving information” (p. 36) that the neurons and synapses have encoded. However, individuals are constantly interacting with sensory
overload, and the brain cannot process all of the sites, smells, sounds, tastes, etc. The brain filters out the unnecessary information and only retains what seems relevant. Wolfe argues that adding emotion into the classroom will help students retain information because the brain will recognize an emotionally charged situation as data to store. Engaging students on an emotional level helps students learn and retain information.

Trying to understand why teachers downplay some emotions and up-play others, Sutton, Mudrey-Camino and Knight (2009) in “Teachers’ Emotion Regulation and Classroom Management” found that K-12 teachers engage in emotion management because they believed it helped them with classroom management and their relationships with students. Sutton et al conducted three surveys to understand teachers’ emotions and classroom management. The surveys were conducted in between 2003 and 2006 and each survey was a modification of a prior survey, redesigned based on the previously collected data and analysis. While the samples for each survey were different, overall there was representation from 70-80% female K-12 teachers, as well as a high (over 50%) representation of teachers with 1-5 years experience. Teachers reported that emotions arose “from management and disciplinary classroom interactions, and that they try to regulate these emotions frequently because they believe it helps them achieve their goals” (p. 130). Sutton et al found that over 90% of teachers worked to manage anger within the classroom, because they felt that displays of anger hurt their classroom ethos. Teachers were also more likely to want to conceal the negative emotions they experienced in fear of harming student learning. In the classroom, teachers surveyed agreed that it was important to not directly show or display negative emotions to students; but, it was
acceptable and encouraged to display positive emotions since they made teaching more effective (such as teachers conveying excitement or pleasure in the classroom). Some of the emotion management strategies teachers reported using included, diverting attention, self-talking, reflecting, deep breathing, asking students to do a quiet activity, and controlling facial expressions. Sutton et al argue that more research is needed to understand what management strategies work best for what emotion and in what context.

Research on teachers’ emotions within the classroom has begun to name the emotions teachers experience (Sutton & Wheatley, 2003; Winograd, 2003; Zembylas, 2005), offer emotion management strategies (Sutton, Mudrey-Camino & Knight, 2009), and examine the relationship between emotion and learning (dos Santos and Mortimer, 2003; Wolfe, 2006). By using research that begins to describe how teaching is an emotional practice and how emotions shape teachers’ pedagogical decisions, this dissertation highlights the emotional practices of university teachers while they are reading and responding to student writing. In addition to Wolfe (2006) considering emotion as a crucial component of the learning process in the classroom, and dos Santos and Mortimer (2003) and Sutton and Wheatley (2003) constructing emotion as a biological and social force that influences teachers’ actions, I approach the emotions writing teachers experience while reading and responding to student texts as an influence on how teachers read student texts.
Conclusions and Beginning Connections Between Response and Emotion

Steinberg (2008) links writing assessment research with research on teachers’ emotions in her article “Assessment as an ‘Emotional Practice.’” Drawing from Hargreaves’ definition of teaching as an emotion practice, Steinberg posits that writing assessment is an emotional practice since emotions shape what is important for assessors and emotions are often linked to professional ideas and identity – both which are wrapped up in classroom and large-scale assessments. While Steinberg refers to writing assessment as large-scale state and nationally mandated assessments that ‘force’ teachers to teach to the test, her approach of how teachers need to suppress negative emotions and up-play positive emotions connects with research on teachers’ emotions. Steinberg believes that assessment decisions are not neutral and involve emotions that relate to teachers beliefs and values. Through an analysis of research on teachers’ emotions that reference assessment, she also found that mandated assessments brought about negative emotions from teachers. Steinberg aims to bring light to the role of emotions within assessment in hopes that more scholars will consider how emotions can be used as a form of reflection for what is and is not working within assessments. Ultimately, she also hopes that “research (and teacher education) can begin to point to possibilities for teachers’ emotions as a site for motivating the personal, pedagogical and structural changes necessary for improved approaches to assessment and teaching” (p. 61).

Tobin (2004) begins to reflect on emotions and their implications for pedagogical improvement within his book Reading Student Writing: Confessions, Meditations, and Rants. Throughout the chapters, he approaches reading student writing through personal
reflection on his own classroom. Within his reflection, emotions emerge as a component of how Tobin reads student writing. Particularly, he questions how he can police his unconscious (emotions included) to “not get in the way of my objectivity and self-control” (p. 50). Arguing that emotions are valuable within the composition classroom, Tobin states that "It is not a question of whether emotions have a place in the writing class; it is a question of which and whose emotions are encouraged and allowed" (p. 80). Tobin, considering the work of bell hooks, wonders what emotions are acceptable in the classroom and how those relate to social status. However, before teachers can understand the social and political nature of emotions within the classroom, teachers need to understand their emotions and reflect on the social development of their emotions in a classroom context. Tobin argues that if teachers do not admit to experiencing emotions when reading to student writing, then teachers refuse “to figure out how to deal with them," (p. 104) assuming that emotions are something to be dealt with. While Tobin begins to approach emotions in the composition classroom, his approach is individual and reflective in nature. It is difficult to imagine how Tobin’s approaches in the classroom would apply to teachers with varying experiences in a range of classrooms, but one this dissertation seeks to find through surveys and think-aloud protocols.

The purpose of this chapter was to review literature that helps answer the research questions of this dissertation: (1) What emotions do teachers express verbally and nonverbally during audio and video recordings of think-aloud protocols?; (2) What triggers teachers’ emotions and what do teachers do with the emotions that emerge when they are reading and responding to student writing?; and, (3) What, if any, actions do
teachers make in response to the emotions that emerge when they are reading and responding to student writing? Even with the calls for more contextualize/social research on response (Phelps, 1989; Carini, 1994; Sperling, 1994; Mathison-Fife & O’Neill, 2001), research that answers those calls is limited (Phelps, 2000; Edgington, 2005; Kynard, 2006). Research on teachers’ emotions is valuable in arguing that emotions are a serious site of study and should be studied more in-depth – in particularly, it should be extended to include college classroom teachers and not just K-12 educators. This dissertation responds to educational research by bringing college instructors into the conversation and conducting an in-depth study on the emotions college writing instructors experience when responding to student writing. Combined, I clarify and extend the conversation that Steinberg and Tobin begin when linking emotion, assessment, response practices and teachers. Using the social nature of response and the social nature of emotion in combination with the important function of emotion for teachers, this study offers the field a list of emotions teachers experience, what triggers those emotions and what teachers do with those emotions. In the next chapter, I describe the methods and design of my study.
Chapter 3: Methodology

Introduction

While emotion literature is vast, as referenced in the last chapter, the ways that researchers (Hargreaves, 1998; Ehn & Lofgren, 2007; Micciche, 2007) have attempted to capture the emotions of teachers is limited. Most studies have used survey methods (Hargreaves, 1998; Ria, Seve, Saury, Theureau & Durand, 2003), observations (Schutz, Hong, Cross & Osbon, 2006; Sutton & Wheatley, 2003) and case studies (Winograd, 2003; Daniell, 2003). This study focuses on naming the emotions teachers experience when responding to student texts and identifying the triggers and actions based on those emotions. To that end, this study uses both survey and think-aloud protocol methods to capture the emotions of teachers when they are reading and responding to student writing. This methodology merges the education methods used to research teachers’ emotions, the response research methods used to understand how teachers are reading and responding to student writing, and the emotion research methods. When teachers are aware of the emotions they experience when reading and responding to student text, teachers have an opportunity to explore the ways emotions shape their response practices. In this chapter, I describe the methods used to answer this study’s three research questions:

(1) What emotions do teachers express verbally and nonverbally during audio and video recordings of think-aloud protocols?
(2) What triggers teachers’ emotions?

(3) What, if any, actions do teachers make in response to the emotions that emerge when they are reading and responding to student writing?

The answers to these questions can inform teachers of possible patterns of triggers and behaviors that they may not be aware of. I begin this chapter with an overview of the study’s design followed by an in-depth treatment on how data was collected using survey and think-aloud methods. While discussing the think-aloud method, I present my sampling matrix and mini-biographies of the twelve teachers participating in the study. Following the participants’ biographies, I conclude this chapter with a review of how the data was collected and how the data was analyzed. At the end of this chapter, readers will have a clear understanding on how the methods and analysis used will answer the research questions in Chapter 4.

**Design Overview**

Studies on emotion within writing studies are limited to rhetorical analyses and applications of emotion theories on narrative accounts of emotions. A detailed, systematic study on the emotions writing teachers experience when reading and responding to student texts does not exist within the literature. Using the most frequently acceptable methods for understanding emotion, self-report and observation (Marsella,
1994; Goddard, 1995; Reisenzein, Meyer & Schutzwhol, 1996; Levine, Prohaska, Burgess, Rice, & Laulhere, 2001; dos Santos & Mortimer, 2003), I document the emotions teachers report they experience and the observable emotions teachers express while responding to student writing. Surveys allow teachers to report what emotions they understand themselves to experience, while think-aloud protocols allow for teachers to express their emotions while responding to student writing. Think-aloud protocols also provided an opportunity for researchers to ‘observe’ teachers’ emotions during a contextual act of reading and responding to student writing, following in the footsteps of research on teacher response (Huot, 1993; Pula and Huot, 1993; Edgington, 2004; Wierszewski, 2010) that also use think-aloud methods to understand the process of reading and responding to student writing.

Because this is an exploratory study into the emotions teachers’ experience when reading student writing, the participants represent a range of experiences, courses taught, assignments read, and university setting, as well as race and gender. The data collected from the think-aloud protocols address the research questions by pinpointing the expressed and unexpressed emotions, triggers and actions of teachers during the act of reading and responding to student writing. In conjunction with teachers’ narrative responses from the survey, video and audio transcripts from the think-aloud protocols help trace out teachers’ emotional episodes situated within the context responding to student writing. Using video to record the protocols, verbal and visual cues of emotion provides additional data to code teachers’ expression of emotions. The triangulation of the surveys, think-aloud data and retrospective interviews provides a foundation for
detailing the emotions, triggers and actions for teachers of writing. In the next section, I review the survey methods and then introduce the think-aloud protocol methods.

**Study Methods**

**Survey**

To begin to understand what emotions teachers experience, a survey (Appendix A) was developed to address (1) teachers’ response practices (modeled after the information gained from the think-aloud protocol interviews) and (2) emotions experienced when responding to student writing (modeled after information gained from think-aloud protocols). The survey was designed to complement think-aloud protocol data for triangulation and was distributed before the think-aloud protocol was collected. Teachers were prompted at the beginning of the survey to refer to emotions experienced in the past semester teaching in an attempt to avoid any methodological issues with memory. Levine, Safer and Lench (2006) studied individuals’ ability to accurately recall their emotions after different time frames (1 week, 2 months, 1 year). They concluded, as Levine, Prohaska, Burgess, Rice, and Laulhere (2001) previously presented, that the more time that elapses between the emotional experience and the individual, the less likely the individual is to accurately recall their emotions.

The survey was broken into three sections (1) background information (2) instructor response practices and (3) emotions and response. Section one included four questions that asked teachers what they taught, how long they have taught, what type of
institution they teach at and their gender. Section two also had four questions and asked teachers what they viewed as the goal of response, how long they respond, how many papers they respond to at one time and if they place a grade on student papers. Section three had twelve questions and included questions geared toward answering the research questions. Five of these questions were open ended and seven were closed questions. For a copy of the survey refer to appendix A.

One question in section two was drawn from a larger research study on the response practices of writing teachers. The options for the first question of section two, ‘what do you view as the goal(s) of responding to student writing? Please select your top 3.’ were generated from pilot data of the larger study. The pilot survey was from a collaborative-research project designed to understand the response practices of teachers. In the pilot survey, teachers were asked in an open-ended question, to list what they viewed as the goals of responding to student writing. To limit the number of open-ended question in the emotion and response survey, the results of the pilot survey question were coded in categories using the language of the survey participants. The categories were then used as the options for the closed questions on this study’s emotion survey.

In section three of the survey, the five open-ended questions were designed to allow teachers to reflect on the emotions they experienced while responding to student writing and included questions that would help answer the research questions. Writing teachers were asked: (1) What triggers your emotions while responding to student writing? (2) How do you deal with your emotions while responding to student writing? (3) What external factors influence your emotions while you are responding to student writing?
These questions were meant to generate additional data on what triggers teachers’ emotions and what teachers do with those emotions. Two additional narrative questions were also included in the survey: (1) Please describe a positive emotional experience with responding to student writing. (2) Please describe a negative emotional experience with responding to student writing. These narrative questions were meant to elicit data on the positive and negative emotions that are most evident in teachers’ minds. In addition to tabulating and cross-referencing closed question responses, open-ended responses were coded to provide the ways teachers perceive their emotional reactions. The open-ended responses were first coded by listing out all of the triggers, emotions, and actions teachers stated. Then, the triggers and emotions were grouped based on similarities. Finally, the grouped emotions were categorized based on the emotion codes used for the think-aloud protocols (discussed late in this chapter).

Also included in the survey was an 18-word emotional adjective checklist. The list of 18 emotions was drawn from the most frequently cited list of emotions within research on teachers’ emotions (Sutton & Wheatley, 2003). Participants were asked if they found themselves experiencing specific emotions while responding to student writing always, usually, rarely, and never. Sometimes was specifically left out of the likert scale to force participants to consider if they do or do not experience that particular emotion. Survey research also mentions that when a 5-point scale is offered, participants gravitate toward the middle option. My 4-point scale eliminated the middle option to force a choice from teachers.
The survey was distributed to the WPA-listserv in early March of 2011 and was available until April 1st. Writing teachers and administrators were asked to pass the survey along to teachers within their department. In addition, the survey was emailed out to faculty at one for-profit institution and two community college faculties to help acquire a diverse sample of teachers. Participants were not required to answer all of the survey questions, and participants could withdraw from the survey at any time. Before participants could begin the survey, they were informed of their rights through an IRB approved survey-consent form (Appendix B). While I cannot provide a count for the number of surveys sent out, 146 teachers completed the survey.

**Think-Aloud Protocols**

The second data source drew from think-aloud protocols, including pre-interviews and retrospective interviews immediately following the protocol session. In writing studies, think-aloud protocols have been used as a way to study the cognitive processes of individuals as they are engaged in activities (Smagorinsky, 1994, p. 3). Smagorinsky (1994) refers to think-alouds as a *human methodology* that “elicit[s] a sample of the thoughts that go through writers’ minds” (p. 16). Think-aloud protocols grew out of the field of cognitive psychology and can be performed concurrently, while the individual is preforming or completing the task, or retrospectively, after the individual has completed the task (Ericsson & Simon, 1980). Hayes and Flower (1983) offer two addition categories of concurrent verbal reports in their research: direct report and think aloud. Direct reports refer to when individuals only speak specific behaviors and think-aloud
protocols refer to when individuals vocalize every thought. Ericsson and Simon (1980) argue that think-aloud protocols “elicited with care and interpreted with full understanding of the circumstances under which they were obtained, are a valuable and thoroughly reliable source of information about cognitive processes” (p. 247). Within writing studies, think-aloud protocols have been receiving more support as a valid research method. Since think-aloud protocols capture the thoughts individuals experience when engaged in an activity, this study uses think-aloud protocols as a way to capture the emotional thoughts and expressions of teachers while they are reading and responding to student writing.

The early use of think-aloud protocols within writing studies was Flower and Hayes (1980) study on the composing processes of writers. With regard to reading, responding and judging student writing, Huot (1993) and later Pula and Huot (1993) used think-aloud protocols to understand if holistic scoring procedures influenced or modified the way that experienced and novice raters read and judged student writing. More recently, Edgington (2004) used think-aloud protocols to understand how teachers read and responded to student writing, and Wierszewski (2010) employed the think-aloud protocol method to understand the ways that teachers read and respond to multi-modal texts. Edgington (2004) argues that “protocol analysis is a valuable method of research that can uncover hidden processes, lead to increased knowledge on how one completes a task, and add new narratives to research on the processes of tasks such as writing, responding, grading, etc.” (p. 85).

For this study, I used data collected from teachers reading and responding to their
students’ texts, participating in “context-rich” think-aloud protocols, as did Edgington. The data collected from the teachers reading student writing (and commenting) aloud, provides a “vivid illustration of thought process” that will offer an understanding for “why people perform as they do” (Smagorinsky, 1994 p. 12). In addition to exploring how the teachers read the text (as suggested by Edgington), I provide a sense of the “lived [emotional] experiences” (Denzin, 1984) of teachers and the possible triggers of teachers’ emotions.

There are two additions to my study that make it unique to other think-aloud protocol studies done. The first unique feature to this study was the sampling procedure used to develop the sample matrix. A second unique facet to this dissertation includes analyzing prior think-aloud data for emotion. Reanalyzing previously collected think-aloud data, intended to answer a different research question, provided me with more opportunities to analyze ‘emotion in action’ in various contexts. Aside from having additional contexts to reanalyze data, using data from a prior study helped eliminate participants responding more emotionally than normal because they were informed of my interest in teachers’ emotions (through the informed consent documents). Previously collected data intended to answer a different research question had no prompt to respond more emotionally. After obtaining IRB approval, five participants from Edgington’s dissertation think-aloud data were incorporated into my sampling matrix.

**Sampling Matrix**

Because emotion is individual and culturally expressed, it was too presumptuous to
assume that one group of teachers would experience emotions more than another group. Additionally, as an exploratory study on the emotions that teachers experience, it is too early to assume a correlation between groups of teachers and emotions. Therefore, I opted for a diverse, stratified sample that included a range of criteria to account for the different experiences, locations, courses and assignments that help create the context of responding to student writing. Seven criteria were included in the sampling matrix (Figure 3): experience, course teaching, college, gender, ethnicity, education/professional development, and assignment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Course Teaching</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>2 semester</td>
<td>Comp 1</td>
<td>4 year</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>PhD 1st year Rhet/Comp student</td>
<td>narrative/diagnostic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brittney</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Comp 1</td>
<td>4 year</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>MA Literature paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>4 year</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>PhD Candidate: Literature</td>
<td>Peer-Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>FYC</td>
<td>4 year</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>PhD Candidate: Rhet/Comp</td>
<td>End-Portfolios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>FYC</td>
<td>4 year</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>PhD Student: Rhetorical Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>For-Profit</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>EdS</td>
<td>Final Exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Community College</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>MA Teaching 7-12 Language Arts</td>
<td>Narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDG</td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>14 years</td>
<td>intro writing</td>
<td>Community College</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>PhD Rhet/Comp</td>
<td>MA professional Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>15+ years</td>
<td>Grad-level</td>
<td>4 year</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>PhD ESL</td>
<td>Argument Essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDG</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>30 + years</td>
<td>FYC</td>
<td>4 year</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>MA Humanities</td>
<td>Argument Essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty</td>
<td>30+ years</td>
<td>FYC</td>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>MA English</td>
<td>Multi-Modal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Specifically, I was interested in recruiting teachers with a range of teaching experiences. My participants range from 0 years experience to 30+ years. While no study has indicated that novice teachers experience emotions more frequently than teachers with more experience, conversations with teachers and survey results indicated that experience could be a possible variable in teachers experiencing emotions.

The second important variable was the institution where the participant was teaching. Because education research on teachers’ emotions indicated institutional context as a factor, it was important to include teachers from 4 year institutions, 2 year institutions and for-profit institutions to account for the different contexts. Following the institution, I accounted for the different courses that teach writing and/or include a writing assignment. While half of my sample includes first-year composition courses, the other half of the sample includes basic writing, graduate-level course, an introduction to literature course, business writing and an online upper-division writing course.

While this sample does not account for every situation in which writing occurs within the classroom, it does provide a large snapshot of where writing is occurring within an English department. Even with half of the sample accounting for first-year writing courses, the particular assignments that teachers are reading and responding to are different. The assignment was an additional variable within the sample matrix, and included a range of assignments such as final exams, peer reviews, diagnostic essays, argumentative essays, portfolios and multi-modal assignments. Survey responses indicated that the type of assignment a teacher was responding to play a role in the emotions a teacher experienced. Another variable, education/professional background,
helped account for the various educational preparation teachers have for teaching writing. The sampling matrix included teachers with doctoral preparation or doctoral degrees in rhetoric and composition, literature and English as a Second Language. Other educational backgrounds included MA in teaching language arts, humanities, professional writing and literature as well as an educational specialists degree. The final two variables ethnicity and gender were equally distributed throughout the matrix. In addition to the range of variables, there were no two participants with similar features adding to the stratified and diverse sampling.

Edgington (2004) accounted for a diverse sample, but focused on fewer variables (race, education and teaching experience). Building upon Edgington’s study, I opted to include as many possible variables that could influence the emotions teachers experience. Since this study on teachers’ emotions is a first for the field of writing studies, I wanted to incorporate as many variables as possible to provide an accurate narrative and description of the emotions teachers experience when reading and responding to student writing. To help with the distribution I added a secondary source of previously collected think-aloud data from Edgington’s dissertation. In addition to adding to the diversity of the sample, it also adds a new dimension to research by re-coding data based on new research questions and holding qualitative data accountable for rigorous replicable studies. The Kent State University Institutional Review Board approved the addition of Edgington’s think-aloud data, the collected think-aloud protocols, and surveys.
Summary of Study Methods

As a way to understand the emotions teachers experience, the triggers of those emotions and teachers’ reactions to those emotions, this study uses survey and think-aloud protocol methods to explain how emotions function when teachers respond to student writing. These methods provide two data sources for answering the research questions. The survey was designed so teachers could report their emotions, triggers and reactions in open- and close-ended questions. The survey was broken into three sections (background information, instructor response practices, and emotions and response) and distributed on the WPA-listserv. The survey was also designed to gather date from a large sample of teachers.

In addition to the survey, twelve teachers consented to participate in think-aloud protocols. The data collected from the think-aloud protocols offers a way to analyze expressed emotions. Teachers were video and audio recorded while engaged in the act of reading and responding to student writing, providing data on the verbal and observable emotions of teachers. After the think-aloud protocols, teachers would also report on the emotions they recalled experiencing during their think-aloud protocol session. The participants for the think-aloud protocols represent a range of courses, assignments, teaching experience and institutions which account for many academic contexts where responding to student writing occurs. This study also incorporates previously collected think-aloud protocol data re-analyzed for emotional utterances. In the next section, I discuss at length the participants of this study. Following a discussion of the participants, I detail how the think-aloud protocol data was obtained and analyzed.
Participants

Seven participants were recruited from local universities (including community college and for profit institutions) to read and respond to writing their students were doing in the courses they were currently teaching. Five participants were added from Edgington’s dissertation. These participants are marked with a * at the end of their pseudonym (the same pseudonyms Edgington used in his study). In this section, I describe each participant in relation to the sample matrix as well as their goals for the response session they participated with during this study. All participants have been given pseudonyms.

Stephen

At the time of this study, Stephen was a doctoral candidate in English Literature. He had earned a Bachelor’s and Master’s degree in English Literature in India before coming to the United States to study, and is of Indian descent. Prior to starting his PhD program, Stephen had no teaching experience. During his first semester in the program he took a teach college writing course, and at the time he participated in the think-aloud protocol he was finishing up his 5th semester teaching. Stephen was teaching College Writing 2: the second course in the First-Year Composition at the public 4 year university. Aside from College Writing 2, he had also been teaching College Writing 1.

Stephen was responding to peer reviews his students had conducted on each other’s final essays for the course. When asked what his goals were for this particular response session, Stephen replied that he was interested in seeing “how effectively the students
Stephen provided the students with an “extensive set of guidelines and instructions” prior to completing the peer reviews. In addition to following directions, he was also interested in the quality of the students’ responses to their peers. In particular, he was looking to see if students commented on higher order concerns (such as organization, thesis statement and paragraph structure) as opposed to lower order concerns (such as grammatical issues). The peer reviews accounted for 5% of the students’ final grades, and students were to complete four peer reviews.

Since this was the end of the semester, Stephen commented that he had a good relationship with his class and “knew what they’re interested in … and their quirks their everything.” During the retrospective interview, Stephen commented that one struggle he had been having in the course was the various levels of writing skills his students had and that “its very difficult to kind of fine tune your pedagogy to meet everyone’s needs.”

Cole

Cole is a white male who had been teaching at a public 4 year university for the past 5 years. During the semester he participated in a think-aloud protocol, Cole was teaching College Writing 1 which was the first course in the writing program’s two course First-Year Composition program. In addition to teaching at the 4 year university, Cole had previous taught at a community college and a for-profit institution as well as a summer enrichment program for high school students. Aside from 5 years of experience, Cole was a doctoral candidate in Rhetoric and Composition and had bachelor’s and
master’s degrees in English literature.

Cole had also participated in a think-aloud session at the end of the semester, and was responding to his students’ final portfolios. His goals for this response session were to see evidence of revision based off of feedback that he had given them throughout the semester. He said that his goals are “primarily that … they can communicate effectively to an audience and that they can do that with a specific purpose in mind given the context of that genre of writing [he] is asking them to complete.” Within the portfolios, students had to include the four formal writing assignments, a few informal writing assignments, and a reflection of the course. In most instances, Cole had seen three of the four formal writing assignments and in a few portfolios he had seen all four. The reflection essay was the new writing that Cole had not previously read.

This particular class, Cole mentioned, had “done more revision than many other of my classes have” and he attributed that to “they are awesome.” Because he incorporated more in-class workshops and gave his students a two-notice of the revision deadline when he had previously only given a week’s notice, students did more revising before the portfolio. Cole felt that it showed throughout their portfolios as well.

**Brittney**

Brittney is an African-American female completing her first year of teaching. She was currently teaching College Writing 1 for the second time in her teaching career at a public 4-year university. Brittney was on a teaching appointment within the department as she was working on her Master’s degree in Literature. Her Bachelor’s degree is in
English, and prior to teaching she worked for two years as a writing tutor/coach at her undergraduate institution. She would meet weekly with students to help them develop their writing process from brainstorming to final products. She took a teaching college writing course the summer before her first semester teaching.

Brittney was responding to her students’ final eight page research papers at the end of her second semester teaching. For this assignment, which she also compared to a final exam, she was interested in seeing how students used the research and writing skills they had been developing throughout the semester. With the first three papers, students had the opportunity to revise their work, and they did not have the opportunity to revise with this final paper. Students were able to choose their own topic, and they had to incorporate academic research sources. Her goal for the course was to help students “develop the research and writing skills that they are going to use throughout their college careers and beyond. And, to get them comfortable using APA and MLA format and understanding what the written expectations are going to be for them.”

Brittney discussed during her interview that she struggled with personal aspect of responding and grading student writing. As a writing tutor, she could “just help students … and nurture them” without having to “judge them or critique them” and as a teacher she could not just do that part. She felt that she to also “evaluate critique ya know and give a grade” while being aware of the personal issues that her students were encountering.
Jessica

Jessica participated in a think-aloud protocol at the beginning of the semester. Specifically, Jessica was responding to her first set of student texts ever. She is a white female in her first year of a PhD program in Rhetoric and Composition at a 4 year public university. Jessica had just recently earned her Master’s degree in literature, and took a summer teaching college writing course at a 4 year institution so she could begin teaching her first semester in the program as a graduate teaching assistant. Jessica was teaching a College Writing 1 course, similar to the above participants – the first course in the program’s First-Year Composition two-course sequence.

She was responding to students’ narrative diagnostic essays. The assignment was non-graded, and was to be a three page long narrative on why they chose the university. Jessica’s goal for this assignment, and this response session, was to “get to know them as individuals and more importantly as writers.” Jessica was also interested in seeing if there were any specific grammatical or sentence-level issues that needed to be addressed later in the semester. Students were reading parts of a writing handbook, and Jessica hoped this assignment would help her see “specific real applications as a class” that could be incorporated into their handbook reading. As her first time responding to student writing, Jessica mentioned that she was going to place comments on the essays so students will be familiar with how she will comment and grade future writings. While she did not have specific plans on how she was going to respond, she knew that if she noticed a glaring issue [she] definitely want[ed] to comment on it so they know that they can choose to look it up themselves in the handbook or when we do work-
Susan

Susan is a white female with ten years teaching experience. At the time of this study, Susan was the department chair of general education at a nationally recognize for-profit institution. Her educational background included a Bachelor’s degree in English, a Master’s degree in Creative Writing and a doctoral specialist degree in Educational Leadership and Administration with a superintendent endorsement. Most recently, Susan had taught a fundamentals of English course and team taught composition 1. She had also been subbing for a teacher in an introduction to literature course. As the department chair, it is traditional practice for her to read, respond, and grade students’ work from other teachers. Because of the quick turn around of adjuncts, Susan is responsible for students’ completing the requirements for incompletes or making-up additional work. It should be noted that the quick turn around of adjuncts is partly due to the term lengths. Students take one course per month and English and other courses are only 4 weeks long.

For this particular response session, Susan was reading and responding to final exams for another teacher’s introduction to literature course. When asked what her goals were for this response session, she responded that she would follow the rubric that the teacher provided and if no rubric was provided she has “taught literature for 10 years so [she] would follow [her] own rubric. Goals are spelling, grammar, punctuation, content and organization.” Though Susan did not teach this particular section, because of the
small size of the institution and monthly course format, Susan was familiar with a number of the students. Even though these were not her students per se, Susan struggled with feeling personally responsible for students’ success and letting students take ownership for their success in writing. Susan also noted that while she did not have a rubric in front of her, her experiences teaching and reading student writing provided her with the knowledge to know that “its either an A paper a B paper or a C paper or someone just showed up and its an F.”

**Kim**

Kim is a white female community college instructor with ten years teaching experience. During the semester she participated in a think-aloud protocol, she was teaching a basic writing course called Language Fundamentals 1. The course was focused on helping students learn about academic discourse and the “conventions of Standard English grammar and punctuation.” While the course objectives focused clearly on Standard English conventions, Kim commented that she focused on higher order concerns and opens the course with a unit on language to help bridge students’ discourses with an academic discourse. Kim’s Master’s degree is in teaching with a focus on language arts for grades 7-12 and she was currently pursing a PhD in Rhetoric and Composition. In addition to teaching the first level of basic writing, Kim has also taught Language Fundamentals 2, College Composition 1 and 2 and worked as a writing tutor at the community college.

In her course, the students were working on a narrative essay where they write
about an experience they had with rudeness. In conjunction with their personal narrative, students were asked to use concepts and quotes from the text they were reading in class. Kim mentioned that class discussions had focused on how “rudeness is contextual and varies by situation and interpretation.” When Kim participated in her think aloud protocol, it was right after midterms and she was reading the first drafts of the rudeness narrative. One of Kim’s main goals for this essay was for students to understand how to provide context for their writing. When reading the student essays, Kim was hoping to see that students set up enough of the story that any reader could understand what was happening in the story. Continuing with the issue of context, Kim was also hoping that students use contextual cues when they reference the outside text. She wants to see that the students provide enough context for the quotes so that they are integrated well within the students’ narratives.

Kim mentioned that another goal for the narrative was to explain how a rude situation affected them. Since this is an assignment that Kim has taught in past semesters, she was aware of the pattern where students seem to leave out that aspect of prompt. Kim comments that at this stage of the students’ development, one larger goal is making sure that students understand what the assignment is and that students are addressing all parts of the prompt.

**Angela**

Angela is a white non-tenure track instruction at a public 4 year university. She has been teaching for more than 30 years, and her teaching experience began in the public
schools before she switched to college level teaching. Angela’s educational background includes a Bachelor’s degree in English and Speech with an educational license to teach K-12, and a Master’s degree in English. She was currently teaching a range of writing courses: College Writing 2 (online), business writing and Stretch (the equivalent of a College Writing 1 course taught in two semesters instead of one) and an upper-division Writing in the Public Sphere (online). For her think-aloud protocol, Angela was reading and responding to her students’ final multi-modal service-learning projects from her upper-division online section of Writing in the Public Sphere. Because this was an online course, Angela had not met any of her students. She had primarily been interacting with them through text on the university’s course management system, through she has had individual conferences with students either by phone, chat or email at one point during the semester.

In Angela’s online course, students devoted a large portion of the class to working on a service-learning project with the Big Brothers Big Sisters organization. Students were to create interactive learning activities for third graders that could be completed with their Big Brother or Sister. In conjunction with this project, students were asked to submit two components: a research document and a multi-modal project. The goals of the research document were to show that the work and information that students put into the multi-modal projects had grounding in what the experts were saying about their chosen topic. The multi-modal projects were to be at the appropriate level (third-grade), credible, and “fun” since the Big Brother Big Sister organization is an extracurricular activity for students and not school-based. Angela was responding to the final projects of the course.
She had previously seen and offered pages of feedback to make the multi-modal projects more appropriate for students. Another criteria that Angela was looking for in the students’ work was “making the ordinary extraordinary” so the audience would engage with the text.

Robert*

Robert is an Asian male who had been teaching for 3 years when he participated in a think-aloud protocol. At the time of the study with Edgington (2004), Robert was a graduate teaching assistant in a Rhetoric and Composition PhD program. In an interview with Edgington, Robert discussed his shift in his views of response. Prior to starting his graduate work, Robert considered response to be a “judgment” that teachers gave to students traditionally focusing on surface-level errors within the texts. After completing some graduate courses within the program, Robert began to view response as something to be tailored to individual students, and that an emphasis should be given to offering students positive feedback. Robert mentioned in his interview that one of his greatest struggles is balancing the number of responses by focusing on one or two areas; however, this is difficult for Robert since the student is not present. Robert mentioned that “I often spend time wondering what the student was thinking when he or she wrote” the paper.

Robert was teaching an English 101 course – the first writing course within the First-Year Composition’s program sequence. His course was dealing with issues of identity and cultural studies. At the think of the think-aloud, Robert was responding to the first drafts of his students’ rhetorical analyses that focused on controversial
advertisements. These analyses would eventually be worked into their portfolios.

**Tim***

Tim had been teaching for 6 years at the time of his think-aloud protocol with Edgington. He is a white male with a professional background of a Bachelor’s degree in English and Economics and a Master’s degree in Professional Writing. The majority of the courses Tim taught were professional writing courses, though he also has experience teaching first-year composition and introduction to literature courses. During Edgington’s study, Tim was teaching an advanced business-writing course at a 4 year institution. He was responding to his students’ final drafts of recommendation letters that students wrote about each other.

For Tim, responses should address higher-order concerns before dealing with lower-order concerns, and that “response should address not only the product, but also the student’s writing process.” In addition, responses to student writing should give students information that they can use to make their writing better. Tim mentioned, in his interview with Edgington, that he is concerned with over- or under-commenting on student texts, and that he may not give equal feedback to all students in the course.

**Dan***

At the time of Edgington’s study, Dan was a full-time instructor at a local community college with 14 years of teaching experience. He is an African-American male who was completing his dissertation in a PhD Rhetoric and Composition program
during the study. Dan attributed his view of response to derive from the notion that writing is “a culturally-based activity; thus, teachers need to be aware of how culture (both the teacher’s culture, the student’s culture, and the academic culture their interaction takes place in) affects how one reads.” Response for Dan, then, is reading a student’s paper. In particular, Dan responds to the higher-order concerns of the student’s text and makes suggestions for revision. One thing that Dan mentioned in his interview with Edgington is that he struggles with not seeing progress from students and wonder if he is offering ‘fair’ responses to those students.

Dan was teaching a basic or introductory writing course that “focused on student knowledge, offering students a chance to talk about and share what they know with each other.” In particular, he was responding to students’ mid-semester portfolios playing particular attention to the students’ memos. He had previous read the students’ work on technology and analyses on standardized testing. Students would be expected to continue to revise these documents for the end of semester portfolio.

**Donna**

Donna was another participant in Edgington’s dissertation study. She is a white female with 15 plus years teaching experience. She was, at the time of Edgington’s study, an Assistant Professor at a 4 year university. Her professional background included a Bachelor’s degree in Education, a Master’s degree in Linguistics and a PhD in English as a Second language. As a teacher, she had taught at nearly even level (elementary, secondary, and post-secondary). In her interview with Edgington, Donna referred to
response as “any feedback (not just textual) in her classroom (she included verbal and technical communication in her view of response).” Donna also distinguished between responding, evaluating and grading. While Donna was happy with the positive responses that she gave students, she struggled with finding the time to respond to the number of papers she had each semester.

During the study, Donna was teaching a graduate seminar course for future teachers. She was reading and responding to her education students’ literacy autobiographies. This course was comprised of graduate students and upper-level undergraduate students, and the topic of responses was a discussion the students and Donna has during class time. Donna had previously read drafts of this assignment and was grading the final drafts.

Betty*

Betty is a white female with more than 30 years of teaching experience. Her professional background included a Master’s degree in Theater Arts and Humanities. She was, at the time of the study, a full-time instructor at a 4 year university. For her think-aloud with Edgington, Betty was teaching an English 102 course (the second course in the First-Year writing program). The course was designed around the theme of students “writing about [their] expectations for living in this country,” and the US Constitution. Betty was responding to her students’ first drafts of their argumentative essay that was focused on the role government should have in today’s society.

In her interview with Edgington, Betty discussed how she aims for conversation
and dialogue with her responses to student writing. While Betty commented that she used to be a teacher who focused on surface-level errors, she now treats students’ work more holistically. Building a conversation about writing is important for Betty, and she meets her students on the page as well as asking students to meet each other on the page.

**Summary of think-aloud protocol participants**

The twelve think-aloud protocol participants of this study represent as wide a range as possible of contexts where responding to student writing occurs within an English department. The participants represent three different institutions: four-year colleges, community colleges and for-profit colleges. In addition to representing a range of courses, the participants also represent a range of teaching experience from no experience to thirty plus years of experience. The writing teachers are responding to different assignments they assigned within their courses. Each participant had varied response goals based on their course and where the writing was within the writing process. Some of the teachers were responding to final drafts of argumentative essays while other teachers were responding to first drafts or drafts to be placed in a portfolio at the end of the course. While there may be some overlap with first-year composition courses, no participant is identical to another with the criteria of the sampling matrix. The addition of Edgington’s think-aloud transcriptions did not only allow for a larger sampling population, but also offered the opportunity to analyze emotions from a study designed to look at the reading processes of writing teachers. In the next section, I discuss how I gathered data from these participants and then how I coded the data for an analysis of
Data Collection and Data Records

The data collected during this study included 1) survey responses; 2) video and audio recorded interviews, think-aloud protocols and retrospective interviews; 3) transcripts of interviews, think-aloud protocols and retrospective interviews; and 4) transcripts of think-aloud protocols and partial interview transcripts from Edgington’s dissertation. These four sources of data help to answer this study’s three research questions.

For the survey, data was collected online using SurveyMonkey. The survey was sent out on the WPA-listserv, and participants had from early March 2011 until April 1, 2011 to complete the survey. For think-aloud protocols, data was collected with a Sony digital voice recorder and a Flip digital video recording camera. The files were transferred to my personal computer and were also stored on a back-up external hard drive at my home office. Transcripts were labeled by participant number (i.e. participant 1, participant 2, etc.) and pseudonym. Both labels corresponded with the sample matrix. Transcripts were also stored digitally on my personal computer and backed-up on an external hard drive. Video files were viewed through the Mac program, iMovie and audio files were listened to through the Mac program iTunes and also ExpressScribe. In what follows, I examine how the think-aloud protocol data was collected from the participants. Following a discussion on the data collection, I discuss how the data was coded and analyzed.
Think-Aloud Protocols

Each participant recruited by me participated in a 45-minute think-aloud protocol. Since my sampling matrix specified different criteria teachers needed to meet, I recruited individual teachers that would fulfill a box within the sampling matrix. Teachers were recruited through email (a copy can be found in Appendix C). Initially, nine participants were asked to participate in the study. Two participants declined because they were uncomfortable with the idea of their think-aloud session being video and audio recorded. The other seven participants were willing to participate in a single video and audio recorded session. Three think-aloud protocol sessions at were recorded at the end of the Spring 2011 semester (Stephen, Brittney, Cole). One think-aloud protocol session occurred during the summer of 2011 (Susan). Another think-aloud protocol session was recorded at the beginning of the Fall 2011 semester (Jessica). One think-aloud protocol session occurred three-fourths the way through the Fall 2011 semester (Kim), and the final think-aloud protocol session was recorded at the end of the Fall 2011 semester (Angela). The other five think-aloud protocol transcripts were sent from Edgington halfway through the Fall 2011 semester. All of the data was collected by the end of the Fall 2011 semester (Figure 4).

Figure 4. Data Collection Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester/Point</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011 Semester (end)</td>
<td>Stephen, Brittney, Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2011</td>
<td>Susan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011 Semester (beginning)</td>
<td>Jessica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011 Semester (middle)</td>
<td>Edgington Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011 Semester (3/4ths point)</td>
<td>Kim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011 Semester (End)</td>
<td>Angela</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because my research questions focus on the emotions teachers experience while reading and responding to student writing, it was not necessary to ask teachers to respond to a specific number of assignments. There was no research that indicated that teachers experience more or less emotion if they responding to two papers or ten papers. Also, since each teacher was responding to different assignments of different lengths and genre, time was a more accurate level of consistency between the participants than number of assignments. A few participants went slightly longer to finish the paper or project they were responding to, but the majority of the teachers ended at the 45-minute mark.

Participants had the option to select where they would like the think-aloud protocol to take place (their on-campus office, my on-campus office, library, home offices or local coffee shops). Because I was interested in teachers’ emotions, I wanted the teachers to respond to student writing in a place they were comfortable and a place where they would typically respond to student writing. Four participants (Stephen, Angela, Cole and Susan) preferred to respond to student writing in their on-campus offices and their think-aloud protocols were recorded in their office. The other three participants (Jessica, Brittney and Kim) preferred to respond to their students’ texts in my on-campus office. They commented that they typically respond in their on-campus offices, but that their offices are loud and would be distracting.

After indicating where the participants wanted to conduct the think-aloud protocol, I asked the participants to select a time for the think-aloud protocol that was convenient for their schedule. Five think-aloud protocols occurred in the mid-morning and two think-aloud protocols occurred in the afternoon. The procedure for each think-aloud
protocol was the same, with one exception of myself being required to stay in the room due to building policy (discussed below further).

At the beginning of each session, I spent between three and five minutes talking with the participants without the recorders on. The purpose of this introduction time was to familiarize the participants with the study and myself. Also, during this time, I went over the informed consent forms (Appendix C) with the participants and explained the purpose and procedure of the study. The participants had two forms to sign (informed consent and video and audio consent) and were provided a copy for their records. While the participants were reading over and signing the consent forms, I set up the digital audio recorder and video recorder. Right before meeting the participant, I placed new batteries in the devices so there was no threat of the batteries dying mid-session. The video recorder was set up in the upper-most right hand corner of the desk. At this angle, the camera was able to capture the participants’ faces as well as the papers to account for the different actions the teachers may take. Also, the video recorder was then out of the teachers ways in case they needed to spread the papers out on the desk. The video camera was stabilized on a small tri-pod. The digital audio recorder was place closer to the participants, on the right hand side either right above the stack of papers or to the direct right of the computer. While both the video and audio recorder captured sound, I placed the digital audio recorder on the desk closer to the participant to record the voice nuances that may occur.

After I collected the signed consent forms from the participants, I turned on both recorders to begin the pre-interview. I asked the participants six questions (Appendix D).
These questions were focused on gathering background information on the participants and their response goals. The questions included the assignment they were responding to, the length of time teaching, their professional background/education, the course description, their most recently taught courses and their goals for response. These questions were meant to fill in the criteria of the sampling matrix as well as provide the contextual information necessary to understand the classroom environment that these responses to student writing take place within. The interviews tended to last around five minutes and were followed by me providing participants with directions for the think-aloud protocol and two practice think-aloud questions. I read aloud the directions to the participants:

During this response session, I am interested in what you are saying to yourself while you read and respond to these essays. To accomplish this, I will ask you to talk aloud as you read and responses to these pieces of writing. What I mean by talk aloud is that I want you to say out loud everything that you say to yourself silently. Just act as if you are talking to yourself. If you are silent for any length of time I will remind you to keep talking aloud. Do you understand what I want you to do?

Good. Before you begin to read and respond to these pieces of writing, I want you to answer a few questions while you talk about. First, I want you to talk aloud while you answer this problem 24 times 34.
Good. Now, find as many words as you can that rhyme with beef.

After the practice think-aloud questions, I confirmed with the participants that they understood to speak aloud while they were responding to their students’ texts and offered them an opportunity to ask any questions they may have (Ericsson & Simon, 1980). After the participants were ready to proceed, I left the office while the teachers spoke aloud. I sat outside the offices where I was able to still hear the participants talking in case they were to be silent for a long time and I could remind them to speak aloud. I sat outside the office for all but one participant. For Susan’s think-aloud protocol, I was required to stay within the room because of the building’s visitor policy. During the protocol, I sat off to the left hand side and did not speak or make eye contact with Susan. She commented in her retrospective interview that after the first paper she had forgotten that I was in the room.

After I left the offices, I noted the time on my watch or computer and calculated when 45-minutes would be over. When the 45-minutes were over, I reentered the office to immediately ask teachers specific questions (Appendix E) about the emotions they experienced. During this retrospective interview, I asked the participants eight questions. One question was concerned with the number of papers or projects the teacher responded to and the other seven questions were focused on probing the teachers to name the emotions they recalled experiencing immediately following their think-aloud protocol. While it is part of the think-aloud method to conduct the retrospective interview immediately following a protocol (Ericsson & Simon, 1980), a secondary reason for the
immediacy of the interview is the role of memory when researching emotions. Individuals are more likely to accurately recall and measure their emotional responses directly following a situation (drawing from their short term memory) than they are with time elapsed (Levine, Prohaska, Burgess, Rice, and Laulhere, 2001; Levine, Safer, and Lench, 2006).

Questions in the retrospective interview included asking teachers to name the emotions, to discuss the intensity of emotions at different points of the protocol, to discuss the change in emotions and if these emotions were typically experienced when they would respond to student writing. The retrospective interviews ranged in time from 15 minutes to 25 minutes. While I asked all participants the same eight questions, I also probed the participants to explain further the different emotions they mentioned they experienced or asked the participants for additional examples they would remember. After the retrospective interview was finished, I thanked the teachers for their participation in my study and turned off the video and audio recorders. I immediately uploaded the audio and video files to my computer, labeled the files by participant number and pseudonym, and backed up the files on my external hard drive. Once the files were secured on my computer and the external hard drive, I deleted the files from the video and audio recorders.

Edgington’s dissertation study followed similar procedures with a few modifications. Edgington met with each participant for a practice protocol session. I accounted for practicing by the two-sample question right before the protocol. Additionally, Edgington was not present when teachers started their think-aloud protocol
since a main focus of his study was the home (or location where they would normally respond) location of teachers. Thus, since I was present for the preparation and pre-interview, I did not need to do a practice session with the participants. Edgington asked his participants to speak-aloud for an hour while I only asked teachers to speak aloud for 45 minutes, because of participant fatigue with the addition of pre-interview, practice questions and post- interviews surrounding the protocol. The word counts for both Edgington and my data were within range of each other (Figure 5) (Counts refer to protocol data only. Interview counts were not included). Edgington also asked teachers to participate in a retrospective interview by asking teacher to vocalize their answers (to be recorded at home) to the questions provided in a sealed envelope. Edgington did not ask teachers specifically about their emotions, but did ask the participants questions about their relationship with the student to help account for the teacher-student relationship and classroom context.

Figure 5. Think-Aloud Protocol Counts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>4295 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole</td>
<td>2960 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brittney</td>
<td>2975 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>4944 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>5627 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna*</td>
<td>3592 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert*</td>
<td>1584 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty*</td>
<td>2355 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan*</td>
<td>2552 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim*</td>
<td>2952 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>4905 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>5146 words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total words: 43,887
Summary of Think-Aloud Protocol Data Collection

The purpose of the think-aloud protocols was to provide audio and video recorded data of teachers reading and responding to their current students’ writing. Writing teachers were recruited to represent a diverse, stratified sample of English department teachers who respond to student writing. After obtaining consent from the participants, they participated in pre-interviews, which were focused on their experiences and goals for response. Following the pre-interview and directions, writing teachers read and responded to student writing for 45-minutes. Immediately following the think-aloud protocol, teachers participated in a retrospective interview where I asked teachers about the emotions they experienced during the session. The pre-interview, think-aloud protocol, and retrospective interview were recorded with a digital voice recorder and video camera recorder. Aside from capturing the video and audio data, using two recorders helped account for capturing data in case one recorder would fail during the session since the video camera recorder also captured audio. Data was immediately transferred to my computer and backed-up on an external hard drive to be analyzed at a later point. In the next section, I review how I created the coding scheme to analyze the data.

Data Organization and Coding

All sources (survey responses, interviews, protocols, Edgington’s transcripts) were included in the data analysis. The pre-interview, think-aloud protocols, and retrospective interviews were transcribed from the audio recordings. I transcribed all of the data as
accurately as possible and included all of the participants’ fillers (um, hm, er) as well as the paralinguistic features (sighing, laughing). The pre-interviews were meant to provide context, while the retrospective interviews where teachers named emotions were meant to triangulate with the emotions expressed during the protocol. Survey data was also triangulated with the interview and protocol data to present a detailed emotional narrative of teachers reading student texts.

Protocols and interviews were transcribed using the program ExpressScribe for Mac. The transcripts were then transferred to a Word document and clustered by student texts. An extra space between paragraphs distinguished the ending of one project and the beginning of another student text. Transcripts were then printed for coding and analysis. The survey and think-aloud protocol data used the same emotion coding scheme, while the survey was coded differently for the triggers and actions. In the next three sections, I explain the emotion, trigger and action coding schemes.

**Emotion Coding**

Before coding the think-aloud protocol data, I read through all of the transcripts multiple times to mark potential utterances of emotions. Having transcribed the data from the audio recordings myself, I was already familiar with the data. I began by reading the transcripts completely for a deeper sense of the data gathered. The second time I read through the transcripts, I highlighted utterances of teachers self-stating their emotions: “I’m so excited,” “Wholly Cannoli,” or “I feel so sympathetic.” If teachers named a specific emotion in the text, I highlighted it. After I highlighted the self-stated emotional
utterances, I went through the transcripts to mark non-explicit emotional utterances.

During this second round of marking potential emotional utterances, I relied on contextual cues and emotion-based research to indicate if a teacher may be experiencing an emotion. I looked for utterances where teachers may be excited, happy, frustrated, confused, concerned and sad. Some examples of these emotional utterances include: “She’s awesome,” “Damn it am I ever going to remember their names?” and “Which isn’t incorrect, it is just I’m not put in a position of deciding whether or not to force her into the ‘author’ box.”

Because of the differences in emotional responses during the think-aloud protocols, I use the term utterance to account for single words, sentences and phrases. I used the contextual cues within the transcripts for indications of where the emotional utterance started and began, and followed up by listening to the audio recordings for pauses or other verbal indicators (intonation) of an emotional utterance beginning or ending. I also asked another writing researcher to code my data for interrater reliability.

After I indicated the potential emotional utterances, I moved to coding the utterances. Using Robert Plutchik’s (1991) circumplex, I coded the potential emotional utterances into the emotion categories of joy, sadness, trust, disgust, surprise, anticipation, anger and fear. Plutchik’s emotion circumplex accounts for emotional families (Plutchik’s term). With his model, the emotion families account for lower and higher intensities of emotions. For example, the emotion ‘joy’ also includes the emotions serenity and ecstasy. Using Plutchik’s theory allowed me to incorporate a wider range of emotions that were ground in emotion theory. Using emotion families helped to account
for multiple emotions within a single code. Additionally, because individuals may have different cultural definitions for emotions (happiness versus joy or anger versus frustration), using Plutchik’s emotion families helped eliminate individual interpretation of emotion terms and definitions.

When I started to code the think-aloud protocol data for emotions, I began with Plutchik’s list of emotion families and added three additional categories based off of the named emotions teachers had in their transcripts. Then, I dropped the emotion family fear, because there were no observable moments of fear within the transcripts. In the end, I had ten codes. The first seven codes are Plutchik’s and the last three are drawn from self-stated emotion utterances within the data (Figure 6). The listed code is the mid-level of intensity from Plutchik’s theory. The emotions listed in parentheses belong to the emotion family. After listing the emotions, I also include a short description of the code followed by a sample from the text. After developing this coding scheme for the think-aloud protocol data, I also applied it to the open-ended survey responses where teachers were asked to name their emotions and describe positive and negative experiences.
Table 6. Emotion Coding Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joy</strong></td>
<td>(serenity, ecstasy, happiness, delight, cheerfulness, elation, pleased)</td>
<td>The teacher expresses a positive feeling such as a liking or love for something within or in relation to the text. For example, “Her paper is very well written.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trust</strong></td>
<td>(acceptance, tolerance, admiration)</td>
<td>The teacher expresses satisfaction or gratification with something in or in relation to the text. For example, “Alright well that’s good.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surprise</strong></td>
<td>(distraction, amazement, uncertainty, astonishment)</td>
<td>The teacher expresses that something unexpected has affected her while reading student texts. For example, “You spelled angst correctly.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sadness</strong></td>
<td>(pensiveness, grief, sorrow, dejection, gloominess)</td>
<td>The teacher expresses that something within or in relation to the text is making her unhappy. For example, “I feel kinda bad about that.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disgust</strong></td>
<td>(dislike, boredom, loathing aversion, revulsion)</td>
<td>The teacher expresses disapproval or aversion toward something within or around the text. For example, “I’m also going to ask him why he did not include the interview that I suggested to him in terms of the video.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anger</strong></td>
<td>(annoyance, hostility, rage, furry)</td>
<td>The teacher expresses that a certain point or word in relation to the text has upset her and her inability to achieve something is upsetting her. For example, “It looks like a big fat fucking paragraph that I would love to read; however, because my head hurts we are going to give it a 25 out of 50.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anticipation</strong></td>
<td>(interest, vigilance, curiosity, expectancy, attentativness)</td>
<td>The teacher expresses emotion such as hope or looking toward something good happening within or in relation to the text. For example, “I’m looking forward to this.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disappointment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The teacher expresses a negative reaction or let down due to something within or in relation to the text. For example: “I gave this assignment like 6 weeks ago so that’s a little bit disheartening.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confusion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The teacher expresses uncertainty toward something within or in relation to the text. For example, “I don’t know that is really confusing.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concern</strong></td>
<td>(sympathy)</td>
<td>The teacher expresses that uncertainty about the future of the student and/or text is negativity affecting them. For example: “I feel so sympathetic because she’s told me some of the crazy things going on in her life.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After coding the emotional utterances based on the above codes, I moved to do another round of coding using the audio and video recordings. During this round of coding, I coded each already marked emotional utterance as either expressed (sigh, laugh, smile) or unexpressed (spoken only); positive or negative; explicit (named emotion) or implied (non-named emotion); and who or what the emotional utterance was directed toward (student, teacher/self, paper, teaching in general). Also during this round of coding, I marked all utterances that had a noticeable (what the ear could hear without specific linguistic training) shift in voice intonation. Because I did not have Edgington’s think-aloud recordings, the second round of coding for his transcripts only included explicit or implied and who or what the emotional utterance was directed toward.

**Trigger Coding**

Once I had the emotional utterances coded, I moved to code the potential emotional triggers. I started with Huot’s (1993) codes for what teachers responded to when participating in holistic scoring and then adjusted the categories as needed. Huot’s scheme included ten core categories that expanded into 63 possible codes. I removed three core code categories (1) series of actions (2) instructional, and (3) reading process since they were focused on the comments teachers made and I was interested in what triggered teachers to make such comments. I added additional codes to account for triggers, instead of comments made, within the core categories Huot established. Then, I added two core categories: grade and multi-modal. Multi-modal assignments were not a part of Huot’s study and therefore there were no codes to account for what teachers
respond to. My final trigger coding scheme looks as follows (Figure 7). I added the codes in italics. The triggers were coded from the text and were mentioned immediately before or after the emotional utterance.
Figure 7. Trigger Coding Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Content</strong> (Sophistication, Logic, Development, Redundancy, Challenges, Agrees, Shows Interest, Ideas, Asks for Information, Whole Paper, Wrong, Argument, Examples)</th>
<th>Something about the content of the paper triggers an emotion for the teacher.</th>
<th>For example, “I’m anticipating that there will be some good stuff here.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong> (Focus, Transitions, Introduction, Conclusion)</td>
<td>Something about the organization of the paper triggers an emotion for the teacher.</td>
<td>For example, “What the fuck are you even saying? Ok, conclusions. Ya you need to figure out conclusions.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tone</strong> (Audience, Personal, Attitude)</td>
<td>Something about the tone of the paper triggers an emotion for the teacher.</td>
<td>For example, “I don’t really like that kind of narrative quality.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style</strong> (Word Choice, Clarity, Awkward, Diction)</td>
<td>Something about the style of writing in the paper triggers an emotion for the teacher.</td>
<td>For example, “I would expect to see his title and then last name.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Print Code</strong> (Punctuation, Sentence, Spelling, Grammar)</td>
<td>A sentence level issue in the students’ text triggers an emotion for the teacher.</td>
<td>For example, “Seriously, how many exclamation points do you have? You don’t seem like whoo this chipper in class.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appearance</strong> (Comparing Essays, Length, Handwriting, Paragraphing, Format, Following Directions, Revision, Missing)</td>
<td>Something about the appearance or assignment triggers an emotion for the teacher.</td>
<td>For example, “I’m happy to see that at least the formatting part of MLA.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Comments</strong> (Indecision, Expectations, Non Evaluative Comment, Relationship with Student, Effort, Class or Prior Class)</td>
<td>An outside, yet related classroom or student factor, triggers an emotion for the teacher.</td>
<td>For example, “What concerns me is that he doesn’t seem to care. He turns in assignments late and did not come to seem me about from the mandatory conference meeting at all throughout the semester.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self</strong></td>
<td>A personal issue or self-reflection triggers an emotion for the teacher.</td>
<td>For example, “How do you fuckin’ spell chose? Damn it. I wish I could fuckin’ spell.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade</strong></td>
<td>Something relating to the assignments or students’ grade triggers an emotion for the teacher.</td>
<td>For example, “And we’re going to have an ‘A’ halli-fucking-ulia 95.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multi- Modal</strong> (Sound, Layout/Design, Audience, Interactive)</td>
<td>Something about the multi-modal assignment triggers an emotion for the teacher.</td>
<td>For example, “I’m trying to think about what’s the connection between the music and the slide and I’m not getting there.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the survey, I did not use the same trigger coding scheme as I did for the think-aloud protocols. While there was some overlapping between categories, with the survey I did a content category coding based on the response that teachers offered in the open-ended question of ‘what triggered your emotions?’ I read through all of the survey answers and then went question by question picking out the trigger (or triggers, as some questions listed two or more). I wanted to use the language of the teachers to accurately report the triggers that teachers were stating in their survey answers. I listed out all of the triggers that teachers reported in their survey responses and then categorized similar triggers together. I kept running tallies of each category as I was coding the survey responses. Since the trigger coding schemes varied depending on what survey question I was coding, I do not list out the entire coding schemes here. However, in Chapter 4 I refer to the survey trigger coding when reporting the results of the survey data.

**Action Coding**

Using the video recordings of the seven think-aloud protocols I collected, I coded the actions that took place immediately after the emotional utterance. Since I only had text transcripts of Edgington’s data, I was unable to code for observable actions. The actions were coded based on what I could see teachers doing. The actions were coded into the categories spoken, written comments, grading the texts, going back into the paper, and pausing.
Spoken: The actions coded as spoken were where the teachers did nothing in addition to verbalizing the emotional utterance. The teacher mentioned or expressed the emotions in their verbalized thoughts and it did not interfere with the teachers’ task at hand.

Written comments: The actions coded as written comments were when the teacher would speak the emotional utterance and immediately write a comment on the student’s paper.

Grading the text: The actions coded as grading the texts were when the teacher would speak the emotional utterance and immediately place a grade on the student’s paper. In addition to writing the grade, the teachers would also vocalize the grade separating it from the written comment category.

Going back into the paper: The actions coded as going back into the paper were when the teacher would speak the emotional utterance and return to either what they had just read in the paper, repeating it vocally, or returning to an earlier part of the paper looking for another example or reference in the student’s paper.

Pausing: The actions coded as pausing were when the teacher would speak the emotional utterance and then have silence for three seconds or longer. In addition to the silence, the teacher would not be looking directly at the paper (which could have been seen as continuing to read), but instead would be an observable moment of thinking, reflecting,
or just pausing.

For the survey, I did not use this action coding scheme. While there was some overlapping between categories, for the survey I did a content category coding based on the responses teachers offered in the open-ended question of ‘how do you deal with your emotions?’ The results of this survey question was much more in-depth and teachers offered a number of actions well beyond the actions teachers took during the think-aloud protocols. I read through all of the survey answers and then went question by question picking out the action (or actions, as some questions listed two or more). I wanted to use the language of the teachers to accurately report the actions that teachers were stating in their survey answers. I kept running tallies of each category as I was coding the survey responses. Additionally, in some survey responses teachers would report if their actions were based on a positive emotion, general emotion, or negative emotion. After coding the questions for actions in aggregate, I coded the actions into the larger categories positive, general and negative based on the emotions the teachers named in the survey response. Since the action coding schemes varied depending on what survey question I was coding, I do not list out the entire coding schemes here. However, in Chapter 4 I refer to the survey action coding when reporting the results of the survey data.

**Interrater Reliability**

As the primary researcher, I did all of the coding. When the coding was completed, I compiled a 10% sample of the texts for a second individual to code. The individual
selected was a PhD candidate who was also working on a dissertation in response. He was familiar with the methods used for this study and had experience coding data. Because I coded 820 emotional utterances, I provided my inter-rater with 84 emotional utterances. The 84 emotional utterances compiled included 7 emotional utterances from the 12 transcripts. I selected every fourth emotional utterance to keep a randomized sample for the second coder. My interrater coded for emotion and the core trigger categories. We had an 82% agreement rate for the emotion codes and a 71% agreement rate for the trigger codes.

**Summary of Emotion, Trigger and Action Coding**

Using Plutchik’s (1991) emotion circumplex, I developed an emotion coding scheme to be used for the survey and think-aloud protocol data. The emotion coding scheme included 10 emotion codes that represented a wider range of emotions because of Plutchik’s understanding of emotion families. The adaption of emotion families also helped to account for individualize varying definitions of emotion terminology. After using the ten emotion codes, I coded the think-aloud protocol transcripts, using the audio files, a second time for expressed or unexpressed emotions, positive or negative, explicit or implicit and where or what the emotion was direct toward.

Following the emotion coding, I used the same emotional utterances to code for what triggered the emotional utterance. Using a modified version of Huot’s (1993) coding scheme, I used the text immediately following or preceding the emotional utterance to code for triggers. I moved from working with the text transcripts to the video
transcripts for the third round of coding, actions. Five codes were devised to account for the different observable actions teachers did after experiencing emotions when reading and responding to student writing. For the survey, the trigger and action coding schemes were created using the language of the teachers’ responses. After listing out all of the triggers or actions, the list was collapsed by putting similar actions or triggers into one category. These three coding schemes help to answer the three research questions of this dissertation study. The results of the coding schemes will be revealed in Chapter 4.

Conclusion

Using surveys and think-aloud protocol methods, this study answers three research questions: (1) What emotions do teachers express verbally and nonverbally during audio and video recordings of think-aloud protocols?; (2) What triggers teachers’ emotions?; and (3) What, if any, actions do teachers make in response to the emotions that emerge when they are reading and responding to student writing? Both methods provide different data sources to answer the three research questions. The survey provides data on teachers reporting the emotions they recall experiencing and what they believe their emotional triggers are. The survey also asks teachers to report on how they respond to their emotions. Aside from teachers reporting their emotions, the think-aloud protocols allow for additional data on teachers expressing their emotions while reading and responding to student writing. These two methods provide different data sources allowing for a fuller picture on the emotional lives of teachers when they are reading and responding to student writing.
For the think-aloud protocols, a stratified, diversified sample of teachers accounts for a range of contexts where teachers read student writing and helps to represent a larger view of the emotions teachers experience since there are many variables. An emotional coding scheme was developed from Plutchik’s theory of emotions and the self-stated emotions of teachers during the think-aloud protocols. The emotion coding scheme provides a list of what emotions teachers experience while responding to student writing and was used for the survey and think-aloud protocols data. A second coding scheme was used to code the emotional triggers while teachers were reading and responding to student texts. Finally, a third coding scheme was developed to account for the different actions teachers took after their emotional utterances. Individualized trigger and action coding schemes were developed for the open-ended survey questions. These codes will be presented in the next chapter while discussing the results. In Chapter 4, I provide an analysis of the emotion, trigger, and coding schemes organized around the research questions, as well as presenting emotional reading profiles for four participants.
“That’s the reason grading is so emotionally exhausting. At the end of the day you feel like ‘what happened today’ ... It’s very funny, because all that you’ve been doing is sitting in front of your laptop reading a bunch of papers. There’s no reason you should feel such a physical sense of exhaustion at the end of the day.” (Stephen)

Introduction

After completing his think-aloud protocol, Stephen spent part of his retrospective interview trying to explain how grading, for him, is emotionally draining. His connection to his students and his desire to be a good teacher for his students weighs on his mind as he reads, responds to, and grades his students’ work. He late referred to response as a “manic depressive roller-coaster.” What seems to be the case for many teachers, and in particular Stephen, is when students have successfully learned and demonstrated that learning in writing, teachers feel happy. But, as Stephen as mentions, “there are these others that don’t learn anything and maybe I’m not that good of a teacher as I think.” The emotional act of teacher response is, as Stephen suggests, connected to a teacher’s sense of identity.
This chapter focuses on the results and analysis of the survey and think-aloud protocol data as it pertains to answering the research questions. Using survey and think-aloud protocol data, I argue that reading and responding to student writing is an emotional activity for teachers and that that emotional nature of response helps shapes teachers’ actions. Additionally, as Stephen’s retrospective interview suggests, I argue that the emotions teachers experience while reading, responding, and grading student writing connects to teachers’ senses of identity. Demonstrating the connections between teachers’ emotions and their reading of student texts, I use Damasio’s emotion episode framework to delineate teachers’ emotions, triggers, and actions. I modify Damasio’s emotional episode to account for teachers’ values in writing and develop an emotional experience framework for teachers.

This chapter is organized around the two data sources which are then brought together to answer the research questions: (1) What emotions do teachers express verbally and nonverbally during audio and video recordings of think-aloud protocols?; (2) What triggers teachers’ emotions and what do teachers do with the emotions that emerge when they are reading and responding to student writing?; and, (3) What, if any, actions do teachers make in response to the emotions that emerge when they are reading and responding to student writing? Beginning with the survey data, I discuss the results of the emotions teachers experience, the triggers of those emotions, and the actions teachers make based on their emotions. Before presenting the results of the think-aloud protocols, I offer a limited discussion on the survey data to introduce my overall arguments. Following an overview of the results of the think-aloud emotion, trigger and
action data, I discuss how the survey and think-aloud data supports an argument on teachers’ emotional experiences. My data analysis demonstrates a connection between teachers’ emotions and their values in writing. This chapter presents four case studies representing the most frequently experienced emotions overall and for individual teachers. The case studies feature a holistic discussion of teachers’ emotional experiences and the relationships between identity, values and emotions as indicated by the data.

**Survey Data Results**

Of the 146 writing teachers who started the emotion and response survey sent over the WPA-listserv, a range of 120-146 writing teachers answered different questions. Teachers were not required to respond to every question and could select ones they wanted to answer or opt out of the survey at any point. Closed questions tended to have the most responses while open-ended questions were responded to less frequently. A copy of the survey can be found in Appendix A. Of the writing teachers who began the survey, 82.9% (121 respondents) were female and 15.8% (23 respondents) male. Writing teachers represented a range of teaching institutions (Figure 8) including 66% (95 respondents) from 4 year public universities, 16.7% (24 respondents) from 4 year private universities, 24.3% (35 respondents) from public community colleges, and 5.6% (8 respondents) from for-profit. In terms of teaching experience (Figure 9), 23.3% (34 respondents) had 0-5 years experience, 30.1% (44 respondents) had 6-10 years experience, 21.2% (31 respondents) had 11-15 years experience, 8.2% (12 respondents)
had 16-20 years experience and 17.1% (25 respondents) had more than 21 years experience.

Figure 8. Teaching Institutions (Survey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Representation (survey)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Year Public Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Community Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Year Private Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For-Profit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9. Teaching Experience (Survey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Experience Representation (survey)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 Years Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 Years Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 Years Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Than 21 Years Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Emotions Results (Survey)

To answer the research question on what emotions teachers experience when reading and responding to student writing, five survey questions asked writing teachers about their emotions. According to 134 teachers who responded to the survey question, “Do you experience emotions while responding to student writing?” 96.3% of teachers responded yes. Immediately following that question, 133 teachers responded to the question, “Do you notice your emotional reactions while responding to student writing?”
97% of teachers responded yes. Teachers self-report that they are aware of emotions while reading and responding to student texts. Later survey questions were geared toward having teachers name specific emotions they experience while reading and responding to student writing.

In order to detail the emotional experiences of teachers, writing teachers named specific emotions in a few open and closed ended questions: (1) Please describe a positive emotional experience with responding to student writing, (2) Please describe a negative emotional experience with responding to student writing, and (3) an adjective emotional checklist where teachers were asked to indicate if they never, rarely, usually or always experienced a particular emotion. The emotions teachers stated in their answers to the open-ended questions were coded using the same emotional scheme developed for the think-aloud protocol data (described in Chapter 3). 107 teachers responded to the open-ended question of describing a positive emotional experience. 78 responses specifically named emotions in their answers while 29 responses did not. The positive emotions teachers self-stated (Figure 10) included joy (55 responses), anticipation (11 responses), surprise (5 responses), trust (4 responses), and personal (3 responses).

---

3 During the survey, a number of participants requested a “sometimes” category indicating rarely and usually were too binary. As a beginning study, I was more interested in knowing the extreme frequency of emotions experience and purposely left out a middle, fifth choice option.
Joy was the highest reported emotion with 55 teachers stating they experience joy or happiness when reading student writing. One teacher states “99% of the time, I'm impressed and very happy that my students have put so much time, effort and thought into their work. They usually exceed my expectations which always makes me proud.”

This comment and the following comment are representative of the 55 joy responses. Another teacher tells the story: “Just this weekend, I read a revision from a student who had turned a less-than-mediocre draft into a powerful and thoughtful argument. I was proud and happy that he has learned so much and applied it so quickly.” In both of these examples, the teachers specifically name the emotions they experience while also naming the trigger of those emotions (perceived effort and revision) to be further explored later in this chapter. Teachers reported having an awareness of their emotions and the context in which these emotions occur.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive emotions self-reported through survey data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>out of 78 responses naming emotions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“YES!!! I do a mental <em>happy dance</em>”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I looked forward to going back to class to continue discussing his project”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Papers that surprise me”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I am always satisfied to see students put into practice concepts that they struggled with when they first encountered them.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“When students really understand and demonstrate whatever student learning outcomes the assignment/course focuses on, I feel really effective as a teacher.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the 107 answers to the negative emotional experience (Figure 11), 76 teachers named the negative emotions they recall experiencing while 31 do not. The most frequently mentioned negative emotion was anger (46 responses). Disappointment was name 15 times, personal negative emotions 10 times, surprise and sadness were each named 2 times and disgust was name once.

Figure 11. Negative self-reported emotions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative emotions self-reported through survey data</th>
<th>out of 78 responses naming emotions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I feel frustration when a student either completely misunderstands the assignment or I can tell the project has been half-assed.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointment</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I feel very disappointed because I’d rather a student ask for help than take the easy way out.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal negative emotions</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Sometimes it is hard not to feel defeated when I learn that a student has had very negative experiences with writing instruction.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I once has a student describe in a paper when he lost his virginity. I was shocked.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I once read an essay where a student wrote about the murder of her family. I was so upset after reading this detailed account that all I wanted to do was hug my own family.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While each response to anger derived from a different trigger, these following examples are representative of the 46 answers where teachers referenced feeling frustrated or angry. These excerpts illustrate the possible triggers for teachers’ anger and demonstrate the different expectations that teachers have when they are reading student writing. The emotion, anger, is triggered when an expectation is violated. The different
triggers represent the various expectations that teachers have when they are reading and responding to student writing. In this first example, the teacher expects to have a thesis sentence.

Frustration occurs when I can't find a thesis statement or when the work is simply so poorly constructed because it is clearly written right before the paper is due. So much potential dreams of being realized, but because the student didn't/wouldn't put forth the effort, I'm stuck reading ick.

And, another teacher references anger when his or her expectation for audience awareness and integration of research does not appear within the student writing.

This weekend, I was extremely angry with a set of upper division technical writing students who turned in formal reports that did not address audience effectively or incorporate reliable primary and secondary research, two elements we had spent a very long time discussing and practicing using in class.

Finally, a teacher describes an incident where he or she becomes angry when a student is arrogant in his writing.

I also recently read a paper by a student who wrote a paper that defied every principle, concept, and technique we discussed in class and did so in a somewhat arrogant manner. In his cover letter to his project, he wrote that he felt (based on peer review sessions) that he understands the readings and assignments better than his peers. He went on to write a paper that was scattered, superficially analytical, and focused on an
outside theory rather than his primary data. I found myself getting angry because he seemed critical of his peers at the same time that he completely missed the point of the assignment.

In addition to having the opportunity to tell their stories, teachers were able to report the frequency of experienced emotions with the emotional adjective checklist. The original checklist had 18 emotions for teachers to select the frequency of occurrence. The 18 emotions were drawn from the frequently cited emotions in teacher education research (see Sutton and Wheatly’s (2003) literature review). At the time of the survey, it seemed relevant to make a connection between published literature on the named emotions that K-12 teachers experienced in the classroom and my study on the possible emotions that college teachers experience. There was no study on college writing teachers named emotions or emotions teachers experience when reading and responding to student writing. After the survey was distributed, I became aware of Plutchik’s (1991) emotion framework that was used for coding the think-aloud protocols. To keep consistent with the think-aloud protocol and open-ended survey questions coding scheme (for triangulation purposes), the 18 listed emotions were collapsed into 8 categories. Figure 12 presents the results of teachers reporting how frequently they recalled experiencing different emotions while reading and responding to student writing.
Teachers reported that 73% of the time they either always or usually experience joy while reading and responding to student writing. Surprise is the most frequently referenced emotion, with 82% of teachers’ responses indicating that they are surprised always or usually when reading and responding to student writing. Surprise can be considered a positive and a negative emotion since teachers could be surprised in a positive or negative manner. Though anger was the most referenced negative emotion in the open-ended survey responses, teachers indicated in the emotion check list that they only always or usually experience anger 40% of the time spent reading and responding to student writing.

Teachers indicated, through survey data, that they experience emotions while reading and responding to student writing. Teachers were able to name the emotions they recall experience while reading student texts, and the frequency of occurrence. The most frequently referenced positive emotion was Joy, and the most frequently referenced negative emotion was Anger. Aside from asking teachers if and what emotions they experienced while reading student writing, the survey also asked teachers what triggered...
those emotions, and what actions occurred after the emotions (answering the second and third research question). The answers to these questions help to build an argument for why emotions and triggers are important to understand. In the next section, I review the results from those questions.

**Trigger Results (Survey)**

Teachers were asked in the survey to self-state what triggered their emotions when reading and responding to student writing. Teachers were able to list their triggers in the open-ended question: What triggers your emotions when responding to student writing? Teachers also tended to reference emotional triggers when they were responding to the open-ended negative and positive emotional experience questions. In general, for the open-ended trigger question, teachers reported that their emotions were triggered by students’ content and ideas. 126 teachers responded to the open-ended question of what triggers their emotions and 60 references were made to content and ideas. Following student content, the next three most frequently mentioned triggers were of equal rank, 20 instances each: students not following directions, students’ improvement, and students’ perceived effort. The final most frequently referenced trigger was error with 19 references to it. However, when teachers mentioned triggers during their narrative stories of positive and negative emotions in the open-ended questions, content and ideas were not at the top of the list.

---

4 Teachers typically listed multiple triggers in their answers and thus the response numbers do not add up to 126. Answers were coded multiple times based on the number of triggers listed.
In response to the positive emotional experience question, teachers reported that emotions were triggered by students’ improvement (21 instances), students showing evidence of development or critical thinking (20 instances), and students “getting it” or breakthrough (18 instances). Teachers reported a sense of pride or happiness when they would see improvement in student writing and when they saw evidence of students developing their ideas and thinking on particular subjects. Writing teachers also referenced the “breakthrough” moment as a positive emotional trigger and would get excited to see the students’ success. Teachers reported that negative emotions were triggered by students not meeting expectations or not following directions (20 instances), students’ lack of effort (14 instances), and students not revising (13 instances). In particular, teachers referenced being frustrated with students who, after meeting with them, would choose not to revise. Teachers also reported that they were annoyed when students did not meet the minimum expectations of the assignment or ignored the assignment sheet. Figure 13 lists the triggers for each open-ended survey question (positive, negative and specific trigger).
Teachers indicated through survey responses what triggered the emotions they reported experiencing while reading and responding to student texts. The most frequently mentioned trigger in the open-ended trigger question was content and ideas (60 instances). For the positive emotion triggers, student improvement (21 instances) was the most frequently mentioned trigger while students not meeting expectations or following directions (20 instances) was the most frequently reported negative emotional trigger. In the next section, I report on the results of the third research question on what actions teachers make based on the emotions they report they experience.

**Action Results (Survey)**

To answer the final research question based on survey data, teachers were asked to answer the question how do you deal with the emotions you experience. The survey question did not ask teachers specifically about positive or negative emotional actions, but some teachers reported their actions based on if the emotion was positive (21
responses) or negative (55 responses), and others reported general emotion actions (86 responses) (Figure 14). Teachers reported that with positive emotions they are more likely to share their emotions with students through a written comment or verbal announcement in class (81% of responses). With negative emotions though, teachers reported taking a break from responding to papers (43.6% of responses) or a break to reread and revise comments (14.5% of responses). Other ways teachers dealt with their negative emotions was by talking with colleagues, friends or family (16.3% of responses) and working out (7.2% of responses). The actions teachers reported without referring to positive or negative emotions included teachers admitting to experiencing emotions (16.2% of responses), sharing with students through written comments (16.2% of responses), reflecting on the emotions (16.2%), and talking with colleagues, friends or family (10.4% of responses).

Figure 14. Emotions and Actions of Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Emotion Actions</th>
<th>Negative Emotion Actions</th>
<th>General Emotion Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share with students through comments (81%)</td>
<td>Taking a break (43.6%)</td>
<td>Admit and experience emotions (16.2% of responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reread and revise comments (14.5%)</td>
<td>Share with students through written comments (16.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talk with colleagues, friends or family (16.3%)</td>
<td>Reflect on emotions (16.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work out (7.2%)</td>
<td>Talk with colleagues, friends or family (10.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The actions teachers reported in the survey influenced their response practices. For some teachers, the emotions they experience when reading student writing resulted in
a written or verbal comment to students. In the below excerpt, the teacher reports on sharing his or her emotions to students through written or verbal comments:

If I get excited, I allow my excitement to emerge through my responses. I will even sometimes insert emoticons in my response. If I get frustrated, I reread my responses and try to delete any comments that come across as harshly critical or non-helpful (e.g., a comment that tells the student about his/her weaknesses without providing suggestions for improvement or revision).

This excerpt was representative of the 30 responses coded as written or verbal comments (18.5% of all responses). In this example, the teacher reports an awareness of how the emotions he or she experiences when reading student writing translates into feedback for students.

Not all teachers had the same awareness of using their emotions to provide feedback to students. For a few teachers (2%), who are more focused on completing the task of responding to student writing, emotions can break their trance.

I tend not to be overly emotional when responding to student writing. I am trying to be fast and effective, so my brain is very busy putting pieces together, analyzing, and figuring out the best choice of words to write on the paper. Humor or a strong narrative can pull me out of "teacher mode" and make me laugh and react positively.

While the teacher in the previous example reported emotions being a component of his or her feedback, the teacher in the above example reports emotions as more of a distraction
that hinders his or her ability to quickly respond to student writing.

Another small group of teachers (6%) were explicit in stating that the emotions they experience had no bearing on their response practices and would make comments such as “My emotions do not alter my ability to fairly and accurately assess assignments.” Or “I still grade objectively, and I usually put a note in the margin that says something like, ‘I agree,’ or ‘That made me giggle,’ or ‘I've been there, too.’”

The actions teachers reported differed between if they experienced positive or negative emotions when they were reading and responding to student writing. The emotions that teachers experienced when reading student writing influenced the response practices of teachers. Some teachers’ actions were to place comments on student texts (81% of responses), while other teachers reacted by taking a break (14.5% of responses) or discussing with colleagues (16.3% of responses). In addition to naming their emotions and triggers, teachers reported the various ways they dealt with the emotions they experienced. In the next section, I discuss the results of the survey.

**Discussion of Survey Data**

The survey data confirms my argument that the act of reading and responding to student texts is an emotional activity for teachers. Teachers reported what emotions they experienced, what triggered those emotions and how they acted based on their emotions. These three components work together to create a framework for understanding what an emotional episode is for teachers when they are reading and responding to student writing. This emotional episode framework is based on Damasio’s emotional episode and
is organized around the relationships between the trigger, emotion and response (Figure 15). Since the top two most experienced emotions are joy and anger, I have focused the chart on teachers’ top action of each emotion.

Figure 15. Teachers’ Emotional Episodes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trigger</th>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Joy</td>
<td>Comment “Wow! This is really interesting. I'd like to learn more about this”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>I reread my responses and try to delete any comments that come across as harshly critical or non-helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Paper</td>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>“If my emotional response is one of frustration or even anger, I try to determine why the student wrote/acted as she or he did. Was it my teaching that was inadequate? Was the student simply not pulling her or his weight? Were the outside factors (like a job, family commitments, etc.) that interfered with the time the student might have put into the project?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Joy</td>
<td>Comment: “I write something short in the margins - wow or that's great - thank you!”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As I began to create an inventory of emotional triggers and actions, based on these survey responses (Figure 16), I started to consider the connection between the triggers and what teachers value in writing (a point I explore further in the next section when discussing think-aloud protocol data). The triggers listed seemed to represent what teachers were expecting or hoping to see in student writing. If the trigger was missing from the piece of writing or if it violated the teacher’s expectation, a negative emotion emerged. If the trigger was evident in the piece of writing or if it exceeded a teacher’s expectation, a positive emotion emerged. At this point, I also began to think about the personal emotions, such as feeling proud, as a possible connection to a teacherly identity as Zemblyas (2003) would suggest.

Figure 16. Triggers and Emotions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trigger</th>
<th>Emotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No thesis/organization</td>
<td>Anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class principles</td>
<td>Anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrogant response (content)</td>
<td>Anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived effort</td>
<td>Joy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeded expectations</td>
<td>Proud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>Joy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of learning</td>
<td>Proud</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the next few pages, I would like to offer two examples of how I see the relationship between teachers’ values in writing and the triggers of their emotions. In this first example on a positive emotion, joy, the teacher reports that he or she experiences joy when a student has demonstrated learning: “Just this weekend, I read a revision from a student who had turned a less-than-mediocre draft into a powerful and thoughtful
argument. I was proud and happy that he has learned so much and applied it so quickly.”

This survey response is representative of the 55 responses coded as joy because of the teacher naming ‘happiness’ in the response. (It was additionally coded a second time for proud as a named emotion.) This example indicates that the teacher values revisions (especially when it results in a strong argumentative essay) in the classroom and experiences emotion when a student confirms that value. While I do not have data that indicates this particular teacher would experience a negative emotion when students do not revise, 10.5% of teachers (who answered the question ‘what triggers your emotions?’) reported negative emotions when students chose not to revise. The ways that these teachers define revision may vary and I do not have the information to define what these teachers mean by revision. But, the teachers are reporting their values and expectations in their survey responses and the triggers of their emotions may be what they value in writing. It also seems plausible that what teachers value in student writing triggers both positive and negative emotions depending on if the student writing confirms or denies teachers’ values. Also in this example, I am led to believe that the emotions that teachers experience when they read and respond to student texts either validates or challenges their identity. This teacher’s identity is validated as a successful teacher because the student was able to demonstrate learning, based on the teacher’s comments.

In the second example, below, anger was triggered by student resistance and challenged the teacher’s identity as a successful teacher. This survey response was representative of the 46 responses coded as anger.

Student resisted engaging the viewpoint of positions contrary to his own
through multiple stages (proposal, drafts) despite my comments asking him to engage those views. Instead, he continued to assume that his position was correct and could/would not consider contrary views. If I had to describe one emotion to associate with this experience it would be moderate-to-severe frustration.

In this example, the teacher reports experiencing frustration triggered by the student’s decision to ignore the teacher’s suggestions. It seems that the teacher values critical thinking (also a top positive emotional trigger), based on asking the student to consider other views, and is trying to engage the student in critical thinking. Since the student did not consider the teacher’s advice to consider other viewpoints, the teacher’s identity as a successful educator who promotes critical thinking in the classroom was challenged and the teacher experienced a negative emotion.

While these are two limited examples on how the emotions teachers experience are potentially triggered by what teachers value in writing or what teachers are expecting to see in student writing, it is the beginning of an argument that the triggers are representative of teachers’ values and expectations in student writing. I continue to develop this argument when discussing the think-aloud protocol data. Furthermore, an analysis of the survey data helped to create a second argument that the emotions teachers experience can influence their identity in the classroom. I also explore that point further in my discussion and analysis of the think-aloud protocol data where I have more contextual information from the participants. The survey data is limited based on the focused nature of the questions to respond to the dissertation’s research questions.
Summary of Survey Data

Throughout the survey, teachers reported experiencing various positive and negative emotions (with joy and anger as the top emotion respectively). Teachers also reported triggers of their emotions, supporting the claim that teachers experience emotions while reading and responding to student writing. Teachers also reported an awareness of their emotions and while they may not always respond to those emotions, 96.3% of teachers who took the survey admitted to experiencing emotions when reading and responding to student writing. Joy was the most frequently reported positive emotion and was triggered by students improving, students showing evidence of developed critical thinking and students “getting it” or breakthroughs. Anger was the most frequently reported negative emotion, and was triggered by students not meeting expectations or following directions, students’ lack of effort and students not revising. It seems as though the emotions that teachers experience are triggered by what teachers value in student writing. Survey data can be used to form a preliminary hypothesis that teachers’ emotions are connected to how they perceive of their identity. The emotions teachers experience can either confirm or deny their identities as successful educators in the classroom.

The survey data also led to the forming of a framework on the emotions teachers experience while reading and responding to student writing. The framework includes three steps of Damasio’s emotional episode (trigger, emotion, action). A fourth category will be added during the discussion of the case studies that accounts for teachers’ values in writing. The emotions teachers experience while they read student writing influences
the ways teachers are characterizing their response practices. The survey data supported an argument that what triggers teachers’ emotions when reading student writing are what teachers value in student writing or what teachers expect in student writing. Reading and responding to student writing is an emotional activity for teachers and influences the response practices of teachers.

Not only are teachers reporting self-awareness of their emotions, as evident in the survey, but also while teachers are engaged in the act of reading and responding to student writing their emotions are observable and occur in their spoken thoughts. In the next section, I discuss the results of the think-aloud data followed by an analysis of the data. I use the think-aloud data to answer the research questions and further develop the arguments started in this section.

**Think-Aloud Data**

While the survey demonstrates teachers’ reports about their emotions, the think-aloud protocols help in observing teachers’ emotions while they read and respond to student writing. Twelve teachers participated in think-aloud protocols and read and responded to their own student writing from a range of university and course settings. While some teachers experienced more emotions than others, all teachers in the sample experienced at least seven of the ten emotions coded. In this section, I present and discuss the overall results of the think-aloud protocol data for the sample in aggregate. Following the results of the emotion, trigger and action data in aggregate, I discuss how the results answer the research questions of (1) What emotions do teachers express verbally and
nonverbally during audio and video recordings of think-aloud protocols?; (2) What triggers teachers’ emotions and what do teachers do with the emotions that emerge when they are reading and responding to student writing?; and (3) What, if any, actions do teachers make in response to the emotions that emerge when they are reading and responding to student writing? The answers to these questions build on the claims started in the discussion of the survey data.

**Emotion Results (Think-Aloud Data, Aggregate)**

Of the 820 emotional utterances within the sample (Figure 17), 32.92% (270 emotional utterances) were coded as joy. Joy was the most frequently experienced emotion as teachers were reading and responding to student writing. The second most experience emotion was anger (18.38%), and trust (12.45%) was the third most experienced emotion. Following trust were the emotions surprise (10.03%), confusion (8.22%), disgust (7.37%) and anticipation (6.17%). Concern comprised 4.84% of the emotions teachers experienced with disappointment (1.81%) and sadness (.84%) being the least two experienced emotions in the sample.
Although joy was the most experienced emotion overall, the think-aloud protocols reveal other top emotions for individual participants. For two of those participants (Jessica and Kim), anger was the most frequently experienced emotion and for the third participant (Robert) trust was the most frequently experienced emotion. All participants experienced joy and surprise. The emotions that these university teachers experience are the same emotions referenced in literature on K-12 teachers (Sutton & Wheatley, 2003). Figure 18 reveals the individual percentages of emotions experienced for each participant.
Figure 18. Individual Emotion Think-Aloud Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stephen</th>
<th>Cole</th>
<th>Britney</th>
<th>Jessica</th>
<th>Susan</th>
<th>Donna</th>
<th>Robert</th>
<th>Betty</th>
<th>Dan</th>
<th>Tim</th>
<th>Kim</th>
<th>Angela</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joy</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disgust</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticip-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappo-</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confusion</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Susan, a teacher at a for-profit institution with 10 years of teaching experience, experienced the most emotions while Dan, a community college teacher with 14 years of experience, experienced the least emotions while reading and responding to student writing. Emotional experiences were not affected by the length of teaching experience a teacher had (Figure 19). Teachers with no experience to teachers with fifteen plus years of experience experienced emotions while reading and responding to student writing. While novice teachers experienced higher counts of emotional utterances (29.5%) and experienced teachers experienced 10% less emotional utterances (19.3%), teachers, regardless of length, experienced emotions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience (years)</th>
<th>Percentage of Emotional Utterances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2.5</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-9.5</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14.5</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 19. Emotions and Length of Experience

Research on novice and experienced teachers has been documented in K-12 studies on teachers’ emotions (Sutton & Wheatley, 2003; Sutton, Mudrey-Camino, & Knight, 2009; Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009; Meyer, 2009). These studies reveal that novice teachers experience emotions differently than experienced teachers. My results suggest that novice teachers experience more emotions than experienced teachers, and also confirm K-12 studies on the different emotions that novice teachers experience. The three novice teachers in this study experienced nine out of the ten emotions coded. One
expert teacher experienced eight out of the ten emotions. The second expert teacher experienced seven out of the ten emotions, and the third experienced five out of the ten emotions.

Female teachers (7 participants) experienced 60% of the emotional utterances while male teachers (5 participants) experienced 40% of the emotional utterances. Hargreaves (1998) found no gender differences within his study on elementary teachers’ emotions. My results suggest that female teachers may have more emotional utterances than male teachers. Teachers within a Master’s degree program or who have completed a Master’s degree (5 participants) experienced 34% of the emotional utterances. Teachers within a PhD Program or who completed a doctorate (7 participants) experienced 65.9% of the emotions. 44.14% of the emotional utterances were explicitly made (teachers naming the emotions), while 55.85% were implicitly made throughout the data. Within the think-aloud protocol sample emotion data, all teachers experienced emotion. While all teachers experience emotions, the length of experience, gender, and educational preparation may relate to the frequency and types of emotions experienced. The results from this study can be used to focus on different subject populations. The most frequently experience emotions for the participants were joy, anger and trust. In the next section, I review the results of the emotional triggers.

**Trigger Results (Think-Aloud Data, Aggregate)**

For teachers engaged in the act of reading and responding to student writing, either something within the student paper or external features of the classroom context
triggered their emotions. Not all of the 820 emotional utterances had a clearly coded trigger. Fifteen emotional utterances have no discernable trigger. 805 triggers were coded from the think-aloud data, focusing specifically on the emotional utterances. First, I present the results of the nine major code categories and then I present the results of the 45 minor code categories. These triggers are for the aggregate sample and do not reference any particular emotion. Of the 805 triggers, 51.55% (415 instances) were from the major category content. 16.89% (136 instances) were from appearance. External Influences accounted for 10.68% (86 instances) of the triggers. The fourth most frequently referenced trigger was print code accounting for 9.81% (79 instances) of the triggers. Organization accounted for 4.59% (37 instances), and style accounted for 3.10% (25 instances). Multi-modal accounted for 2.23% (18 instances), and grades accounted from 1.86% (15 instances). The least coded trigger category was tone with 1.49% (12 instances).

In Figure 20, the top five minor-category triggers and their frequency are listed. The top minor-category trigger of emotion for teachers was students’ ideas (209 instances). Following students’ ideas, the next most frequently referenced trigger for teachers was students’ whole papers (85 instances). From there, the frequency of triggers continue to drop with 48 instances of format (citations) triggering emotion for teachers, 40 instances of students not following directions triggering emotions and 36 instances of the teachers’ relationships with students triggering emotions. These triggers are not broken down into positive or negative emotional triggers but provide an overview of what triggers teachers’ emotions while reading and responding to student writing.
There is no clear indication of what emotion a particular trigger will cue for a teacher. Teachers may experience the same emotions, but based on culture, course, assignment, experience, etc. the trigger may vary. Additionally, the triggers may be consistent for teachers, but the emotions teachers express vary depending on the teacher. Figure 21 lists out the possible emotions for the top five triggers. Student ideas, the most frequent trigger for teachers, would trigger any of the ten possible emotion codes. The second most frequently experienced trigger for teachers, whole paper, would also trigger any of the ten emotions. Format would trigger any of the possible emotions except sadness. Students not following directions would trigger any of the possible emotions except joy, sadness and disgust. Finally, a teacher’s relationship with a student would trigger any of the emotions except disgust.
The survey data supported an argument that what triggered teachers’ emotions related to what teachers value in student writing. These top five triggers listed above are what the overall sample of teacher participants value in student writing. Depending on the trigger, different emotions could emerge when teachers were reading and responding to student writing. 36.5% of teachers values in writing are students’ ideas and students’
whole papers. In addition to teachers valuing ideas and student papers, teachers also value the format of writing, students following directions and the relationships teachers develop with their students.

**Action Results (Think-Aloud Data, Aggregate)**

Teachers did not always react and respond to their emotions while reading students texts. The actions teachers did make included writing comments to the student, grading the student text, pausing or returning to the paper. The moments when teachers did not physically react to their emotions, but spoke them, were coded as spoken. Theses numbers refer only to the think-aloud data I collected (566 emotional utterances). I did not have the video recordings of Edgington’s data to observe the actions teachers took. Overall the majority of teachers’ emotional responses were spoken (366 responses). The second most frequently used action was writing comments on students’ texts (116 responses). Thirty-five of teachers’ emotional responses were grading the student texts. Twenty-eight emotional responses were teachers going back to the paper. Finally, in 27 instances, teachers paused after experiencing an emotion.

There were two actions that were individual to two participants. For Cole, one of his emotional responses was making a check mark (26 responses). For Jessica, one of her emotional responses was writing notes to herself (5 responses). All teachers experienced spoken and written comments, and four of the seven participants had emotional experiences that had a grade-based response. Five teachers had emotional responses that
had them go back into the student paper, and six teachers paused after experiencing emotions.

**Summary of Think-Aloud Protocol Results**

The think-aloud protocol data indicates that teachers are experiencing emotions while reading and responding to student writing and that the triggers are discernable. Teachers voiced 820 emotional utterances and 805 of those utterances had discernable triggers. Teachers most frequently experienced joy and anger, and students’ ideas and students’ whole papers triggered the majority of emotions. Teachers also had discernable actions such as spoken or written comments. What triggered teachers emotions related to what teachers value or expect in student writing, similar to the survey data. There was no clear indication of what emotion the triggers would elicit in the teachers, and the emotions the triggers elicited varied from participant to participant and for individual participants.

The results of the think-aloud protocol data also support the argument that reading and responding to student writing is an emotional activity for teachers. The emotions that teachers experience while reading to student writing help shape how teachers respond to student writing. Novice teachers experience more emotional utterances than teachers with fifteen plus years of experience. Female teachers also experienced more emotional utterances than male teachers.
The results from the think-aloud protocol data also help to build a framework for emotional episodes that teachers experience while reading and responding to student writing.

In the next two sections, I combine the results of the think-aloud protocol data and survey data, to answer my research questions and develop an argument for a framework on emotional episodes for teachers reading and responding to student writing. The first section is a discussion of my answer to the first question, and the second section answers my second and third research question.

**Research Question 1: What emotions do teachers express verbally and nonverbally during audio and video recordings of think-aloud protocols?**

Teachers expressed various positive and negative emotions verbally and nonverbally while they participated in think-aloud protocols. Morgan, Ludlow, Kitching, O’Leary and Clarke (2010) in *What makes teachers tick? Sustaining events in new teachers’ lives*, investigate the “routinely encountered affective episodes” teachers’ encounter on a daily basis arguing that the emotional episodes teachers encounter contribute to teachers’ concept of self. For Morgan et al, an affective episode for teachers has four defining features:

1. they are coloured by a positive or negative feeling,
2. they are normally triggered by an interaction involving teachers’ professional work and identity,
3. they have a beginning marked by the triggering of a
feeling and end with the dissipation of that feeling and (4) they have the potential to recur routinely. (P. 192).

While writing teachers may not be responding to student writing on a daily basis, I argue, based on the data collected, that the act of reading and responding to student writing is a routinely encountered affective episode for teachers furthering Edgington’s (2005) claim that reading is a highly emotional activity. Understanding teachers’ routinely occurring affective episodes provides information on what motivates teachers to continue with the profession and what sustains teachers’ motivations. Morgan et al contend that understanding the affective episodes of teachers helps explain why some events are more important than others. For writing teachers, responding to student writing is an important act if for nothing else than to provide a grade for students. Reading and responding to student writing is important because it is a form of teaching students about writing. Huot (2002) asserts that “we read student writing to teach student writers: ‘In fact, pedagogical purpose saturates the whole phenomenon of response’” (p. 113). To discuss how reading and responding to student writing is an emotional activity for teachers, I draw from the survey and think-aloud protocol and retrospective interview data.

As demonstrated in the survey and think-aloud protocol data, the act of reading and responding to student writing consists of positive and negative emotions. Both in the survey and in the think-aloud protocols, joy was the most frequently experienced positive emotion. Similarly, anger was the most frequently experienced negative emotion in both the survey and think-aloud protocol.
Cole, in his retrospective interview, alludes to experiencing both positive and negative emotions when he states

Maybe what I thought was an extraordinary thing at the beginning wasn’t as extraordinary because other people are doing that too … but then you get to another one that maybe isn’t so great and it’s like well maybe that was pretty extraordinary.

In this instance, Cole is referencing reading his student portfolios and how he was overly excited at the beginning of the protocol session, but as the session went on his excitement seemed to level out because all of the students were meeting his expectations. However, at the end of the session, Cole encounters a paper that does not quite match up to the papers he was reading earlier and his positive emotional response toward the earlier papers are confirmed for him. During the think-aloud session, Cole’s emotions and triggers shift as he is navigating what is extraordinary and what is not. Whether positive or negative emotions, Cole experiences emotions while he is reading student portfolios. Reading and responding to student writing is shaped by positive and negative emotions that meet the first defining feature of an affective episode.

Cole is not the only participant to experience both positive and negative emotions during a think-aloud protocol session. All of the participants experienced positive (joy) and negative (anger or disgust) emotions. All participants have a distributed emotional experience with no participant experiencing all of their either emotions at one particular moment while reading and responding to student writing. In the survey data, teachers self-reported they did experience emotions. With the emotional utterances distributed
throughout the session and with teachers experiencing both joy (32.92%) and anger (18.38%), reading and responding to student writing is an emotional activity for teachers.

For each of the teachers in the think-aloud protocol sample, the emotions they experienced during the session were reoccurring at different points during the think-alouds. There were some emotions that the teachers did not experience at all, but teachers tended to experience the top emotions multiple times throughout the sessions. Not only did the emotions that teachers experienced while they were reading and responding to student texts reoccur, but also during the retrospective interviews teachers admitted that these emotions were typical of their response practices. Brittney admits to experiencing both positive and negative emotions while reading student writing “oh yeah, oh yeah, yeah … Just thinking back I have moments when I’m proud. I have moments when I’m frustrated. I have moments when I’m disappointed. And I have moments when I’m confused.” While it is evident teachers are experiencing emotions while responding to student texts, and that those emotions are reoccurring during response sessions for teachers, it is less evident on the influences emotions have on teachers.

Teachers are experiencing emotions while reading and responding to student writing, and these emotions recur routinely while teachers are reading and responding to student texts. These two points satisfy the first and fourth feature of Morgan et al’s (2010) definition of an affective episode. In the next section, I discuss how the data satisfies the second and third feature of an affective episode further developing the argument that reading and responding to student writing is an emotional activity. By considering how triggers are related to teachers’ values and identity and how the
emotional activity can be traced, I introduce a framework for describing teachers’ emotional episodes. The data collected was not unique to these twelve teachers as the survey data further supports response as an emotionally charged activity for teachers. Emotions have the potential to occur at any point when teachers are reading and responding to student writing.

**Research Questions 2 and 3: What triggers teachers’ emotions? and, What, if any, actions do teachers make in response to the emotions that emerge when they are reading and responding to student writing?**

Before discussing what teachers do with the emotions that emerge while they are reading and responding to student writing, I discuss the relationship between the triggers and emotions. While there is not a clear pattern for what triggers what emotion, there are frequently referenced triggers for the emotions teachers experience (Figure 22). For the most frequently experienced emotion Joy, the top three triggers included ideas (106 instances), whole paper (39 instances) and format (14 instances). For the second most experienced emotion anger, the top three triggers included ideas (23 instances), whole paper (10 instances), and self (personal triggers with 8 instances). The top three triggers for trust include whole paper (22 instances), ideas (21 instances) and format (17 instances). Ideas (28 instances) and relationship with student (8 instances) were the top triggers for surprise.
In discussing the first research question, I satisfied Morgan et al’s (2010) first and fourth component of the affective episode. The second component relates to teachers’ identity and the third refers to having a marked beginning and end. For teachers participating in the think-aloud protocols and for teachers responding to the survey, discussions and indications of identity and values emerged satisfying the second component. Using think-aloud transcriptions, retrospective interview transcripts and open-ended survey responses, I first discuss how the triggers and emotions that teachers experience while reading and responding to student writing are tied to their identity and conception of a teacher self. Then, I will demonstrate how the data satisfies the third component.
component of the affective episode, leading to an overall framework on teachers’
emotions while reading and responding to student writing.

Responding to student texts is a reoccurring event that happens multiple times
throughout the semester and is a crucial component of the writing classroom. Responding
to student writing is a pedagogical activity with roots in wanting to help students improve
as writers (Huot, 2002). Since affective episodes “are the building blocks from which the
full edifice of teachers’ emotional experience is constructed” (Morgan et al, 2010, p. 192), it seems appropriate to consider the reading and responding to student writing as an
emotional activity with the ability to provide teachers with insight to their sense of “self-
identity and self-worth” (Morgan et al, 2010, p. 193). Referencing Turner and Stets
(2006) sociological research on emotion, Morgan et al posit that when interactions in the
affective episode result “in verification of the self, positive emotions like satisfaction and
pride will follow, while, in contrast, episodes that disconfirm that self result in any of the
several negative emotions including anger, guilt, shame, anxiety or distress” (p. 193).
This link between emotion and identity can be seen in the answers teachers’ provided in
surveys and in the think-aloud protocols. The emotions teachers experience while reading
and responding to student writing either confirms or challenges teachers’ identity.

Brittney relates her experiences during the think-aloud protocol with her identity
as a beginning teacher. During her retrospective interview, Brittney discusses the
struggles she has with responding to student writing which are grounded in her
movement toward a teacher identity. She states
I hate to really be ya know be a hard ass or ya know? That’s really hard for me. That’s hard for me, and so I’m constantly having to coach myself into ‘no no no.’ That for me has been um really difficult um ya know, because before when I was a writing tutor. I spent two years as a writing tutor. You could just help students. You could just help them, help them, help them, nurture them, nurture them, nurture them. You never have to judge them or critique them. So coming and that’s what I want to do. But, ya know, now that I’m a teacher, I can’t just do that part. I have to ya know evaluate, critique, ya know and give a grade.

Here Brittney is explaining the struggles she had with placing a grade on a student paper. The student did not meet the minimum requirements of the assignment, but Brittney knew about the struggles the student endured during the semester. Brittney identifies with the student, acknowledging the difficulties of the student, but Brittney separates herself to identify as a teacher stating “I have to ya know evaluate, critique, ya know and give a grade.” While Brittney was already navigating her identity as a teacher versus her previous identity as a writing tutor, she was also navigating her emotional state with her professional work. Brittney was sympathetic toward the student and the student’s circumstances, but she also knew that she needed to give the student’s paper a grade. And for Brittney, that was difficult.

For Susan, the experience of negative emotions while responding to student writing challenged her identity as the chair of the department. During the think-aloud protocol session, Susan was consistently frustrated with the lack of paragraph structure
she was receiving from students when the assignment clearly stated 2-3 body paragraphs. After responding to two final exams and part way through the third, Susan pauses and states “what is so confusing about 2- body paragraphs? Maybe it means my course curriculum is out of sequence … though I can do nothing about that” The negative emotions Susan was experiencing did not confirm her identity as a successful educator, but challenged her teacherly identity to consider why students were not successful and if the curriculum design was at fault.

In the survey, teachers relate their expectations and values of responding to student writing with the emotions they experience. The positive emotions teachers experienced were triggered by what the teachers valued in the student writing (arguments, student ideas, punctuation), while the negative emotions teachers experienced were trigged by teachers’ values, which also challenges teachers’ identities as successful educators. The emotional triggers for teachers connect to what teachers’ value in student writing.

Britney, who is aware of the influence of emotions on her response practices, reflects on the actions she takes based on her emotions. Brittney includes herself as part of her reaction during the retrospective interview when I ask her if and how her emotions influence her responding practices.

I had to stop myself from responding from cause my first instinct is to grade from the emotional response. So I have to not grade. Um I have to consciously take a step back and say ‘ok what if I didn’t know this person? What if I didn’t know their circumstances? What if I didn’t have this
relationship with this student?’ Um ya know, how how would I judge this or those times when I’m ya know blaming myself for oh did I not do something as a teacher well ya can’t penalize them for something I did (laugh) ya know? Here, Brittney is relating her emotional responses to the triggers as part of her identity as a teacher. She does not want to penalize students for what she did or did not do in the classroom. During Brittney’s pre-interview, she discussed her goals for response and the class in general as “helping students develop the research and writing skills that they are going to need throughout their college careers and beyond. And to get them comfortable using APA and MLA and understating what the written expectations are going to be for them.” The emotional triggers Brittney experienced during her think-aloud protocol session correspond with her goals and values for the assignment. Brittney’s emotions are triggered by what she values in student writing (Figure 23).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trigger</th>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th>Connection to Brittney’s goals and values in Pre-interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Joy and Anger</td>
<td>“To get them comfortable using APA and MLA format”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following Directions</td>
<td>Joy</td>
<td>To help them “understand what the written expectations are going to be for them”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with Student</td>
<td>Joy</td>
<td>“I have to consciously take a step back and say ok what if I didn’t know this person”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Paper</td>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>“Hopefully they have used the different research and writing skills that they’ve been honing throughout the semester to have create this paper”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reading and responding to student texts is an emotional activity for teachers, and teachers regardless of how long they have been teaching, experience emotions when reading and responding to student texts. The values teachers have about writing are potential triggers for positive and negative emotions. Robillard (2007) noted that the negative emotion anger, triggered by plagiarism, challenged her authority as the teacher of the classroom. For Susan, the negative emotion, frustration, triggered by her value of students following directions and writing body paragraphs challenged her identity as an educator who shapes the curriculum sequence. For Stephen, the positive and negative emotions he experienced while grading his students’ peer review sheets led him to conclude what sort of teacher he was to different students. In the survey, one writing teacher associates his or her feeling of guilt with his or her approach in the classroom:

Just this semester I was hit hard with guilt after grading 17 Social Science Writing 221 papers that should’ve been a review of relevant literature, but all of them lacked any synthesis. After reading 17 summaries, I felt like I should curve everyone's grades because this was clearly my fault. Even though we had practiced synthesis in class individually and together, filled out synthesis charts and visited the library with a dandy little worksheet, nothing seemed to work! I still don't know how I'm going to resolve this for future iterations of this course.

Emotions are catalysts for helping teachers understand their values of writing. Their pedagogical training and other contextual makers that comprise the response activity inform the actions teachers make based on their emotions. In terms of practices within the
classroom, two components of teacher identity seem to be if teachers have “figured out” what practices work in the classroom and what practices they have “not figured out.” This is evident within the above writing teacher’s survey response since the emotion experience was guilt leading the teacher to feel as an unsuccessful educator for not helping students learn about synthesis. Even though this teacher thought he or she had the practices figured out in the classroom (worksheets, synthesis chart, library visit), those practices did not lend themselves to helping students compose literature reviews that synthesized information – a value of this writing teacher.

Faigley (1989) in Judging Writers, Judging Selves also points to teachers commenting, grading or responding based on their sense of value. Huot (2002) continues this assertion: “Culture and privilege continue to evolve and be marked in different ways, and teachers’ reading of student writing is continuously influenced by their cultured sense of value” (p. 118) Teachers’ emotions are potentially triggered, knowingly or not, by their values of writing. Evident within my sample of teachers reading student writing is a connection between the emotional triggers of teachers and their values of writing and responding to student writing. Pula and Huot (1993) also argue that the ways teachers read and holistically assess student writing comes from teachers’ experiences and values. While responding to student writing based on a teacher’s values is not new, the addition of emotion to the equation is new.

Up to this point, I have discussed what emotions teachers experience while reading and responding to student writing, what triggers those emotions, and the actions teachers make based on those emotions. These are three components of the emotional
experience framework (Figure 24). While I have accounted for the triggers through a major and minor coding scheme, the triggers reference what writing teachers value in writing which is the fourth component of my proposed emotional experience framework. The triggers and emotions that teachers experience while reading and responding to student writing either challenge or confirm teachers’ identity. Responding to student writing is an emotional activity for teachers, and teachers experience positive (joy) and negative (anger) emotions. I further define and develop the emotional experience framework through four case studies. These case studies help demonstrate how the emotional experience framework shapes the ways teachers read and respond to student writing.

Figure 24: Emotional Experience Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Trigger</th>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Research Questions

During my discussion of answering the research questions, I argued that for teachers reading and responding to student writing is an emotional activity triggered by teachers’ values in writing. Reading and responding to student writing is an interaction between the teacher and a text (and the student behind the text who is not physically present) (Pula & Huot, 1993; Mathison-Fife & O’Neill, 2001; Huot, 2002). While responding to student writing is ultimately situated within a classroom context, the
context for these teachers is an individual moment where they are interacting with texts (and the student behind the text). Just as Phelps (2000) mentions the response situation includes interaction “with the text, the situation, and most of all the person” (p.103). Huot (2002) further discusses the importance of the writer and context: “It is important to remember that when we read and respond to a student text we are influenced by a wealth of factors, many of which are grounded in our interaction with the student herself” (p. 121). The emotions a teacher experiences intersects with the teacher’s interaction with a text, further meeting the requirements to be an affective episode.

In my discussion of the think-aloud protocol and survey data, I have examined single instances of how reading and responding to student writing is an emotional activity for teachers, connecting with teachers’ identity and teachers’ value in writing. While it is valuable to discuss individual parts, in the next section I provide a holistic picture of how reading and responding to student writing is an emotional activity for four individual teachers (Cole, Jessica, Susan and Kim). In this section, I continue to develop the emotional experience framework through mini-emotional reading profiles, by noting what emotions, triggers and actions occur when teachers are reading and responding to student writing. I also provide further evidence for the relationship between triggers and values and teachers’ emotions.

**Case Studies**

Cole was selected as a mini-case study to represent teachers as happy readers. Joy is a featured emotion because it is the most frequently experienced emotion in the
emotion data aggregate for both the think-aloud protocols and survey data. For Cole, joy was also the most frequently experience emotion accounting for 43% of his emotional utterances. Jessica was selected as a mini-case study to represent teachers as surprised readers. Jessica had the highest percentage of surprised emotional utterances out of the think-aloud sample, and surprise was Jessica’s second most frequently experienced emotion accounting for 25% of her emotional utterances. Susan was selected as a mini-case study to represent teachers as angry (frustrated) readers. Anger was also the second most frequently experienced emotion in the aggregate think-aloud protocol and survey data. Anger was the second most frequently experienced emotion for Susan accounting for 26% of her emotional utterances. Finally, Kim was selected as a mini-case study to represent teachers as concerned readers. Concern was not a frequently experienced emotion for teachers in the think-aloud aggregate data (only 4.84% of the emotional utterances); however, for Kim, concern accounted for 20% of her emotional utterances and was the second most frequently experienced emotion for her. These four cases studies answer the research questions holistically looking at a specific emotion the teachers’ experienced, what trigger those emotions, what actions teachers make on those emotions and a connection to the larger analysis discussion on teacher identity and writing values.

**Cole as a happy reader**

From the very beginning of the think-aloud protocol session, Cole anticipated “good stuff” from his student’s portfolio. Cole had been teaching for five years and was
currently teaching a composition 1 course at a four-year university. Throughout the semester, students are able to revise their work and Cole lets his students know when their papers have reached ‘portfolio readiness.’ The first two papers of his first portfolio he read during the protocol session were ready for the portfolio and Cole expressed happiness that the student had worked hard to have her early papers ready for the portfolio. As Cole continues to read the student’s work, he comes across writing he has not seen yet. For this student’s portfolio, it was the last paper. Cole speaks, “Alright last paper ok let’s see if she gave me a first draft of this some of them did and some of them didn’t so umm it wasn’t required by I’ll take a look and see she did of course cause she’s awesome ok.” Here, Cole confirms first his earlier thoughts of happiness, and excitement that he references in his interview that this student would be so prepared for the portfolio reading. While reading her final paper of the portfolio, Cole expresses a number of happy moments triggered by the student’s content. His first moment of happiness was when the student wrote, “the number one concept that I learned in this class was to clearly define a specific audience and purpose in my papers.” Cole immediately responds to reading this with a laugh, smile and “that’s exactly what I wanted you to get out of this class.”

The second instance of happiness based on the student’s content was when the student wrote, “I particularly gained the most from revising my papers.” Cole’s emotional response to this sentence was a smile, laugh and a mini-shout “YES!” Cole was not only happy that the student found value in revising her papers, but he was also excited that she came to that conclusion on her own based on the work she had done during the semester. One of the interesting things of Cole’s emotions throughout the think-aloud protocol was
that he was not looking for triggers to make him happy. Instead, he genuinely expressed surprise, excitement and happiness over the work his students were doing. In his retrospective interview, Cole references his happiness emerging from student’s revision process: “I would get happy when um I saw that they had been doing a lot of revisions in the semester I would also get kinda excited when they mentioned purpose and audience in their reflection (laugh) because I was like yes! this is what I want happening here”

Cole continued to experience moments of happiness and joy in the second portfolio. In this portfolio, the student had also submitted drafts throughout the semester earning her the ‘portfolio readiness’ comment. In this example, Cole realizes that overall he is happy with the work his students are doing and explicitly states his happiness.

“ok she has the go for the portfolio so that’s already let’s look at the next one these guys did so well with their revisions this time I’m so happy um ok the third for student B ok she did one revision and that one is ready for the portfolio wholly canolli they just keep getting good good”

Here, the triggers for Cole’s emotions are completely revised drafts of student text. Cole explicitly states that he is “so happy” with the work of his students. Continually throughout Cole’s protocol, Cole is praising his students’ work: commenting “nice work” or “nice good” or “good work.” He even links his praise with his understanding of the work that the student had been doing over the course of the semester: “yeah good she’s talking about revision here and ya know she did a really nice job over the semester.”

For Cole, even when a student did not quite meet his expectations with a paper he had not previously seen before, he found joy in the positives of the student’s work instead
of focusing on the mistakes the student made. He acknowledges the disappointment he feels for the student, knowing that the rest of her work was at an A-level, but returns his focus to what the student did well in the portfolio as a whole. Just as Phelps (1998) and Zebroski (1989) argue for teachers to make something of student writing, Cole genuinely enjoys reading his students’ work and finds the positives in their texts. Teachers cannot make something of student writing without acknowledging their emotions while reading and responding to student texts.

Cole attributes his happiness with his students’ work with his pedagogical choice to add in more revision workshops throughout the semester. Here the emotion joy is a result of the trigger of revision and student’s portfolios that is rooted in his pedagogical values in the classroom. Cole values revisions and portfolios as a component of the writing classroom and when he sees those values playing out in his students’ work, he experiences happiness.

I would say that it is typical that I get happy when I see that they’ve been revising all semester definitely I think this particular class has done more revising than many other of my classes have and I think that’s partly because they are awesome and I think that’s partly because I allowed them more time at the end to do revising.

In this example, Cole reflects on the successful classroom practices this semester. Cole found that providing students more time to revise at the end allowed him to be happy with the extent of student revisions.

Because Cole was responding to student portfolios, most of the actions based on
his emotional triggers were cognitive thoughts spoken during the think-aloud protocol or smiles and laughter. Some of his responses were grade related in terms of placing a check mark on the portfolio rubric indicating that a student had met the expectations. Cole was enjoying his opportunity to read the work of his students and he was making something of his students’ work. Cole was a happy reader who focused on linking his values with his classroom choices and seeing his students succeed with those choices. Modifying Damasio’s emotion episode chart to account for goals/values, the emotional experience framework constructs Cole’s happy reading profile (Figure 25). Since this dissertation is interested in answering what emotions teachers’ experience, what triggers those emotions and the actions teachers make after experiencing emotion, these ‘emotional reading charts’ provide a visual answer to the research questions. I provide an emotional reading chart for each individual emotional reading profile to have a holistic view of teachers’ emotional reading experiences.
Figure 25. Cole’s Emotional Experience Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connection to goals and values</th>
<th>Trigger</th>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“That they can communicate effectively to an audience um and that they can do that with a specific purpose in mind given the context of that uh genre of writing”</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Joy</td>
<td>Laugh, Smile, and Cognitive Thoughts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I’m looking for um evidence that they have revised according to the feedback that I’ve given them throughout the semester”</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>Joy</td>
<td>Laugh, Smile, and Cognitive Thoughts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I’m looking for um evidence that they have revised according to the feedback that I’ve given them throughout the semester”</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>Joy</td>
<td>Check Mark (Grade)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jessica as a surprised reader

For Jessica, responding to student writing was a new experience. She had a three-week intensive course on writing teaching instruction to prepare her for her first semester teaching composition 1 at a four-year university. The think-aloud protocol session Jessica participated in was her first experience responding to student writing. Jessica was not
planning to grade the first narrative assignment of her students, but instead use them as a way to see what she would need to focus on throughout the semester. Jessica had planned to place comments on the student’s papers, but only for students to see what sorts of comments she would place on future graded assignments she was grading. Jessica also intended to comment and point out glaring issues for students so they would have a topic to focus on during in-class workshopping.

Throughout the think-aloud protocol session, Jessica was consistently surprised by the content of her student’s texts. Sometimes, her surprise was focused on the specific ideas of her students “wow, what? What do finger nails have to do with typing fast?” and other times her surprise was focused on the way students would phrase their ideas “wow you drove right into drugs?” For, Jessica, most of the session was a learning experience for her as she was finding her grounding as a writing teacher offering responses to students. Her moments of surprise seemed to quickly multiply as she continued to read her students’ writing. There were very few instances where Jessica would pause to write a comment (less than 5) based on the instances of surprise. Similar to Cole, Jessica’s actions were cognitive spoken thoughts.

Other triggers for Jessica’s surprise was punctuation. For one student, Jessica was impressed and surprised by a student correctly using a colon in her paper. However, later in that paper she is also surprised and confused by the wording a student chooses: “I also believe that I can better discern how I feel I reflect on my life. What??” Since this was Jessica’s first time responding to her own students’ papers, it seems reasonable to assume to she would be surprised by students’ content, ideas, word choice and punctuation
because it is a new experience for her. One student wrote in her paper “But I realized that I wanted to do something with fashion.” Jessica’s response, “Jesus Christ. Seriously? Seriously?” followed a few sentences later with “Wow. Ok.” While these instances of surprise were not translated into comments for the student, they were moments were Jessica was caught off guard while reading the student’s paper.

During her retrospective interview, Jessica did not reference surprise as an emotion that she saw herself experience. Jessica referenced “feeling bad” for one student during her narrative story, but in general Jessica did not see the session as emotional because few personal issues arose in the students’ texts. On a personal level though, Jessica felt worried and nervous about spelling, annoyed about the overuse of exclamation points and mad about colon usage since she could not figure out what one student was doing wrong. Jessica did think that the emotions she experience would be typical of her future response sessions. For Jessica, “the hardest emotion to deal with is what I need to know that I have teach them” and that “Most of the emotions are tied to making sure I know what they need to be taught.” In these quotes, Jessica is referencing self-doubt and classifying ‘self-doubt’ as an emotion. I argue that while Jessica did not self-state experiencing surprise throughout the session, the newness of the experience creates a context of surprise because of the unknown. It is also possible that Jessica did not consider surprise as an emotion, because she was focused on her experience of other emotions.

Jessica’s main concern and emotion are her “feelings relating to my own inadequacies” which she further defines as the imposter syndrome. As a beginning
teacher, Jessica’s values on what defines good writing stems from her experience within the writing instruction course and what teachers have commented on her own writing. As a first-semester teacher experiencing imposter syndrome, it seems reasonable to see a reliance on responding to features of writing that are more concrete (colons, exclamation points, word choice) where she could direct students to different sections of the handbook for more direction. Jessica’s emotions and triggers provide further support for the relationship between triggers, values, and identity (Figure 26).

Figure 26. Jessica’s Emotional Experience Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connection to goals and values</th>
<th>Trigger</th>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“to allow me to get to know them as individuals and more importantly as writers”</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Cognitive thoughts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I’m going to use this to figure out specifically what we need to look at in the St. Martin’s handbook”</td>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“to allow me to get to know them as individuals and more importantly as writers”</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Comment/Rewrite student text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Susan as a frustrated reader

Before the think-aloud protocol session started, as Susan and I were gathering our materials and setting up the cameras, Susan told me she was suffering from a never
letting up headache that she hoped would not be an influence during the session. While I doubt the headache was the main trigger for Susan’s experience as a frustrated reader, it did seem to set the tone for the session. Susan was responding to final exams for an introduction to literature course. Susan was not the teacher of this course, but is the chair of general education for the for-profit institution and has ten years of teaching experience. In this institution, it is typical practice for the chair to grade final exams or other assignments for her teachers. Teachers have some control over the day-to-day activities in the classroom, but teach from a common, standardized syllabus. Even though these were not Susan’s students at the moment, she occasionally teaches the introduction to literature course and was familiar with the students because of the small community of the institution.

Susan has an internalized a rubric that she uses when she grades student writing and it includes “spelling, grammar, punctuation, content, and organization.” Susan begins the think-aloud protocol session by reading the assignment sheet. This particular line of the assignment sheet is an important component of the emotional triggers for Susan “Your essay should include an introduction and conclusion, as well as 2-3 developed body paragraphs.” The first exam Susan responds to does not meet the expectations of the assignment sheet. Susan comments: “I would still prefer 2-3 body paragraphs… missing 2 paragraphs I’m gonna err on the side of caution and take off just 10.” On the exams Susan reads after this first one, the trigger of not meeting the assignment sheet and lack of paragraph structure elicits more intense frustrated responses.

In the second exam, Susan’s annoyance starts to emerge triggered by missing
paragraph structure: “Looking at Elizabeth’s paper I can already see lack of paragraph structure. I know I thought I was pretty clear on the exam maybe I should read it aloud to them before the start of the exam.” However, when picking up the third exam, Susan’s frustration over missing paragraph structure is evident. “Oh my god. Lack of paragraph structure looks like a big fat fucking paragraph that I would love to read however because my head hurts we’re going to give it a 25 out of 50 and this is me being generous at this point.” In this example, Susan’s frustration is triggered by the missing paragraphs that were clearly mentioned in the assignment. Susan’s action, based on the emotion is an automatic 25/50 without even reading the student’s exam. Susan’s frustration continues through the other exams with her having moments such as “I need to see body paragraphs” and “1 big fat paragraph. 1 big fat paragraph. You have a 50%.”

Susan confirms her frustration and “crankiness,” as she referred to it, in her retrospective interview: “Just give me some goddamn paragraphs already. I said give me paragraphs, and I just didn’t see paragraphs.” Susan, while aware that paragraph structure was triggering her frustration, came to a point in her interview where she started to question what was behind the anger. She starts questioning by asking herself

What are you really angry about Susan? Is it these students’ papers? Do you, Are you upset about something else? I ran that quickly through my head and the answer was no it was just that I am here to do a job and I really want to prepare them and I want them to get this goddamn career by the time this is all over and they won’t get it and if they do get it they won’t be able to keep it if their writing doesn’t improve.
Susan comes to the realization that though the lack of paragraph structure is the immediate trigger of her frustration, it is ultimately linked to her identity as the chair of the department because she wants to see students have successful careers that ultimately reflect positively for the for-profit institution. For the institution to continue to recruit students (and make a profit), potential students need to see high job-placement and retention rates of currently enrolled students. Susan references this as an outside factor weighing on her mind when her frustration arises.

Another outside factor that weighs on Susan’s mind during the think-aloud protocol is the curriculum sequence: “I don’t really know what is confusing about 2-3 body paragraphs maybe it means that my course curriculum is out of sequence has been for my last 5 years as a chair though I can do nothing about that (sigh) still something I think about obsessively.” In this example, the missing body paragraphs trigger a reflective moment having Susan question her identity as the chair. Unfortunately, Susan cannot change the curriculum, but she does have control over teaching students paragraph development which she continues to focus on and experience frustration through the rest of the protocol session.

Dorney (2010) argues that anger is not always seen as negative emotion “if it is motivated by a deep caring for students, a hope for the future, and a vision of how it could be otherwise.” (p. 144). In Susan’s instance, her anger and frustration toward the lack of paragraph structure in the students’ essay is tied to her desire for students to be successful in their careers. Student success is intertwined with Susan’s identity as the chair of the department and while Susan states that students need to be in charge of their
successes and failures, she also needs to provide opportunities for students to be successful. As she learned in the think-aloud protocol, teaching students about paragraph development is one way to help them be successful.

Susan’s goals and values were referenced within her internalized rubric she discussed during the pre-interview. While not referenced in this chart (Figure 27), Susan’s desire for students to be successful in their careers is a motivating factor for the emotions Susan experiences while reading and responding to the final exams.

**Figure 27. Susan’s Emotional Experience Framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connection to goals and values</th>
<th>Trigger</th>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“I would follow my own rubric um goals are spelling grammar punctuation content and organization”</td>
<td>Paragraph Structure</td>
<td>Disgust</td>
<td>Lower grade and comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I would follow my own rubric um goals are spelling grammar punctuation content and organization”</td>
<td>Following Directions</td>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>Lower grade and comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I would follow my own rubric um goals are spelling grammar punctuation content and organization”</td>
<td>Paragraph Structure</td>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>Grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kim as a concerned reader**

Though concern was not a top emotion across the sample (only 4.84 %), concern was the second (20 %) most experienced emotion for Kim. Kim was responding to
narrative based essays where students were telling a story that involved rudeness and linking it to a reading they had done in class. Kim was teaching a basic writing course at a community college and had ten years teaching experience. At the beginning of the think-aloud protocol, Kim starts by stating how she likes to read papers all the way through before commenting on the students’ work. Almost immediately, within the introduction, Kim realizes she is not going to be able to just read the work because there are too many surface errors that interfere with her ability to read through. While Kim is reading through the essay and commenting on both surface level and content-based issues, she experiences multiple moments of concern. Concern for the student and concern for herself if she is making the right pedagogical decisions.

The first instance of concern occurs about five minutes into the think-aloud protocol when Kim pauses to question why she is commenting on surface errors: “again I feel weird pointing out surface errors um but I’m also really highly aware that they are trying to learn some of the conventions of academic writing such as underlining a title so I feel like I kinda need to point these things out.” In this instance, Kim’s concern is triggered by surface errors, specifically the addition of the word ‘author’ and the title of the book in quotation marks and not underlined. About 20 minutes into the protocol, Kim again comments on surface level:

Wrong spelling of weather um (sigh) I hate to point that stuff out but obviously spell check didn’t get it and at this stage I do feel like these are honest mistakes and that nobody points them out and if no one ever does
they will just keep going on I don’t know if this will help for sure it’ll just happen again but I’ll remiss if I didn’t point it out

In this instance, Kim is concerned that if she does not point out the errors to the student, the student is not going to recognize that she is making these errors. Part of the concern Kim feels is due to a prior class discussion on language and power. “I’m in this really weird position where we had this fantastic discussion on language and privilege and power and um we read all these wonderful pieces and had these discussions where we ran out of class time.” Kim is concerned that by commenting on the surface level issues in this student’s text, she is inadvertently undermining the discussions of language and power that her and the students had in the classroom. Yet, at the same time Kim is cognizant of the fact that for these students to succeed in the academy, they need to be able to write in an academic voice.

Aside from a personal level of concern about the surface level issues, Kim is also concerned about the student based on the student’s content: “so I can see that this is really upsetting to her.” Kim is also concerned about how her comments are read by her students and the tone that she takes with her comments:

I can see there are a couple of issues here. One the new deacon the new deacon may have um stepped on the pastor’s toes. I’m I hope that this isn’t condensing. I try to use phrases like stepped on the pastor’s toes rather than the new deacon may have asserted his authority. I always feel like if I make a comment like that not that somebody wouldn’t understand it but just that it sounds too professor like.
Here, Kim is concerned that she does not appear as sound “too professor like,” but that she meets the students on the page with their own language (Kynard, 2006). The other instance of concern for Kim is at the end when she needs to consider what to comment on to help the student improve the text: “I’m just trying to weigh how much needs to be written on the paper I don’t want it to be depressing and overwhelming.”

Kim continues the theme of concern for the student and concern for the choices that she is making as an instructor during her retrospective interview. She first discusses her feelings of sympathy for the student who is struggling to grasp the material and conventions of academic English. Kim mentions, “I truly feel bad that it must be this difficult” for the student. Additionally, Kim expresses concern for the student because of her relationship with the student. Kim knows that when she meets with the student she is going to have to give the student positive feedback so that the student continues to work on her progress and not be discouraged with her current piece of writing.

Kim continues feeling concerned for the writer when she mentions “Because I’ve worked with students for a while and because I’ve worked in the writing center I feel like I know they can take this stuff personally, I would” And Kim’s actions, based on this feeling of concern, is to take it easy on the student and put a positive spin on the comments in the margin. Kim also mentions how she has moved toward oral conferences with the students since she is able to convey her thoughts more clearly with the student when they have a conversation about the writing. I see Kim’s move toward oral conferences as an example of O’Connor’s (2008) claim that “Teachers need to navigate
the path between being emotionally engaged with students as an individual and undertaking emotion labour to meet the demands which their professional role places upon them.” (122) Kim, as a concerned reader, also connects with her identity as a teacher who wants to help students succeed in future classes. Zembylas (2003) would argue that Kim’s move to add oral conferences is the result of agency (based on the connection between teacher identity and emotion) that determined Kim’s ability to reflect on her professional actions and make a decision that satisfied her needs as an instructor and the needs of her students. Kim values academic written conventions as a teacher, but she also values the students’ rights to their language and when those two values intersect for Kim she experiences concern (Figure 28).
Figure 28. Kim’s Emotional Experience Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connection to goals and values</th>
<th>Trigger</th>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Making sure that students understand what the assignment is and making sure they are responding to all parts of it.”</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>Cognitive reflective thoughts and comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It is a goal of this particular level of class to discuss issues of grammar and punctuation”</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>Cognitive reflective thoughts and comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It is a goal of this particular level of class to discuss issues of grammar and punctuation”</td>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>Cognitive reflective thoughts and comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It is a goal of this particular level of class to discuss issues of grammar and punctuation”</td>
<td>Style (Word Choice)</td>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>Cognitive reflective thoughts and comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**

Teachers are interacting with their students and their texts when they are reading and responding to student writing. For teachers, the act of reading and responding to student writing is an affective episode where emotions are reoccurring. Teachers are frequently experiencing joy and anger triggered by student content, format and relationships. I argue that the emotions teachers experience are tied to their values in writing and to how they perceive of their teaching identity. When teachers experience
positive emotions, their perception of their identity is enhanced. On the other hand, negative emotions challenge teachers’ identity and push some teachers (Brittany, Kim, Susan) to reflect on the pedagogical choices they make in the classroom (or curriculum structure). Teachers are aware of their emotions and emotional triggers, as they self-stated them in a survey, and the emotions and emotional triggers of teachers is observable when they are engaged in the act of reading and responding to student writing. The triggers, emotions and actions help develop an emotional experience framework that accounts for how emotions shape the reading and responding experience of teachers.

Teachers need to know how they feel about writing before they are able to discuss what they value in writing. The triggers of teachers’ emotions are linked to what teachers value in writing and what teachers are expecting to see in student writing. Sutton and Wheatley (2003) conclude that “teachers who report experiencing much joy and little anger have a different experience of teaching than those who experience constant frustration and little joy” (p. 330). In the above case studies, the different emotions the teachers experience shaped their very different reading and responding profiles. Emotions are a substantial component of the act of reading and responding to student writing since they help teachers understand what they value in writing and help shape the response actions that teachers experience while reading student writing.

Sutton and Wheatley (2003) also discuss classroom practices in terms of goals suggesting that “positive emotions are more likely associated with mastery and approach goals, and that negative emotions are more likely associated with performance and avoidance” (p. 340). The relationship between emotions and practices (or goals as Sutton
and Wheatley refer to them) helps explain teachers wanting to revise their classroom practices to change student writing. Cole realized, based on his positive emotions, that allowing students more time to revise was a successful classroom practice for him. Susan struggled, based on her negative emotions, on finding the right classroom practices (including reading the assignment sheet aloud or revising curriculum) so students would produce stronger final exams. Brittney also referred to her positive and negative emotions that she experienced while reading and responding to student writing and how that was related to what she may or may not have done in the classroom.

Understanding how emotions help shape the ways that teachers read and respond to student writing, can help writing teachers know what they value in writing and what practices may or may not be working in the classroom. Sutton and Wheatley (2003) argue that a full understanding of teachers’ emotions can help researchers understanding why new teaching practices are not adopted or attempted in the classroom. The same argument can be made for the different practices teachers do not use while reading and responding to student writing. Response research has detailed the various textual response practices of teachers, but it is not known how emotions influence what practices teachers choose to use and the reasoning behind that decision. Further research is needed on the emotions teachers experience and the relationship emotions may have with teachers’ response practices.

In the next chapter, I work to accomplish two tasks. First, I explore the implications of this analysis as a way to help first semester teachers navigate their emotions and as a way to help teachers name their emotions, triggers and actions for
individual reflection on values and identity. Secondly, I conclude this study with overall implications and calls for future research.
Chapter 5

Case Study and Conclusions

This dissertation focused on answering research questions aimed to understand the emotional processes of teachers while they were reading and responding to student writing. Traditionally, in this concluding chapter I would review the main points of my argument, furthering the discussion started in chapter 4, offer a list of implications, and call for further research on the topic. While I do intend to discuss how I see this study influencing how teachers approach reading student writing and summarizing my main argument, I am going to approach the implications of my study through a mini-case study. Since this study partly grew out of my mentoring work with first-semester teachers, I see immediate applications for understanding teachers’ emotions and identity as a way to educate beginning teachers. My mini-case study serves as a small example of the importance of emotion by paying attention to the emotional response of teachers learning to teach and respond to student writing.

To partly follow the traditional structure of Chapter 5, I begin by reviewing the study and the main arguments from Chapter 4. After reviewing my arguments, I move to the non-traditional format of this chapter, the mini-case study. This mini-case study demonstrates how my arguments and conclusions function in a different, though limited, data set. I discuss the ways I saw these teachers’ identities emerge during our end of the semester mentor group discussion. I also reflect on the steps I could have taken as their
mentor to help these teachers develop their identity, based on what I now know about emotion. Furthermore, I refer to results from the data analysis to triangulate with the mentor group meeting as an extra data stream.

To fully explore the mini-case study, I incorporate a limited literature review on teacher identity and emotion to understand the moves teachers are making during our conversation. During the discussion of the analysis, I draw from survey and think-aloud protocol data to demonstrate that the emotions, triggers and actions the sample population experienced are not limited to only those teachers but can be representative of a larger population. Following the mini-case study, I conclude this chapter in a more traditional way by calling for more research on emotions, teachers, and response studies.

Summary of Study

For response research to portray a full and complete picture of the ways that teachers read and respond to student writing, studies need to examine the emotional processes of teachers as well as the cognitive processes. Current response research focuses on teachers’ practices (Sommers, 1982; Connors & Lunsford, 1993; Straub, 1996) and reading processes (Zebroski, 1989; Sperling, 1994; Phelps, 2000; Edgington, 2005) pushing aside the emotional processes teachers experience when they read and respond to student writing. To capture the full picture of the emotional and cognitive processes, this dissertation study was driven by three research questions: (1) What emotions do teachers express verbally and nonverbally during audio and video recordings of think-aloud protocols?; (2) What triggers teachers’ emotions?; and (3) What, if any,
actions do teachers make in response to the emotions that emerge while they are reading and responding to student writing? Drawing from literature in response studies, emotion research, emotion and writing research, and teachers’ emotion research, I designed a study to understand the emotional processes of writing teachers while they read and respond to student writing.

To answer the three research questions, I gathered data from surveys, as well as audio and video recorded think-aloud protocols. Drawing from Plutchik’s (1991) emotion circumplex, I developed emotion, trigger and action coding schemes to answer the research questions. Writing teachers across the country were invited to participate in an online survey distributed across the WPA-listserv. Teachers who participated in the study answered questions developed around gathering teachers’ reports of emotions experienced while reading and responding to student writing, triggers of those emotions and the actions teachers took after experiencing their emotions. In addition to 146 teachers reporting their emotions in the survey, twelve teachers consented to participate in video and audio recorded think-aloud protocols. Teachers were recruited to represent different institutions, courses, assignments and educational preparations. Since no study has looked specifically at teachers’ emotions while they are reading and responding to student writing, it was premature to assume that one group of teachers would experience more or different emotions than another group of teachers. Therefore, a sampling matrix was designed so writing teachers would represent a diverse, stratified range of contexts where teachers, in an English department, would be responding to student writing.

Approaching reading and responding to student writing as an emotional activity
allows for a full understanding on how teachers experience cognitive and emotional processes. As presented in Chapter 4, data from surveys and think-aloud protocols support an argument that reading and responding is an emotional activity, teachers’ emotions are triggered by their values in writing, and that emotions either confirm or challenge teachers’ identities. Using Damasio’s emotional framework as a starting point, I developed an emotional experience framework to account for the triggers, emotions, actions and values that occur when teachers read and respond to student writing. (Figure 29)

Figure 29. Emotional Experience Framework

Value ➔ Trigger ➔ Emotion ➔ Response/Action

In the survey and in the think-aloud protocols, joy was the most experienced and reported emotion for writing teachers, and anger was the second most experienced and reported emotion. In the survey, teachers reported joy as the top emotion they experienced when reading and responding to student writing (70% of the 78 responses to answering “describe a positive emotional experience”). Teachers were explicit in reporting joy in their open-ended responses by stating joy or happiness in 55 responses. In the survey, anger was the second most experienced emotion reported. Teachers named anger in 60% of the 107 responses to the question “describe a negative emotional
experience.” In addition to joy and anger in the think-aloud protocols, teachers also experienced trust (12.45%), surprise (10.03%), confusion (8.22%), disgust (7.37%), anticipation (6.17%), concern (4.84%), disappointment (1.81%) and sadness (0.84%). This summary of the results focuses on the top two experienced emotions joy and anger.

Teachers reported that the positive emotions were triggered by student development (21 instances), students showing evidence of development or critical thinking (20 instances) and students “getting it” or having a breakthrough moment (18 instances). When teachers would experience these positive emotions, they reported that their responses would be to share their emotions with the students in either written comments or verbal announcements in class (81% of the responses) (Figure 30).

Figure 30. Positive Emotional Experience Framework (Survey Results)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Trigger</th>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th>Response/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student development (21 instances)</td>
<td>Positive emotions such as Joy</td>
<td>Share with students through written or verbal announcements in class (81% of responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students showing evidence of development or critical thinking (20 instances)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students “getting it” or having a breakthrough moment (18 instances).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teachers reported that negative emotions were triggered by students not meeting expectations/not following directions (20 instances), students’ lack of effort (14 instances), and students not revising (13 instances). When teachers would experience these negative emotions, they reported that their actions would include taking a break (43.6% of the response), rereading and revising comments (14.5%), or talking with colleagues, friends or family (16.3%) (Figure 31). The results of the survey triangulate with what teachers experienced in the think-aloud protocol data since the students not following directions (6.67%) was also a trigger of anger. Triangulation between the survey and think-aloud protocol data further supports the argument that reading and responding to student writing is an emotional activity for teachers.

Figure 31. Negative Emotional Experience Framework (Survey Results)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Trigger</th>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th>Response/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students not meeting expectations/not following directions (20 instances)</td>
<td>Negative emotions such as Anger</td>
<td>Taking a break (43.6% of the response)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students’ lack of effort (14 instances)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rereading and revising comments (14.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students not revising (13 instances)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talking with colleagues, friends or family (16.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another triangulation point between the survey and the think-aloud protocol data was joy being the reported in the survey as the most experienced emotion and joy being the most experienced emotion (32.92%) for teachers participating in the think-aloud protocols. Additionally, each of the 12 teachers experienced joy during their think-aloud protocol. For 11 of the teachers, joy was one of the top three emotions experienced. Joy could be triggered by student ideas (41.73% of the time), the student’s whole paper (15.35% of the time), or the format of the paper (5.5% of the time). Teachers routinely experience joy while reading and responding to student writing.

Anger was another triangulation point between the survey and think-aloud protocol data as the second most experienced emotion for the 12 teachers, 18.38% of the emotional utterances. Eight teachers in the sample experienced anger during their think-aloud protocols. In the think-aloud protocols, anger could be triggered by student ideas (19.16%), the student’s whole paper (8.33%), teachers themselves (6.67%) or students not following directions (6.67%). Just as teachers routinely experience joy, teachers routinely experience anger while reading and responding to student writing.

After answering the first two research questions on the emotions and their triggers, the third research questions asked what actions teachers make after experiencing emotions. The actions teachers took during the think-aloud protocols vary from the actions teachers reported in their survey answers. Of the 566 emotional utterances coding for actions, 366 were coded as spoken, 116 were coded as written comments, 35 were coded as grading, 28 were coded as teachers returning to the paper and 27 were coded as teachers pausing.
Not only do teachers experience joy and anger while responding to student writing, as indicated by the survey and think-aloud data, but also these emotional moments influence their identity as successful teachers in the writing classroom. In Chapter 4, in addition to arguing that response is an emotional activity for teachers, I argued that teachers’ emotions are triggered by their values in student writing and that the emotional moments either challenge or confirm teachers’ identities. When teachers experience positive emotions, such as joy, teachers feel like successful educators who have taught students some aspect of writing. Stephen mentioned, in his interview, that he knows that he is a good teacher for the students who demonstrate development in their writing, but that for students who do not learn anything he may not be a good teacher. Susan’s identity as a successful educator was challenged when she experienced anger triggered by her students not following directions and not writing in multiple paragraphs. Susan started to consider why students were not successful in the course and if there was something that she could do for students to be more successful. When teachers experience negative emotions, such as anger, teachers’ identity as a successful educator is challenged.

In the next section, I consider one place where teachers can begin to change the response narrative by including the full picture of teacher response (cognitive and emotional processes). Using a mentor group meeting as my data source, I present an analysis of how emotion research can impact the way we conceive of preparing teachers for the work they will do in the writing classroom. I begin by looking at some novice
teacher identity research to connect with my argument in the prior chapter that emotions can either confirm or challenge a teacher’s identity.

**Mini-Case Study Introduction**

While I was beginning to envision how this dissertation study was going to account for teachers’ emotions, I was meeting with four MA-level first-semester teachers for an hour each week. Mentoring first-semester teachers was part of my duties as the Assistant Writing Program Coordinator and this was the third semester that I was working with new teachers. Throughout the semester, Abby, Noel, Brittney, Joe and I discussed what was working well in their classrooms, what was not working in their classrooms and different in-class writing activities to try the following semester. The semester I was meeting with them was also the semester I was starting to draft my prospectus and think about how to design a study that would allow for an analysis of emotion.

Since I was constantly reading about teachers’ emotions, I was more aware of the emotions these first-semester teachers would express during our mentor group meetings. It was not until the end of the semester, as I was immersed in emotion research and drafting the prospectus that I realized that my mentees had articulated emotions throughout our meetings. After realizing the rich data site of four beginning teachers talking about their emotions, I asked the group if I could record our final group meeting that was focused on reflection on the semester as a whole. This hour offers as naturally occurring discourse data among teachers in a mentor group who are discussing and reflecting on their first semester of teaching.
When I first recorded the mentor group meeting, I was not sure what I was going to find. After listening to it before collecting survey and think-aloud protocol data, I was not sure if the data would pertain to this dissertation study. Even though this data source did not focus on emotion, during the meeting teachers referenced emotions when they were reflecting on what happened in their classrooms throughout the semester and preparing for their courses next semester. We discussed a number of different issues, ranging from their anger with responding to student writing that showed no evidence of revision to their role as a teacher in the classroom. As I was completing the data analysis for the survey and think-aloud protocol data, it became clear that the teachers’ emotions were related to teachers’ identity. Considering the prevalence of emotion and identity in both the think-aloud protocols and mentor meeting, I began to reflect on the ways emotions relate to identity. Even though my mentees’ emotions were not always tied to responding to student writing, they were tied to practices in the classroom especially relevant to their identity as teachers.

Methods

As discussed in Chapter 1, during their first semester teaching, four teachers of college writing 1 at a 4-year public institution and myself met for one hour a week to discuss what was occurring in their classrooms. Abby, Noel, and Joe were first semester graduate students in the Master’s of Fine Arts program, and Brittney was a first semester graduate student in the Master’s Literature program. During the semester we met, the four of them were teaching College Writing 1 for the first time. Prior to teaching, the four
of them were enrolled in a summer Teaching College Writing course. One of the
purposes of these mentor meetings was to give teachers a space to discuss what was
occurring in their courses, to exchange ideas and to engage in reflective practice.
Additionally, we continued discussions that were started in their summer course on
teaching writing. They were not only asked to share what was occurring in their
classrooms, but also to discuss the theories they were subscribing to with their writing
activities and assignments. Aside from meeting weekly, I observed one course session for
each of the four participants and they observed each other’s teaching as well. Beyond the
mentor meeting, I was in contact with the individual teachers via email throughout the
week.

The week before our final reflective meeting, I asked the teachers if I could record
our final meeting, having already obtained IRB approval, to analyze the different
emotions and topics that were discussed as a possible component of my dissertation
study. Since we had been meeting all semester long and had developed a strong
mentoring relationship (one that we have carried on the past two years as this study has
developed), all four teachers were eager to help with my research. Before our meeting
began, I passed out the IRB informed consent forms and asked the teachers if they had
any questions or concerns about recording our meeting. After collecting the signed forms
back from the teachers, I turned on the digital recorder and placed it in the center of the
oval table that the five of us were sitting around. The recorder stayed on in the center of
the table until the end of the meeting.

Up until this meeting, we had talked about specific incidents and assignments in
their classes. The week prior to the recorded meeting we looked at sample syllabi from other College Writing 1 courses to generate ideas on how to revise their syllabi, since all four of them wanted to make changes based on what they had experienced. We decided as a group that during the last meeting we would reflect on the semester as a whole and consider what practices to carry into their second semester of teaching and what practices or assignments they should revise. At the beginning of the meeting, the teachers and I discussed what they saw as the goals of the course and what they hoped students would learn. Focusing on gathering similar data collected from the survey in the study, I asked the teachers two questions: (1) describe a positive emotional experience, and (2) what emotions did you experience while reading and responding to student writing. Beyond those two questions, I allowed the conversations to follow the interest of the group members as it had been happening during the semester since my goal was to collect naturally occurring discourse. While I asked two specific emotions questions, the rest of the questions emerged from the discussion, focusing on the overall purpose of reflecting on what occurred in their classrooms. I collected 9, 420 words during the one-hour mentor group reflective meeting.

Using the same coding scheme developed for the think-aloud protocols, I coded the emotional utterances of the mentor group meeting. I was interested in understanding what emotions teachers experienced during their first semester teaching, what triggered those emotions, and how my mentees articulations of emotions compared to the survey and think-aloud protocol data for the larger study. While this dissertation was focused on the research questions of what emotions teachers experience while reading and
responding to student writing, what triggers those emotions, and what actions teachers take based on their emotions, this part of Chapter 5 looks at similar questions within a different context building toward the argument that emotions do occur in the writing classroom and that emotions can influence teachers identity. In what follows, I review a few studies on beginning teachers’ identity. The further literature reviews were spurred by the mini-case study and data analysis of the larger study.

As previously discussed, emotions are inseparable from rational thought and the natural situations emotions occur, according to Damasio’s neuroscience research and other emotion and education studies (Immordino-Yang & Faeth. 2010; Sutton, & Wheatley, 2003). As discussed in Chapter 2, the emotional processes of individuals help to shape their decisions. Damasio’s research on the gambling card task demonstrated that individuals rely on their emotions to make decisions. If there is damage to the ventromedial prefrontal cortex, individuals cannot rely on their emotions and thus struggle to make rational decisions. Emotions and rational thought are related and occur in similar places in the brain. Emotions do not just occur as teachers are reading and responding to student writing as demonstrated in the last chapter; emotions are an inherent part of teaching.

Using Peirce’s three categories for experience, Ria, Seve, Saury, Theureau and Durand (2003) in “Beginning teachers’ situated emotions: A study of first classroom experiences”, researched and analyzed eight high school beginning teachers’ emotions in situ during their pre-service year. The participants had high honors on national exams and had three months of teaching experience. Thirteen physical education lessons were video
recorded and interviews were conducted with the teachers after each lesson, and teachers were asked to watch and review the video prior to the interview. Ria et al used the Estimation of Affective States (EAS) scale to account for the range of affective states teachers’ experiences. One teacher, Gaelle, ranged from a +3 to a -2 during a two-minute excerpt of her class. She went from a calm state to a discomfort state when loss of control occurred. Another teacher, Christophe experienced a stable emotion during his course (a -2 to a -1), which was an unpleasant, discomfort state. Overall, the teachers’ emotions were linked to the specific activity or lesson they were trying to complete during the class. Emotions functioned to call teachers to question their success or lack of success during the lesson plans. According to Ria et al, adhering to lessons plans are a key influence on beginning teachers’ emotions states: “Teachers make decisions and act in class on the basis of their emotions. They feel discomfort when their lesson plan is not respected, and they also modify their plans when negative feelings arise. Their emotions are the basis for the adaptive intelligibility of their classroom action.” (p. 229). The emotions teachers experience in the classroom can influence how they feel about themselves as teachers or how they perceive of their teacherly identity. Just as Cole felt joy when his addition of class workshopping techniques helped students produce strong revisions (as mentioned in his think-aloud protocol and retrospective interview), teachers’ emotions are a catalyst for the actions they make in the classroom and the ways they perceive themselves as teachers.

Emotions do not only influence the work a teacher does in the classroom, but also influence a teacher’s development of her identity as I argued in Chapter 4. In a 2009
literature review article “Understanding teacher identity: An overview of issues in the literature and implications for teacher education,” Beauchamp and Thomas discuss issues such as defining identity and related definition issues such as the relationship between emotion, agency and identity, and the role of reflection for identity development. Relying on Sachs (2005), teacher identity is at the core of teaching, and “provides a framework for teachers to construct their own ideas of ‘how to be,’ ‘how to act’ and ‘how to understand’ their work and their place in society.” (p. 178). Additionally, as stated in many of the articles Beauchamp and Thomas reviewed, identity is not static and not forced upon individuals; instead, teachers negotiate identity through experience and external and internal factors (such as emotion). For novice teachers, whose identities are in constant flux and development, the influence of the local community or mentors plays a strong role in the development of identity. Beauchamp and Thomas further suggest that “the challenges are many as student teachers make their way through teacher education and into initial practice: negotiating within shifting conceptions of what teaching is or should be, relating to the identities of others, becoming agents of their own identity development.” (p. 185) Novice teachers are not only trying to learn and navigate the content of their subject, but also how to act within the classroom. During Brittney’s retrospective interview, she mentioned how she struggled to take on the teacher identity and judge student writing, when she was used to the having a writing center tutor identity who did not have to judge student writing. Novice teachers work to negotiate what they perceive as effective teaching (through their past experiences) with what they see other teachers doing in the classroom.
Judith Butler’s well-known work on identity contributes to the literature on teachers’ identity. Butler (1988) presents the idea that individuals are trying to assume and preform a specific identity. In “Preformative acts and gender constitution: An essay in phenomenology and feminist theory,” Butler refers to gender identity as “an identity tenuously constituted in time—an identity, instituted through a stylized repetition of acts” (p. 519). Individuals can preform or express different identities and the acts of individuals are “usually interpreted as expressive of a gender core of identity, and that these acts either conform, to an expected gender identity or contest that expectation in some way” (p. 527-528). Novice teachers are working to learn how to express and preform their new identity as educators.

Walkington (2005) in “Becoming a teacher: Encouraging development of teacher identity through reflective practice” continues with a definition of identity that accounts for an ongoing development promoting “the teacher as a flexible, lifelong learner, able to participate in ongoing change—confident in him/herself” (p. 54). Walkington collects reflective thought journals from over 240 first year undergraduate pre-service teachers. Walkington focused on the relationship between the pre-service teachers and the mentor teacher at their school visits suggesting that the opportunity for growth and learning for both parties in the mentor relationship makes it a unique and valuable relationship to study. Mentoring “is not a one-way transfer of skills and knowledge from expert to novice, but an opportunity for challenging those things that create personal philosophies and modes of operation” (p. 54). Mentors, according to Walkington, “assist in the development of the functional teacher role including socialization, modeling and
evaluating” (p. 55) and encourage teachers to be reflective practitioners, which aligns with my goals as the mentor of these teachers. In the next section, I use these definitions and theoretical frameworks of identity to discuss the identity development and emotions of four first-semester teachers (Abby, Noel, Brittney, Joe) that emerged during our final mentor group meeting.

**Mentor Group Responses**

The main emotions that emerged during our conversation were anger, anticipation, excitement and joy. The teachers’ emotions varied depending on the topic (grading, reading papers, in-class activities, students) and teachers indicated their values in the classroom while discussing their emotions. The emotions, values, and identities the teachers develop are not distinct or independent of one another, but are intertwined throughout the teaching process.

One instance of emotion and identity that occurred for two of the participants during the hour had to do with students taking initiative to meet with them and complete their own work. Of particular interest to me, was the topic of “chasing after” or “tracking down” students and how that was not their job. What was interesting to me at this point was the distinction the teachers were making between their role (or identity) in the classroom and their desire for these students to develop initiative. For Abby, student motivation challenged her and brought her to a moment of feeling “lost” as a teacher.

I think what kept them from learning was their lack of motivation. Their own, like I can’t make them motivated I can make them do assignments
and I can dock them for not doing them which I don’t cause I don’t do points which is a disaster but uh its ah you can’t make them care and a lot of mine don’t care especially at 9:15 in the morning not a lot but some of them don’t care and then I have some who are there who are sweet who try really hard so it runs the gamut

Abby moves to consider the students’ perspective a few moments later “I think a lot of them feel scared approaching college like to them we are professors (laugh) but to them we are older figures are authority and its scary to like go to someone’s office”

Noel also struggles with students lacking initiative

I don’t know I noticed progression in a few students um I want them to learn initiative and I just there is some students I just can’t I don’t know how to do it. you know? I think that is something that I am going to try to work with next semester and I’m not sure how to go about it. Like there just some students like they write in their journals that they want more of my comments on their things when they peer review like ya know I make sure that I ya know go around and talk to everybody but their like its helpful when you say things and when you do this and I’m just like I’m here ya know available to talk to you and I have office hours and I can talk to you other times and sometimes our class ends early and I’m just sitting there and I want them to take that initiative to ask me questions ya know sometimes I don’t know that you are struggling when you are writing a draft or things like that ya know or that something is going on and maybe
you can’t write your paper on time and your going to submit something that not quite what you could do but I’m not aware maybe I would give you an extension if you would ya know come talk to me I guess things like that I just want them to like do ya know so

Both Abby and Noel are struggling with finding the boundaries of teacher authority and the influence of power. By boundaries, I mean that both of these teachers recognize and value student-teacher interaction and want to see more of that interaction happen, but when does the responsibility shift from the teacher to the student to cultivate the interaction? Abby and Noel work to define their identity as teachers who want more student-teacher interaction and try to understand what acts are acceptable to perform within their understanding of teacher boundaries, and then how those acts will be interpreted by others (Butler, 1988). Discussing their frustration with testing the boundaries of being the teacher helps Abby and Noel work to decide when it is okay to seek out students and when to sit back and wait for students.

Salient in these conversations, but not in the think-aloud protocols, was the notion of who should start the interaction. However, just as the participants in the think-aloud protocols experienced anger (frustration) and confusion, Abby and Noel felt confused and frustrated with not knowing what to do. Similarly, during Brittney’s retrospective interview (2nd semester teacher who was also a member of this mentor group), she also indicated a sense of confusion and frustration with not knowing what is the best choice she could make as a teacher to help students. Brittney was struggling to grade based on the product of the student’s work with also knowing the student’s
struggles during the semester. Novice teachers do experience emotions and some of those emotions are tied to their lack of experience in knowing what is the best thing to do. Frustration and confusion can be about lack of experience, as evident in this data sample, or as evident in the think-aloud protocols it can be about something else. The central point between the teachers in the mentor group and the teachers in the think-aloud protocols is that these experiences and emotions are linked with their perception of identity. For me, with a limited focus on ‘students’ within teachers’ response, I am happy to see that these teachers are ultimately concerned about the students’ success and are struggling with what to do to help students succeed in the classroom.

Later on in the mentor group discussion, Noel articulates what I see as part of her developing teacher performance in terms of student-teacher interaction. In the above example on student-teacher interaction, Noel struggles with students wanting more feedback (as they say in their journals), but does not see students seeking out the feedback. In this next example, Noel places responsibility on the students and asserts her developing teacher authority:

I have two students who didn’t turn in their research paper and then they came to class today or yesterday and they didn’t say anything to me. They came in late and then left early. I’m like let’s talk about this … It’s not my responsibility though. Like you’re in college. You need to come up to me and you need to say something. I don’t know what is going on in your life. I’m not going to hunt you down … I’m not going to walk up to every individual person and be like so what’s going on how ya do what’s up
with your paper like that’s not my responsibility especially when I’m teaching 2 classes like I’m not going to walk around and ya know go up to every person and be like you didn’t turn in your paper’’

Abby agrees with Noel and shares here experiences:

I have students who are bailing on conferences who are not rescheduling or not responding to my emails saying cause essays were due yesterday their research paper and like where is your paper why didn’t you email it to me? Like nothing? Its just they’re all they’re all bailing I don’t know if like it would help in the beginning of the semester something in the syllabus like you are an adult with responsibilities I’m not going to run after you or remind you there is work you do it. It is not my job to hold your hand. I don’t know. It’ll happen regardless

Abby and Noel both experience a sense of helplessness and frustration in negotiating their desire for students to be successful in the classroom (by submitting work) and the realization that some students violate their desires. They are unsure about what to do to encourage students to submit assignments and to encourage students to communicate with them about what is going on in their lives. Abby and Noel both state a sense of teacher authority by stating their identity boundaries as, “I’m not going to run after you” and “It’s not my responsibility” while also expressing frustration (coded as anger) over the helplessness of the situation. Similarly, one of the emotional triggers for anger in both think think-aloud protocols and the survey was students not submitting work or students not following directions or not revising. Not only are novice teachers experiencing
frustration of students not “doing something,” but also teachers from a range of experience continue to experience and express the same sense of frustration.

Assessing student writing was another teacher identity the mentees worked to acquire. For teachers in the survey and think-aloud protocol data, assessing student writing either confirmed their identity as successful educators or threatened their teacher identity. Both Joe and Abby express their frustration with responding to student projects and grading, an identity all four of them found hard to perform for different reasons. Joe, when asked what emotions did you experience while grading or responding, answered, “anger exclusively.” Joe attributes the trigger of his anger to students not revising or not changing their essays even after both he and fellow students had given feedback. Joe’s point of frustration was similar to what other teachers referenced in the survey. Abby also mentions the same trigger for her frustration with grading:

I got frustrated when like I would see their drafts and then I would get their final and it was the same damn paper same thing like no extra work like one kid I spent an hour with in the writing center and it didn’t change at all so like it needs to be this or this instead and yeah if they blatantly just like blew off feedback that’s frustrating they kept making the same mistakes and they would have a page of full feedback from me detailing what to do instead that was frustrating

This frustration may stem from the nagging doubt that perhaps Abby and Joe did not present their comments to students in a way that students would understand. The teacher
identity Abby and Joe strive for is challenged by the receiving writing from students that
does not meet their expectations.

In dealing with the emotions that arose during grading, Abby, Noel and Joe exchanged their practices on staggering student papers. All three of them organize their stack of papers based on who they assume the good writers are and intersperse those papers throughout the rest of the stack. Abby mentions a fellow teacher who “reads all her stronger students ones first and then just go further down the line and I think that’s a terrible idea because the more you read the worst it gets and I need there to be some hope interspersed.” Noel referenced a specific recent incident when “I had to look at one girl’s because I knew it was going to be really good. Because I knew what she was talking about so like it was there were only 5 left and I need to read this girl’s. I know it’s going to be good.”

Brittney, during the mentor group meeting, separates herself by setting aside the good papers till the end because they take her longer to respond to.

I … save my best students for last not because I need a break but because my best students it takes me longer to give them feedback that I think is going to be helpful for them to make their paper better and the ya know bad students ya know I know first glance ok this needs to change to make this a better paper so in some ways it is easier for me to grade the poor students and I take more time um with the students who are better writer’s because um even though it is a great paper there is always something that ya know you can say to someone to help them improve as a writer.
So, while Abby, Noel and Joe exchange practices on how to deal with the negative emotions that arise during grading, Brittney is concerned with making sure that she gives helpful feedback to all of her students and recognizes that it takes longer for her to give feedback to ‘great papers.’

Teachers, early on, are able to distinguish between the ‘good’ writers and the ‘poor’ writers, as evident in these teachers’ conversations about stacking paper and offering feedback. Novice teachers, who are still navigating their identities as teachers, quickly develop a teacher persona to judge good versus poor writing and situate their response practices around those judgments. As their mentor, had I known what I know about emotions now, based on this study, I would shifted the conversation different. As it happened, I allowed the teachers to exchange their practices, questioning them on why they made those choices and what was their rationale for those choices. If I were able to do it again, I would ask the teachers to think of the different practices or types of papers that triggered the positive emotions for them. If emotions are tied to values in writing and that a teacher’s identity is either confirmed or challenged by how successful their practices are (as concluded in the previous chapter), then when teachers are beginning to figure out what practices work best for them in the classroom they should consider what emotional episodes are working and not working for them.

After I noticed my mentees struggling with different practices such as responding to student papers, in-class peer review sessions or students not submitting work, I should have asked them to trace out their emotional episodes (Figure 32). What was triggering
their emotion? What emotion were they experiencing? What was their response? And, what value was that emotion stemming from?

Figure 32. Emotional Experience framework for Mentees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Trigger</th>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th>Response/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students not turning in work</td>
<td>Anger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responding to student Papers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students not revising</td>
<td>Anger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students good writing</td>
<td>Joy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By asking teachers to reflect and look closely at the different positive and negative triggers (possibly their practices) and values, novice teachers would have a clearer picture as to what was occurring and why. Then, I would ask the teachers to consider what triggered negative emotions for them (such as students not submitting work or students not revising). This way, teachers could see more clearly (as opposed to abstract conversations), what practices are helping them feel like successful teachers in the classroom and what practices are cultivating a negative teacher self. As discussed in the last chapter, a teachers’ identity is either confirmed or challenged based on the positive or negative emotions that emerge from the triggers. Teachers can use the understanding of their emotions to begin to figure out what practices are successful in the classroom (such
as Cole realizing extra revision time at the end of the semester helps student produce stronger portfolios in his eyes).

Additionally, while I did ask teachers to journal about what was successful and unsuccessful in the classroom over the course of the semester, knowing what I do now about emotions, I would have asked the teachers to consider and incorporate the emotional experience framework into their journals. Just as Winograd (2003) was able to recognize patterns in his emotions over the course of a semester, first-semester writing teachers would also have the information available to recognize their patterns. Then, toward the end of the term, instead of reflecting on the semester as a whole (something I do think is valuable) teachers instead would be able to look for patterns in their emotions, triggers, responses and values. While I do not know what the results of those analyses may be, I would hope, as for Winograd, these would help the teachers revise their practices for the following semester. While I think the group discussions we had throughout the semester were helpful for these teachers, and all of the teachers admitting to enjoying have a space to discuss classroom issues, I think that since I know more about emotion now, I have a better idea of the aspects of their classroom experiences that teachers need to focus on and to add journals to my mentoring repertoire. In the next section, I suggest avenues for future research based on the conclusions of my two studies.

**Future Research**

This study has brought me to the conclusions that (1) Reading and responding to student texts is an emotion activity for teachers, and teachers experience both positive
and negative feelings.; (2) The positive and negative emotions teachers experience are triggered by what teachers value in writing.; and, (3) The emotions teachers experience while reading and responding to student writing either confirms or challenges their identity. While this research study has helped answer my research questions and brought me to the above stated conclusions, it has opened up other questions and avenues of research that I am now curious about.

**Looking at how the emotions teachers experience are or are not transferred into comments**

One of the limitations of this study is that I did not have access to the comments that teachers left on the student papers. While I was able to see when an emotional action was a written comment, I was unable to see if the emotions that teachers were experience translated into the comment. Therefore, one future line of inquiry could consider whether or not teachers’ emotions become part of their written comments. Edgington’s (2004) methods could be replicated, since he gathered comments on students’ papers in addition to teachers’ think-aloud protocols. Future studies could ask, do positive emotions translate into positive comments? Do negative emotions translate into negative comments? Are teachers able to mask their emotions through written comments as they are able to mask their emotions in the classroom? Teachers reported in the survey that they would share their emotions with students through written comments, but as a field
we do not know what those comments look like; additionally, we do not know how students interpret those comments.

**Looking at students’ interpretation of teacher comments in terms of emotions**

One criticism of response research, as Mathison-Fife and O’Neill (1997) and Murphy (2000) point out is the exclusion of student voices from the conversation. Therefore, another avenue for future research would be to consider what emotions students experience when they are reading comments from their teachers. Would students be able to sense the emotion the teacher was experiencing as she wrote that comment? Do students experience emotions when reading teachers comments? What actions do students take, in terms of their writing and revision, based on the comments teachers leave them? Since this was an exploratory study into the emotions teachers experience, I did not want to bring student voices into the conversation because I did not know what to expect from the teachers. Now that I have a clearer idea of what emotions teachers experience, I think the next step is to bring students to the conversation. Do students even want to know that teachers experience emotions? Since emotions influence a teachers’ identity, do emotions also influence a students’ identity as a writer?

**Looking at the ways that emotions may shift for a particular teacher over the course of a semester or years**

While my study indicated that all teachers, regardless of length of teaching experience, experienced emotions while reading and responding to student texts, I am not
sure how stable those particular emotions are over time if emotions are based on identity performance of teachers. If emotions are triggered by values in writing or teachers’ expectations for that particular assignment, then is it possible that as teachers’ values shift over time their emotions also shift? Do teachers experience the same emotions over the course of a semester or teaching career? Since this dissertation was exploratory in naming emotions, triggers and actions, the next step is to look at individual teachers’ holistic experiences with emotions and responding to student writing over a specific period of time.

Looking at how emotions may or may not influence the grades teachers put on student papers

While this study indicated a few instances where the emotions teachers experience resulted in an action that was a student’s grade, it was inconclusive if positive emotions correlated with a higher grade and negative emotions correlated with a lower grade. Also, there were no student grades to compare with these results. A future study on teachers’ emotions could focus specifically on when teachers place a grade on student paper to see if that is a more emotionally charged event then the act of responding to student writing as whole. Additionally, looking at it from the students’ perspective, research could consider students’ emotions when they are receiving their grade and feedback to see if there is any relationship between teachers’ emotions and students’ emotion.
Conclusion

This study has answered the research questions (1) What emotions do teachers express verbally and nonverbally during audio and video recordings of think-aloud protocols?; (2) What triggers teachers’ emotions?; and (3) What, if any, actions do teachers make in response to the emotions that emerge while they are reading and responding to student writing? It has suggested that reading and responding to student writing is an emotional activity for teachers, that teachers experience positive and negative emotions while responding to student writing, and that teachers’ identity is challenged or confirmed based on the emotions they experience. One of the many possible implications for this study is to use emotions as a way to help novice teachers navigate their identities in the writing classroom and in their response practices.

An emphasis on the positive emotions that teachers experience could help revise the current narrative surrounding response research as a negative burden placed upon teachers. Maybe, instead of the image of a teacher pulling out her hair while secluded in an office with stacks of papers everywhere the new narrative could elicit an image that pictures a teacher sitting in an office with students and smiles on both the students’ and teacher’s faces. The emphasis would not be on how to ‘fix’ the response issue by speeding up the process, but on what the act of responding to student writing is suppose to do, help students become better writers.

In order for response research to focus on narratives that showcase responding to student writing as an enjoyable act, emotions should be a part of reflective practice for teachers. This way, not only can teachers become aware of their emotions, but also
teachers can have a better understanding of why they respond to certain triggers in the ways that they do: just as Susan came to the conclusion that something, other than the 2-3 body paragraphs, was the root of her anger. And, with responding to student writing being such an integral part of the writing classroom, we need a full and complete understanding of the positive and the negatives. Considering emotions as one part of the response research conversation is a way to develop a full narrative.
Appendix A: Emotion Survey

I. Background Information
1. Total number of years teaching writing:
   - 0-5
   - 6-10
   - 11-15
   - 16-20
   - More than 21

2. Gender
   - Male
   - Female
   - Rather Not Say

3. Please select the type(s) of courses that you teach
   - Freshman/Sophomore Composition Courses
   - Upper-division Writing Courses
   - Literature Courses
   - Business Writing Courses
   - Technical Writing Courses
   - Women Studies Courses
   - Grammar/Linguistic Courses
   - Graduate Courses in Rhetoric and Composition

4. Please select the type(s) of university you teach at
   - Public two-year/community college
   - Private two-year/community college
   - Public four-year college or university
   - Private four year college or university
   - Career Education Schools/Commerical Colleges
   - Online colleges and universities

II. Instructor Response Practices
1. What do you view as the goal(s) of responding to student writing? Please select your top 3.
   - Help students improve as writers
   - Identify strengths in student writing
Identify weaknesses in student writing
Provide rationale for assigned grade
Identify errors in student writing
To encourage revision
To provide individualized advice
To indicate whether students have accomplished the goals or objectives of the assignment / course
To prompt critical and creative thinking
To identify argumentative and analytical strategies in student writing
To provide encouragement to student writers

2. Do you place a grade on the paper?
   Yes
   No

3. On average, how much time do you spend responding per essay?
   0 - 10 minutes
   10- 20 minutes
   20-30 minutes
   More than 30

4. On average, how many essays do you respond to in one sitting?
   1-3 essays
   4-9 essays
   10-14 essays
   15-19 essays
   20-25 essays
   More than 25 essays

III. Emotions and Response
5. Do you experience emotions while responding to student writing?
   Yes
   No

6. Do you notice your emotional reactions while responding to student writing?
   Yes
   No

7. Do you share your emotional experiences while responding to student writing with your students?
   Yes
   No
8. What triggers your emotions while responding to student writing?

9. How do you deal with your emotions while responding to student writing?

10. What external factors influence your emotions while you are responding to student writing?

11. Do you find yourself experience the following emotions while you are responding to student writing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frustration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annoyance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care/Concern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discomfort/Uneasiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest/Surprise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other _______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Do you feel as though you can talk about your emotions within your department?
   Yes
   No

13. Please describe a positive emotional experience with responding to student writing

14. Please describe a negative emotional experience with responding to student writing

15. Do you engage in reflective practice with your teaching? If so, how often?
   Don't engage
   Engage daily
   Engage weekly
   Engage every few weeks
   Engage halfway through the course
Engage at the end of the course
Engage when something isn't working

16. Do you consider your emotions as part of your reflective practice?
   Yes
   No
Appendix B: Informed Consent Forms

Before taking part in this study, please read the consent form below and click on the "I Agree" button at the bottom of the page if you understand the statements and freely consent to participate in the study.

Consent Form

This study involves a combination of open-ended and multiple-choices questions designed to understand the complex relationships between teachers’ responses to student writing, and teachers’ emotions/feelings. This study is being conducted by a doctoral candidate, Nicole Caswell, and it has been approved by the Kent State University Institutional Review Board. No deception is involved, and the study involves no more than minimal risk to participants (i.e., the level of risk encountered in daily life).

Participation in the study typically takes 30 minutes and is strictly anonymous. Participants begin by answering a series of demographic and background questions about their teaching and institution. Following that section, participants will answer a series of questions focusing on their response practices and emotions.

All responses are treated as confidential, and in no case will responses from individual participants be identified. Rather, all data will be pooled and published in aggregate form only. Participants should be aware, however, that the survey is not being run from a "secure" https server of the kind typically used to handle credit card transactions, so there is a small possibility that responses could be viewed by unauthorized third parties (e.g., computer hackers).

Participation is voluntary, refusal to take part in the study involves no penalty or loss of benefits to which participants are otherwise entitled, and participants may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which they are otherwise entitled.

If participants have further questions about this study or their rights, or if they wish to lodge a complaint or concern, they may contact the principal investigator, Nicole Caswell at (330) 672-2676; or the Kent State IRB, at (330) 672-2704.

If you are 18 years of age or older, understand the statements above, and freely consent to participate in the study, click on the "I Agree" button to begin the experiment.
Informed Consent to participate in a research study for think aloud protocols and follow up interviews

You are being invited to participate in a research study. This consent form will provide you with information on the research project, what you will need to do, and the associated risks and benefits of the research. Your participation is voluntary. Please read this form carefully. It is important that you ask questions and fully understand the research in order to make an informed decision. You will receive a copy of this document to take with you.

Study Title: Reconsider Emotion: Understanding the relationship between teachers’ emotions and teachers' response practices
Purpose: The purpose of this research is to examine the complex relationships between writing teachers' emotions and responding to student writing. Little is known about how the emotional responses influence teachers’ reading and about what emotions teachers are experiencing. My research aims to understanding what emotions teachers articulate they experience and what emotions teachers express while reading student writing. This can further the field’s understanding of the influence of reading and responding, and the function of emotion within the response act.

Principal Investigator: The primary investigator of this study is Nicole Caswell, a doctoral candidate in the Literacy, Rhetoric, and Social Practice program at Kent State University.

Procedures: Teachers will be asked to talk through their process of responding to student papers. The participant will be left alone in a room, while talking through their process of response, and data will be gathered either by audio recording or video recording (each participant will be allowed to choose which medium they would prefer to be recorded on). After think aloud protocols have been recorded, participants will be briefly interviewed to allow them a chance to comment or elaborate on their protocols.

Audio and Video Recording and Photography: See attached Video/Audio recording consent form.

Benefits: This research will not benefit you directly. However, your participation in this study will help me better understand the complex relationship between teachers and their emotions.
Risks and Discomforts: As all information provided by participants in this study will remain anonymous, there is no risk involved outside of the normal risks of day to day life.

Privacy and Confidentiality: Your study related information will be kept confidential within the limits of the law. Any identifying information will be kept in a secure location and only the researcher will have access to the data. Research participants will not be identified in any publication or presentation of research results.

Compensation: You will not be compensated by taking part in this study.

Voluntary Participation: Taking part in this research study is entirely up to you. You may choose not to participate or you may discontinue your participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You will be informed of any new, relevant information that may affect your health, welfare, or willingness to continue your study participation.

Contact Information: If you have any questions or concerns about this research, you may contact Nicole Caswell at 330.672.xxxx or ncaswell@kent.edu. This project has been approved by the Kent State University Institutional Review Board. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant or complaints about the research, you may call the IRB at 330.672.2704.

Consent Statement and Signature
I have read this consent form and have had the opportunity to have my questions answered to my satisfaction. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study. I understand that a copy of this consent will be provided to me for future reference.

Participant Signature _____________________ Date _____________________
AUDIOTAPE/VIDEO CONSENT FORM

Reconsider Emotion: Understanding the relationship between teachers' emotions and teachers' response practices
Nicole Caswell

I agree to participate in an audio-taped/video taped interview about teachers’ emotions and teachers’ response practices as part of this project and for the purposes of data analysis. I agree that Nicole Caswell may audio-tape/video tape this interview. The date, time and place of the interview will be mutually agreed upon.

__________________________
Signature                  Date

I have been told that I have the right to listen to the recording of the interview before it is used. I have decided that I:

_____ want to listen to the recording
_____ do not want to listen to the recording

Sign now below if you do not want to listen to the recording. If you want to listen to the recording, you will be asked to sign after listening to them.

Nicole Caswell may / may not (circle one) use the audio-tapes/video tapes made of me. The original tapes or copies may be used for:

_____ this research project _____ publication _____ presentation at professional meetings

__________________________
Signature                  Date

Address
Appendix C: Recruitment Letter

Dear Writing Instructor,

I would like to invite you to participate in a research study. The purpose of this research is to examine the complex relationships between writing teachers’ emotions and responding to student writing. Little is known about how the emotional responses influence teachers’ reading and about what emotions teachers are experiencing. My research aims to understanding what emotions teachers articulate they experience and what emotions teachers express while reading student writing. Your participation is vital to understanding the influence of emotion while reading and responding to student writing.

Your participation would include 1 hour of your time broken into two segments. The first 45 minutes includes a think-aloud protocol as you read and respond to student writing and is followed by a 15-minute interview. During the think-aloud protocol, you would vocalize all of your thoughts while you were responding to your own students’ writing. The follow-up interview would be based on your experiences during the think-aloud. Both segments would be video and audio recorded.

This study has been approved by the Kent State University Institutional Review Board (IRB), and poses no threat to participants. Participation is completely voluntary, and you may withdraw at any time. The data collected during the think-aloud and interview will be kept confidential.

If you are interested in participating in this study or have any questions, please don’t hesitate to contact me at ncaswell@kent.edu.

Thank-you for your time and consideration,
Nicole Caswell
Appendix D: Think-Aloud Beginning Interview Questions

1. What are your goals for response?
2. What type of assignment are you responding to?
3. How long have you been teaching?
4. What is your professional background/training?
5. What course is this?
6. What other courses have you recently taught?
Appendix E: Retrospective Interview Questions

1. How many papers did you respond to?
2. What emotions did you notice while you were responding?
3. Are those emotions typical when you respond to writing?
4. Do you think your emotions influenced how you responses and how so?
5. Which emotions were the most intensely experienced at the beginning of the session?
6. Which emotions dissipated by the end of the session?
7. Which emotions resisted change?
8. Which emotions intensified and de-intensified?
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