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This dissertation, building on Horner et al.’s (2011) elaboration of translingualism as “the disposition of openness and inquiry that people take toward language” (p. 311), uses a sociocultural lens to examine attitudes and emotion responding to language difference present through and in collaboration of peer review workshop participants in an English-language mainstream first-year composition course integrating linguistically diverse students. Employing qualitative methodology, focused around an interpretivist paradigm into how peers experience and are affected by workshops, this study draws on Guerra’s (2016a) framing of ideological approaches to language and cultural difference as a continuum, based on Horner et al.’s (2011) understanding of language ideologies responding to linguistic variety. Further, this study posits Canagarajah’s (2018a) explanation of semiotic resources to conceptualize responses on a productive spectrum. To research how students apply linguistic ideologies in language use, and the relation by students of these ideologies to others’ language use, the following questions were explored:

(1) What are first-year composition (FYC) students’ understandings of language difference and how do they impact peer review collaboration in a mainstream FYC class?

(2) How do these FYC students implement responses toward language difference in their practice of peer review?
In accord with participant observation study design, data sources were collected consisting of answers to e-mail question forms on prior experiences of peer review; how peer review responses were implemented in the form of drafts, revisions, and final drafts; as well as observations of peer review workshops; and semi-structured interviews of relevant workshop participants and their instructor. Then, an interpretive analysis followed of the resulting themes emerging from the collected data: the extent to which participants approached peer review as a space of learning through understandings of language difference; the resulting degree of judgment on each other’s work; the importance of individual ownership of writing; directness of expression, tact, and empathy with which they implemented language difference understandings responding to others’ work; and language difference understandings in collaboration responding to peer review feedback, taking a range of forms. These findings can help workshop participants engage translingual literacy adaptively, and further to recognize stances toward language difference when needed.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend my wholehearted gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Curtis Porter, for his support: I am certain I could not have written this dissertation without your thoughtfully deliberative guidance. I’ll forever be thankful for your invaluable comments over many, many drafts. It was a privilege taking this intellectual journey with you.

As for my readers, Dr. Gloria Park and Dr. Ben Rafoth, I hope I haven’t exhausted your patience too grievously in what may have at times seemed to be my attempt to set a record for world’s longest sentences. To all my committee members: you are paragons of diligence and determination, and represent the epitome of professionalism.

There are many other individuals who helped solidify my choice to walk an educational path. I am in debt to the great teachers I’ve had in my experience at IUP, as well as the mentors and colleagues I’ve encountered throughout my scholastic endeavors and academic career who have shown a sincere interest in my work. My own students inspire me on a constant basis.

In addition, I note my appreciation of the willingness on the part of the institutional site at which I conducted my study to grant me permission to do so. Specifically, I wish the very best for study participants, whose contributions comprise a wealth of knowledge on these pages.

I also thank all my friends for their camaraderie, and the fellowship. In particular, I cherish the memories I have of time spent with members of my summer 2012 doctoral cohort, including Nell Rose Hill, whom I recall as stressing the importance of making the familiar strange--an imperative which I internalized. I’d like to give a special shout-out to Titcha Kedsri Ho and Carrie L. Breyer, respectively, whom I could depend on to lend an ear and/or try to set me up with someone (mission status: TBD).
Finally, I thank my whole family, especially my brother, Abdo, whom I laugh with at times to the point I cry, and vice versa; and my parents, Vida and Shaol, without whom I know for sure I would not be here. I love you.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context of the Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation of Theoretical Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outline of the Coming Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>REVIEW OF LITERATURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students’ Understandings of Language Difference in Peer Review Among Multilingual English Language Learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students’ Understandings of Language Difference During Peer Review in English Language Learner-Integrated Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language Difference and Peer Review in Sociocultural Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociocultural Theory, Attitudes and Emotion, and Responses to Language Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language Difference in Diverse Learning Environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual Framework: A Spectrum of Approaches to Language Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chapter Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>METHODOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Researcher Perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methodological Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Context of the Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical Concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chapter Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summary of Key Activities and Descriptive Data on Student Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Presentation</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive Analysis</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Summary</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 133 |

Overview | 133 |
Discussion | 133 |
Implications/Recommendations | 146 |
Directions for Further Research | 154 |
Conclusion | 156 |

REFERENCES | 157 |

APPENDICES | 167 |

Appendix A - Instructor Informed Consent Form | 167 |
Appendix B - Student Informed Consent Form | 170 |
Appendix C - E-mail Question Form Distributed to Students | 173 |
Appendix D - Observation Protocol/Sample Field Notes | 175 |
Appendix E - Sample Interview Questions | 176 |
Appendix F - Sample Interview Transcription | 177 |
Appendix G - Rhetorical Analysis: Common Problems Checklist | 178 |
Appendix H - How Do You Know? : Checklist of Evidence to Support Claims in an Argument Analysis | 179 |
# LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Summary of Key Descriptive Data on Student Participants............ 98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Research design</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Visual representation of first peer review workshop activity situation</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Three ideological approaches to language and cultural difference</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Thematic data sets on participants’ collaborative language practice activities of peer review</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Peer review as an exchange of ideas</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Overview

My interest in peer review was sparked partially by one of many moments when a student in my English-language mainstream first-year composition class asked me a query with which I had dealt before, but which, despite my efforts, has reared its head in some iteration every semester. Specifically, in the midst of a peer review workshop during which the students exchanged drafts with classmates for the purpose of each of them answering a set of questions, then returning the answers to their peers to discuss and mull over in the revision process, a student who was a monolingual speaker of English inquired whether it might not be better to start by correcting grammatical issues in the draft of a multilingual peer. The workshops, as I help facilitate them, are typically oriented toward global concerns of essay organization, unity of ideas, and coherent development of thoughts in accord with the assignment requirements. Since I advise the class in advance to refrain from marking up the essays, instead answering the questions on a separate sheet of paper, I suggested the student bring up any concerns in the context of when it interfered with the clear conveying of the writer’s intended meaning, in a manner connected to the effectiveness of the writer’s essay, following the peer review workshop question guidelines.

This monolingual student’s asking whether he should proceed according to guidelines perhaps indicated he felt the focus on global issues to be insufficient, so I did not have reason to doubt his sincerity of intentions in helping his classmate. Nevertheless, this incident left me as discomfited as those in which a monolingual student has mentioned to me that he or she does not feel expert enough to help out a multilingual peer, or in which a multilingual student expects not
to get much from being in a group with another multilingual peer—as well as the usual anecdote about a monolingual student who presupposes he or she will not receive appropriate feedback from a multilingual peer, or a multilingual student embarrassed to share a draft with a monolingual classmate.

Reflecting on my discomfort, it occurred to me that some of it was due to my sense that such a turn of events indicated a flaw in my teaching. Notwithstanding my emphasis for students on critical thinking being crucial to writing well, the scenario recurs of students being concerned that issues of grammar will need correction first, separate and apart from whether or how they affect credibility and meaning. The persistence of this characteristic called for further attempt to understand its implications on several fronts, including how it plays out in peer review workshop activities, and the effect of their collaborations on participants’ subsequent approaches to writing and understanding of what they have learned, which I delve into in this study.

The blurring of linguistic boundaries present in classrooms can serve as a way to move students beyond fixed understandings of what makes different levels of knowledge valuable and conducive to intellectual and personal growth, notably in a mainstream composition class including multilingual speakers. This kind of class is found in much of the U.S. by necessity, due to the preponderance of minority group members throughout the nation making it impractical to set up separate courses for those with this linguistic background (Matsuda, 2006). This is the reason a translingual perspective, described by Lee and Jenks (2016) as acknowledging “the inherent plurality of language resources at play in any communicative act…as resources to be cultivated” (p. 318) is posited as a form to assist in reconciling of communicative differences and misunderstandings. Horner, Lu, Royster, and Trimbur’s (2011) definition of it as one that “asks of writing not whether its language is standard, but what the writers are doing with language and
why” (pp. 304-305) sets it in contrast to the more convention-concerned approach of monolingualism and the difference-emphasizing approach of multilingualism (p. 306). In order to look at how students not only make productive meaning from their course collaborations, but to elucidate how they are doing it, then, I employed an understanding of Horner et al.’s (2011) delineation of responses to language difference (monolingualism/multilingualism/translingualism) as a continuum of ideological approaches (Guerra, 2016a, p. 229) to conduct research on peer review workshops in a mainstream first-year composition course integrating individuals from linguistically diverse backgrounds.

This understanding helped to frame participants’ collaboration within peer review, in the form of how their uses of ideological approaches constituted understandings of language difference, through a sociocultural theoretical lens. Lundstrom and Baker’s (2009) study on the effectiveness of peer review as found in sociocultural theory is consistent with Swain’s (2013) interpretation of sociocultural theory, as functioning at the levels of practicing collaboration, verbalizing private speech, and co-constructing emotion that are implicated in peer review student dialogue. Alluding to the work of Aljaafreh and Lantolf on Vygotsky’s zone of proximal development (ZPD), or “the place between where learners…are able to perform a task on their own versus with the help of a teacher or parent” (as cited in Lundrom and Baker, 2009, p. 31) Lundstrom and Baker explain carrying out their own experimental research study, the results of which indicated that peer review is effective for second language writers to “reach a level where they are able to perform a task on their own” (2009, p. 31). What I find most intriguing about their research is how teaching techniques devoted to contextual issues of overall meaning and intent can inform how peer reviewers make these issues part of their ZPD, no matter their proficiency level. This would seem to suggest that training on contextual focus as part of a
reframing of the approaches to language difference that make up language ideologies can prove beneficial to collaboration between native English speaking (NES) and second language student writers.

This dissertation, building on Horner et al.’s (2011) elaboration of translingualism as being “about the disposition of openness and inquiry that people take toward language and language differences” (p. 311), examines via a sociocultural lens how peer reviewers in an English-language mainstream first-year composition course integrating multilingual speakers harness attitudes and emotion in respect to language difference through their collaborative activities. Moreover, referring to translingualism, Canagarajah (2018) writes, “An emergent second definition focuses on the need to transcend verbal resources and consider how other semiotic resources and modalities also participate in communication,” with “Yet another approach focus[ing] on transcending the text/context distinction and analyzing how diverse semiotic features…actively participate in communication,” as well as another signifying how translingualism can “transform social structures” (pp. 31-32). By studying how students’ understandings of language difference in a class of this type played out in the collaborative activities of workshops in which they participated, I spotlighted how participants engaged them as semiotic resources to approach difference, observing the role of language ideologies as complex and nuanced.

This observation is in line with Horner et al. (2011), who write:

Students who are identified by conventional standards as monolingual might take a translingual approach to language difference, as demonstrated by their response to unfamiliar ways of using language, while individuals identifiable by conventional standards as multilingual with regard to their own linguistic resources might well
approach language differences in ways at odds with a translingual approach. (pp. 311-312)

So too did my study, rather than just producing information on students as displaying characteristics associated with one ideological approach to language at the expense of another based on their language backgrounds in a static manner, indicate the dynamism of language ideologies. This project thus advances knowledge of how engagement with difference can be achieved strategically, considering that a classroom provides a microcosmic setting for a playing out of broader sociopolitical dynamics—part of the study context detailed in the next section.

**Context of the Study**

**Social/Political Context**

When thinking about the extent to which language ideologies prioritize notions of grammatical correctness (which, of course, even native-born speakers struggle with) and associate accent with degree of proficiency, I consider the emotional effects such notions can have. For instance, there is my multilingual relative for whom English is her fourth language, but who to this day avoids texting friends in English due to feeling ashamed if she were to make a mistake.

In my own experience as an English language learner (or ELL), I look back and wonder sometimes what drove me to strive to be proficient in English to the point that I now have trouble speaking Spanish, the language I first learned. When I was growing up, native-born speakers of English now and then detected that I spoke with a slight accent, a take which my multilingual family would find laughable, considering they see me as totally culturally Americanized. Though it may have instilled in me a defiant sense of wanting to achieve greater fluency (or though I may
not have cared much what others thought), such occurrences do cause me to speculate on the extent to which the attitudes of others might impact language learning development.

An NBCNews.com post dealing with the author’s own story of being ashamed as a child in the United States of the Spanish that she and her family spoke touches on the uptick in discrimination against Latino/as in the U.S.: “According to a survey by Pew Research, nearly four in 10 Latino/as say they experienced some kind of harassment related to their ethnicity in 2018” (Machado, 2019). In a polarized society, shedding light on how beliefs and preconceptions can be confronted and redirected for greater collaboration is a goal worth pursuing.

**Educational Context**

The research I conducted for this study was carried out at a Mid-Sized Private Research University in the southeastern United States (hereafter referred to as MSPRU), which runs mainstream English-language sections of composition that include ELL writers, with Writing Fellow tutors, undergraduate peer consultants from the institution’s Writing Center, embedded into their composition courses. Located in a diverse metropolitan area, MSPRU enrolled over 1,100 international students in fall 2017, at which time Latino/a students comprised over a quarter of its total population (MSPRU Office of Institutional Effectiveness, 2018, p.89, 94, 96). These demographics are impacted by the national trend toward growth of the Latino/a populace: Guerra (2004) states that the U.S. Latino/a population in 1995 reached 10.2%, and “the U.S Census Bureau and immigration scholars currently project that by the year 2050, 24.5 percent of this country’s population will be Latina/o” (p.9). To figure out how to support multilingual speakers of English integrated into a mainstream writing course, it must be acknowledged that the current and projection estimates have grown: 17.3% of the U.S. population consisted of Latino/as in 2014 (Stepler & Brown, 2016) and, according to Nuñez and Murakami-Ramalho
(2012), they comprise over 20% of the U.S. undergraduate academic population, along with being on track to comprise the largest-growing minority group, at 30%, by 2050. Due to its large Latino/a population, along with a diverse body of multilingual and monolingual individuals—both immigrants and from across the U.S.—MSPRU has been designated as a Hispanic-serving institution, or HSI, by the Dept. of Education’s Title V of the Higher Education Act (U.S. Department of Education, 2014).

Since writing instructors are not just teaching multilingual students, but doing so in multilingual classroom environments (Matsuda, 2006), this study focused on experiences of peer review in a mainstream, linguistically diverse first-year composition course integrating monolingual students and multilingual ELLs. To specify, I investigated participants’ understandings of language difference in the form of their approaches to linguistic diversity as applied to collaboration, and how their variety of implementing responses to writing in a diverse environment (Guerra, 2016b, p. 6) impacted their practice of peer review activities.

Pedagogical Context

Through teaching practices, writing teachers can convey an inclusive perspective to students by emphasizing writing as a collaborative and recursive process that entails undergoing multiple drafts across workshoped revisions, pointing to how they can take comments from their instructor (and/or the Writing Fellow undergraduate peer consultant from the institution’s Writing Center embedded into their composition course, in addition to Writing Center tutors) and peer reviewers in the form of suggestions for their work. For the purposes of this study, the process of providing feedback in collaboration is integral to the pedagogical context of peer review workshops. In fact, DiPardo and Freedman (1988) cite “the benefits of peers’ working together to foster a kind of peer-based learning that takes power away from the teacher and puts
it in the hands of the students” (p. 125). While peer review is another means to reinforce the idea of writing as dialogue, as Jordan (2012) notes, “even the term peer review is loaded for many students who encounter it, owing to its clear reference to peers’ evaluating one another’s work when they may not feel or seem qualified to do so” (p. 132). Peer review workshops can assist students to manage understandings of classroom diversity, so it is useful for composition instructors to understand the dynamics at work within them, to make learning beneficial to a wider array of students. By observing students’ perspectives on the process of giving and receiving feedback, I was able to gain understanding of the interplay of stances underlying use of collaboration to help each other convey meaning, and how they made sense of peer review for themselves.

A review of the literature has made evident that L2 classroom-contextualized research finds mixed results for students when it comes to the “affective advantage”—students’ preferences for; attitudes during and experiences within; and revisions resulting from—peer review (Zhang, 1995; Jacobs, Curtis, Braine, & Huang, 1998; Zhang, 1999). In need of further explanation was how individuals’ language ideologies are expressed through understandings of linguistic diversity evident in their peer review practices and experiences of workshops.

One of the goals of composition instruction is instilling in students the ability to become astute language users in a multilingual society. A way to do this to help teach composition is by implementing a fair and inclusive environment for students. Such can be done through understanding the communicative concerns that affect the facilitation of collaborative peer review activities. The collaboration of peer review provides instructors with a method to research how to give voice to the diversity of populations on campus.
The intricacies of how dialogue is conducted gains special relevance to my project insofar as how writing is accomplished through the context of peer review workshops. By looking at peer review workshops set against a mainstream environment that includes people with different language backgrounds, my study investigated collaboration through a sociocultural lens for how it called upon participants’ use of language ideologies to inform experiences of practicing feedback activities in their writing.

According to Boyle (2016):

Practice is the repetitive production of difference even if that difference looks, to our conscious awareness, the same. When we repeatedly undertake the same task, we introduce differences simply by adding another version. The difference is perceived and affirmed within an ecology, and relations within that ecology become activated in new ways. (p. 547)

In other words, to attempt to understand as much as possible what is being expressed takes effort that expands one’s abilities to come to terms with differences in various situations. In order to contextualize the concept of employing the particular practice of collaboration through activities that require participants to enact approaches to difference in language as a result of their understandings of linguistic diversity, it is helpful to reiterate the sociocultural theory-oriented foundations of collaborative learning for peer review, along with the challenges posed to it by the increasingly visible emergence of the sociopolitical and educational contexts that have been described.

For example, the focus in peer review groups on how well ideas are conveyed collaboratively through determining their appropriateness contextually is commensurate with North’s (1982) idea that a collaborative learning session should proceed based on the context of
what the writing requires (p.435), and with Bruffee’s (1978) conception of “mechanics” being tackled in relation to these (pp. 457-458). However, their viewpoints do not account for how best to facilitate the learning of multilingual writers. Indeed, with its being a mainstream first-year composition course integrating linguistically diverse students, the educational context at which I conducted the research for this study is emblematic of the status quo.

To be sure, collaborative strategies have been applied to multicultural-populated classes of non-native English speakers (NNESs). In 1990, Sara Kurtz Allaei and Ulla Maija Connor reviewed the research linking both different cultures’ oral styles and contrastive rhetoric to how students of English as a Second Language (ESL) interact in peer response groups (p.20). The authors emphasize putting writing in social context and understanding composition skill as emerging from familiarity with structural conventions of given cultures (pp. 23-24). Considering students’ varying levels of proficiency in English, Allaei and Connor provide suggestions such as “explaining the rationale for using collaborative response groups, leading students through several group activities, and modeling ways of responding to their peers’ writing,” along with having the same students comprise semester-long groups, as possibilities for the handling of collaboration between multilingual student writers of different cultures (pp. 24-27). The authors stress the possible effectiveness of peer review for collaboration between NES and NNES writers, arguing that both sides participating in the process would be alerted toward the need for contextual sensitivity (p. 27).

Earlier, Witbeck (1976), writing on the advantages of peer correction for intermediate and advanced ESL composition, stressed additionally the intrinsic aspects of collaboration that help writing students see use of language as a two-way process, with their input allowing for practice in conveying their ideas in a mutually cooperative way, rather than just accepting
teachers’ corrective feedback with little, if any, further elaboration (p. 322). According to Witbeck, particularly for students from similar language backgrounds, peer review might help focus their attention on some of the composing problems they share (pp. 323-324).

Chaudron details a 1982 study examining an advanced ESL and a high-intermediate composition class, respectively, in which all students, at various times, received both peer and teacher feedback, along with a native-speaker peer reformulation (1984, pp. 5-7). While students did score better on average in their revised essays, there was little improvement of significance in their revisions, and the differences in the revisions between those who received peer evaluations and those who received teacher evaluations were insignificant (pp. 7-11). Nevertheless, Chaudron calls for expanding the role of feedback: “The revision process must be learned as an interaction between writers and their readers. Without practice in this, L2 learners will not fully appreciate the functions...of their newly acquired writing proficiency” (p.11). By extension, this stress on the mutually beneficial relationship between student writers and their peers is worthwhile to scrutinize for the role that approaches to language difference play in the space of the writing classroom during peer review workshops.

Berger (1990), in her study exploring the effectiveness of peer and self-feedback in two ESL sections of freshman composition, found that peer feedback contributed to a greater number of, and higher-quality, revisions than self-feedback, and that students actually preferred peer feedback (pp. 27-28). Nevertheless, due to the study’s relatively small sample size and its limitation of not being designed longitudinally, it is difficult to arrive at a definite solution, so Berger advocates having students use peer and self-feedback (pp. 27-29). This combined method would seem to be confirmed in Connor and Asenavage’s (1994) study of two peer groups, individually comprised of four ESL writing students, in which fewer revisions were made based
on peer comments than those revisions resulting from self-feedback, rather than from that of the teacher—with the latter appearing to have the most impact on those who made surface, or local, as opposed to text-based, or global, changes (pp. 265-267).

Leki (1990) asked ESL writing students themselves about their reactions to peer response, identifying as “overwhelmingly positive” their perception of the usefulness of reading other students’ work, and their perception of the usefulness of hearing other students’ comments on their own work as also positive, though more tempered (p. 9). Leki suggests some of the latter might be due to peers’ lack of understanding the difference between editing and response, as well as being too teacherly in their comments, yet also being blunt in tone (pp. 10-11). Another problem, Leki states, might be ESL students’ deeming of their reviewers’ comments as less legitimate than that of a more experienced reader, and ESL writers having different sorts of preconceptions of the extent to which they need to structure their writing to fit American academic conventions (pp. 11-14).

By comparison, the explicit suggestions Berg (1999) provides for helping second language writers practice peer response illuminates the nature of how teachers have instructed students to approach peer review. Explaining to students the purpose of conducting peer response groups in the first place; and making them feel less apprehensive about the process by reminding them that they are thinking through the aspects of meaning, development, clarity and organization of ideas suitable for their given writing contexts (p. 21), Berg draws attention to how training students for peer review concentrates their awareness both of how to respond to others’ work and of how to perceive others’ feedback to sharpen critical thought on their own writing and its effect on the reader (pp. 22, 25).
As can be seen, contextualizing the use of collaborative activities as a practice to approach difference in language, by examining studies of classroom collaboration through peer review with second language writers, provides an argument for the need in a diverse landscape of this dissertation’s study into how approaches to language difference illuminate, expand on, and intersect with the work involved in peer review. The number of multilingual students that make up composition courses demands that writing teachers not only be aware of the variety of collaborative activities possible, but of those activities’ role in classrooms. The researching through a sociocultural theory-oriented lens of collaborative peer review activities in a mainstream composition classroom integrating writers from linguistically diverse backgrounds can serve to make a pedagogical challenge into an opportunity. To aid in this objective, I conceptualize a theoretical framework of participants’ engaging with translingual/transcultural literacy as a spectrum based on Guerra’s (2016a) framing of ideological responses to language and cultural difference as a continuum, which I proceed to present in the next section.

**Presentation of Theoretical Framework**

Given that the role of peer workshopping differs from that of other forms of classroom activity, with students being asked to provide each other with input that may or may not be at disparate qualities of proficiency to one another, it can be construed as part of the pedagogical point to have students grapple with the challenge of collaborating in the act of communication through writing, so that their very responses to language difference become part of the learning experience. Whether undergoing such experiences as not understanding someone else’s line of thinking or else having to clarify what seems to the writer to be obvious; believing that one’s writing is much better or worse than a peer’s to the point that one of the reviewers is being unproductive or disadvantaged; or more generally regarding peer review as a waste of time if the
enterprise does not result in tangible forms of changes to one’s writing based on direct feedback through peer collaboration leading to revision, the workshopping of drafts is a procedure infused with the navigation of differences. Since part of the effectiveness of peer review groups has been found to be their focus on how well divergent ideas are exchanged collaboratively, this navigation was explored through an interpretivist paradigm that “attempts to understand social phenomena from a context-specific perspective” (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012, p. 28).

Putting language into perspective contextually in regard to setting an atmosphere for clarifying individual meaning and personal intent can help peer reviewers make these issues part of their ZPD, a sociocultural-theory oriented understanding which has been applied to some degree toward multicultural-populated classes of English L2 learners, but not sufficiently in the cases of classes integrating monolingual and multilingual students. Lundstrom and Baker’s (2009) study featured a treatment group of second language writers reviewing peers’ work but not receiving feedback, and a control group receiving peer feedback but not giving it, and found that, whether of lower or higher proficiency, all “giver” students improved their writing at the global level more than did the “receivers,” with even the higher intermediate-proficiency students who were new to peer review improving their writing at the global level at which they had been trained to review their peers’ work, compared to their receiver counterparts (pp. 33, 37). The authors end their article on the note that more training as to how to engage in insightful peer review work is time-consuming, but can be well worth it, especially for beginning-proficiency writers, or those less experienced with peer review (p.39).

As Lundstrom and Baker discuss in conjunction with their study’s results:

beginning learners are still learning how to negotiate with their peer reviewer to receive feedback within their (the reviser’s) ZPD, and therefore, they benefit more from
reviewing than from receiving peer feedback. Peer review may be a process that requires
writers to understand how to negotiate for instruction that falls within their ZPD. (2009,
p.39)
This finding indicates the importance of teaching students the intricacies of how to
conduct peer review workshops—what to focus on, and developing a vocabulary specific
to their efforts. Consequently, at the forefront of the agenda for reader response in peer review
sessions is capitalizing on contextualizing, global-level, higher-order abilities, including
identification of rhetorical organization and development of concepts, in service of how well
writers get across their intended meaning.

In order to lay out how to make the mainstream composition class more of a setting in
which to have students engage in a complex manner akin to that in which they will have to work
to develop bridges of understanding later in life, this project studied the perspectives on language
difference, their impact on experiences of peer review, and resulting responses emerging from
the engagement of multilingual and monolingual students in peer review workshops taking place
in an integrated, linguistically diverse mainstream first-year composition class. A focus on how
participants go about the work of approaching language-based issues that problematize writing
was established to study collaboration in the circumstances underlying the activities of the peer
review situation. Within this framework, the reaction of students with dissimilar linguistic
backgrounds to giving and receiving peer feedback in a first-year composition classroom
integrating students from linguistically diverse backgrounds serves to extend knowledge on how
writing can be employed toward ends that engage collaboration consequentialy between a
community of individuals who must entertain and strategize approaches for communication with
others—in this case, their classmates.
Groups in a mainstream first-year composition course integrating linguistically diverse students were studied for how they cultivated responses to language difference in peer review workshops to guide them through their collaboration. To conceptualize their activities, I drew on the ideological approaches to language and cultural difference delineated by Guerra (2016a) “as a continuum with a monolingual/monocultural approach at one end, a multilingual/multicultural approach in the middle, and a translingual/transcultural approach at the other end” (p. 229), based on Horner et al. (2011)’s understanding of language ideologies as responses to linguistic difference (p. 306). Rather than being mutually exclusive, Guerra sees adapting from each approach as being a matter of degree, dependent on one’s translingual/transcultural literacy. In this dissertation, the findings of my study suggest a prism through which to understand this continuum as a spectrum of orientations that vie for the attention of multilingual and monolingual students. It is through this reconciliation of approaches to language difference with peer review collaboration that I, along with incorporating Pratt’s (1991) understanding of communal spaces as cultural “contact zone” (p. 39), develop the concept of the continuum of ideological responses to language difference as representing a spectrum of ideologies toward linguistic diversity that can in themselves be a layer of resources that participants call on to communicate their meaning. This study further explains the theoretical framework to help conduct peer review so that it can reach out more pertinently to participants involved.

**Research Questions**

My research questions were:

1. What are first-year composition (FYC) students’ understandings of language difference and how do they impact peer review collaboration in a mainstream FYC
class?

(2) How do these FYC students implement responses toward language difference in their practice of peer review?

**Research Methodology**

My methodology accorded with a participant observation qualitative study research design (Hatch, 2002, p. 22). In contrast to full-fledged ethnography, participant observation studies are more targeted; with their emphasis on factors manifested through the work of individuals with each other, participant observation focuses on the elements at work regarding how participants’ varying approaches to language difference play out in peer review workshops. Since I took actions, including interviewing the study subjects and making myself available as an optional resource for tutoring, my role was not strictly passive. I positioned myself between the definitions for passive to moderate participation on the continuum of involvement that Hatch cites (2002, p. 76) from Spradley (1980).

Taking into account the various student perspectives in play, the confluence of data sources through multifaceted factors and variables gathered through a participant observation study seemed more strongly resonant to juggling the perspectives involved in studying the differing needs of a mainstream composition classroom integrating ELLs. The methodological opening in looking at these interests was filled in with an inclusive assessment of data sources to attempt to determine through a sociocultural lens the effect of language ideologies in tangible practice. These sources consisted of answers to e-mail question forms on prior experiences of peer review; peer review responses in the form of drafts, revisions, and final drafts; as well as observations of workshops; and semi-structured interviews, both of relevant workshop participants and their instructor.
I conducted interpretive thematic content analysis, coding and analyzing data from interviews, looking for themes based on patterns that emerged from each research participant’s self-reported responses to e-mail question forms on prior experiences of peer review; their drafts, revisions, and final paper; and my peer review workshop field note observations. For the purposes of this project, interpretive analysis seemed most useful as it constitutes an organized “framework” to “apply the processes [of analysis] directly, modify them to suit different preferences, or adjust them to suit individual studies” (Hatch, 2002, p.180). As an ELL who myself immigrated into the U.S., I understand the necessity of assisting students to process their perspectives in different situations. Approaching experiences from an interpretivist paradigm permits qualitative researchers to understand these perspectives.

Significance

To contribute to the preparation of college students for the communicative experiences they have lying ahead of them, this study researched how students in an ELL-integrated mainstream first-year composition class collaborated to manage their approaches to language difference in their perspectives on their peers’ feedback and their own responses to peers’ writing in review workshops. In particular, the classroom studied included multilingual and monolingual individuals speaking English, at a school with a Writing Fellows program component through which an undergraduate peer consultant from the institution’s Writing Center is embedded in the work of the course. Studying peer review integrating linguistically diverse learners is significant due to its implications for all writers.

As a recognized site of student collaboration, peer review presents an opportunity to investigate conceptualization of language difference between individuals. This study deepens breadth of information on peer review workshops by focusing on students’ experiences of them
in an ELL-integrated writing class and by exploring the implications of these workshops for students’ perspectives of multilingualism as existing not solely within individuals, but as manifested in the various languages present in the classroom, in accord with translingualism (Canagarajah, 2013b). Such examination of peer review within the field of composition can inform the teaching of writing, with students reflecting on their experiences of the degree of helpfulness and appeal of these workshops, in order to further empower writers with knowledge of the impact of feedback.

My study findings suggest that students collaborating in situations including people of diverse backgrounds bring with them an ability to draw upon their understandings of language difference that they should be encouraged further to employ explicitly and adapt as resources. Furthermore, this study is significant for institutional contexts in which multilingual writers are present, though not necessarily the majority—in other words, where they comprise an ample segment of the population the need for whose inclusion will always be a constant factor. Besides promulgating awareness of what most helps students effectively, the emphasis on the relation of language ideologies to peer review workshops was aimed to uncover information that could better assist faculty to develop teaching techniques for the context of the multilingual-speaking focus population, as pedagogical concerns send a message to the larger community regarding what the field of composition sees as the communicative capabilities individuals need to lead successful lives in the connected world of the 21st century.

My interest in this project is influenced by my position as a compositionist teaching writing at a college serving multilingual speakers of English. Examining the language ideologies at work during peer review workshops in a mainstream first-year composition classroom integrating multilinguals and monolinguals can aid in the increase of students’ ability to write
critically through language that engages people’s differences and similarities, a trait crucial toward processing of intercultural experiences and impact on learning. In large part, by the time students reach college, they have been approaching language use as a way to express themselves throughout their formative years, so it is the job of composition teachers to get them to cultivate explicitly knowledge regarding approaching and responding to language difference, thereby deepening their linguistic sophistication of how they make meaning from their exchange of ideas. Students will need such awareness to communicate effectively with the people they will come across on their educational journey, and with those they will come into contact with over the course of their lives.

Outline of the Coming Chapters

Chapter II reviews the scholarly literature within which this study is contextualized. Building on Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory for comprehending collaborative learning (1962; 1978), this research complicates it by providing insight through an interpretivist paradigm into how participating students experience and are affected by language difference in peer workshops, notably the perspectives of those in groups featuring members of diverse linguistic backgrounds. After having elaborated the problem area, I bring into focus Guerra’s positing of a continuum for ideological approaches to language and cultural difference as a framework through which I conceptualize the study and my understanding of it as a productively meaning-making spectrum of responses that can be capitalized on to cultivate a translingual disposition, explicated by Canagarajah (2013c) as invoking a cooperative version of Pratt’s (1991) visualizing of communal spaces as cultural “contact zone”—or spaces where different cultures collaborate successfully with one another—and supplemented by Canagarajah’s (2018a) explanation of semiotic resources.
Chapter III lays out elements of my interpretivist qualitative methodology for researching how students’ understandings of language difference are situated to influence their language use and of their relation to that of others’ language use, during peer review workshop experiences in an ELL-integrating mainstream first-year composition course, including researcher perspective, methodological approach, research context, research design, data collection procedures, data analysis procedures, ethical concerns, and limitations. Data sources included elicited writing in the response to e-mail question forms on prior experiences of peer review, and writing done for the course, namely peer review responses/drafts/revisions/final drafts, along with semi-structured interviews of student participants and their instructor.

Chapter IV presents in-depth the data on five study participants in contact situations consisting of peer groups in a mainstream first-year composition course featuring linguistically diverse students that were studied for how they disrupted, developed, and/or confirmed student preconceptions of language practices. This is proceeded by an interpretive analysis of the following sets of themes emerging from the information: the extent to which participants approached peer review as a space of learning through their understandings of language difference, the resulting degree of judgment on each other’s work, and the importance of individual’s ownership of writing; directness of expression, tact, and empathy with which they implemented language difference understandings responding to others’ work; and language difference understandings in collaboration responding to peer review feedback, taking a range of forms. This last set, of language difference understandings in collaboration responding to peer review feedback, was determined by the context of which ideological approach to language difference participants were using as a resource in how they understood linguistic diversity as reflected in their peer review practices, drawn from the framework of the responses that
comprise what Guerra (2016a) describes as a continuum of ideological approaches to language and cultural difference.

Chapter V elaborates on how the study findings answer the research questions along with implications of and recommendations suggested by the data for teaching of linguistically diverse students, as well as directions for further research. In doing so, I discuss the themes gleaned from the data compiled from the study participants, and how dividing them into participants’ understandings of language difference; their implementation of language difference understandings in response to peers’ work; and their language difference understandings in collaboration provides a conceptualization of peer review as a recursive process of communicating through exchanging ideas that can be adapted toward cultivating a translingual disposition.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Overview

This chapter provides a frame of reference to set a suitable scope for my project bringing to the forefront the ideological approaches to language difference of students in peer review workshops taking place in an English-language mainstream first-year composition class integrating linguistically diverse students. Encompassing various strands, the literature on sociocultural theory in language learning is reviewed in regard to how participating students experience and are affected by language difference in peer workshops, notably the perspectives of those in groups featuring members of diverse linguistic backgrounds. In presenting students’ ideas of language difference in peer review among multilingual English language learners (ELLs) and the connection of their ideas toward language practice during peer review in ELL-integrated classes, the study I conducted builds on existing work into the factors that multilingual students draw on through collaboration, described in the literature to emphasize the results of the social situations of peer review workshops. In contrast, a problem area needing further research is students’ participation in peer review workshops occurring in an integrated mainstream first-year composition course. As part of a sociocultural theory-oriented peer review process, and in regard to how the attitudes and emotions they bring to it are harnessed through their responsiveness to language difference expressing different language ideologies while carrying out collaborative activities, such workshop participants reflect the extent to which they display Horner et al.’s (2011) elaboration of translanguaging as being “about the disposition of openness and inquiry that people take toward language and language differences” (p. 311). According to
Leonard (2014):

Researchers in writing and rhetoric studies have set out to describe multilingual writers’ resources—the knowledge, skills, and experiences they draw on when writing…But often this research focuses on writers’ knowledge rather than their rhetorical activities—what their literate resources are rather than how they are used. (p.231)

The objective of this project was to study the collaboration in the activities of student participants during peer workshops by supplementing previous research with a conceptual understanding of how, whether, and to what extent monolingual and multilingual peer review participants bridge language difference, through looking at the conducting of workshops in a mainstream ELL-integrating first-year composition class.

I synthesize the major findings of my review of the literature on these issues in separate sections for each below. The ideas at issue are useful to delineate due to their relevance to my research questions. These questions are:

(1) What are first-year composition (FYC) students’ understandings of language difference and how do they impact peer review collaboration in a mainstream FYC class?

(2) How do these FYC students implement responses toward language difference in their practice of peer review?

As will be seen, keeping these questions in mind throughout my literature review helped conceptualize a framework for studying the ideological practice of language difference in a tangible context.

In particular, to explain why a study of this kind is needed, below I detail what has been written on how the sociocultural aspects underlying peer review function pedagogically in a first-
year composition class integrating linguistically diverse writers. For such classes integrating multilingual ELLs and monolingual students, peer response groups can be the vehicles whereby composition students learn to approach feedback from and to a variety of audiences, through their experiences of workshops.

The conditions calling for research on workshops in this context is evident: the Institute of International Education, as illustration, assesses there were over 670,000 international college students in the United States in the academic year of 2008-09; however, this figure does not indicate the number of second language writers in the country, and added to that is the fact that international students can be monolingual speakers of English, and students living in the U.S. can be multilingual (as cited in Jordan, 2012, p. 4). The heterogeneous reality of the U.S. population necessitates attempting to explore how diversity is incorporated into composition pedagogical practices, through resources of peer review workshops in a mainstream first-year composition class integrating linguistically diverse students.

For the southeastern U.S. region where this study’s focal population was researched, the multilingual population is particularly impacted by the national trend toward growth of the Latino/a populace. Not only does Guerra (2004) point out that this segment of the U.S. population in 1995 reached 10.2%, but “the U.S Census Bureau and immigration scholars currently project that by the year 2050, 24.5 percent of this country’s population will be Latina/o” (p.9). Since then, both the current and projection estimates have grown: Latino/as comprised 17.3% of the U.S. population in 2014 (Stepler & Brown, 2016) and, according to Nuñez and Murakami-Ramalho (2012), over 20% of its undergraduate academic population, along with setting to become the largest-growing minority group, at 30%, by 2050, more broadly.
Thus, Latino/as’ increase as the largest-growing minority population makes research necessary into working with and across linguistic diversity, so this literature review highlights the work that has looked at students’ understandings of language difference in carrying out of peer review workshops in multilingual speaker-populated classes of second language students. It then delves into their understandings of language difference during peer review in a diverse ELL-integrating mainstream first-year composition classroom, after which I put students’ understandings of language difference into greater perspective by reviewing relevant material about sociocultural theory and peer review; on the relation of sociocultural theory to attitudes, emotions, and responses to language difference; and regarding language difference in diverse environments.

This is followed by a conceptual framework, emerging from the ideas synthesized during the course of my review, of translingual practice as part of an ideological spectrum for responding to language difference, consisting of rhetorical resources for conveying and understanding meaning drawn on and adapted by students. As Horner et al. (2011) suggest, the complexity of language use is found in its variety not only in multilingual manifestations, but in monolingual diversity of dialects and cross-cutting employment of conventions and ideas about, and through, language in multiple forms (p. 303). Enumerating responses to difference in language, they define the purpose of monolingualism as being “to eradicate difference in the name of achieving correctness” (p. 306); of multilingualism as being “to distance itself from the eradicationist approach by acknowledging differences in language use; codifying these; and granting individuals a right to them” (p. 306); and of translingualism as being the viewing of “language not as a barrier to overcome or as a problem to manage, but as a source for producing
meaning in writing, speaking, reading and listening” (p. 303). Difference, instead of constituting mere “interference” is intrinsic to individual language practice (Horner et al. 2011, p. 303).

Next, then, I will review the research on students’ understandings of language difference in peer review among multilingual ELLs. In examining this earlier work in the following section and proceeding with other related literature, I ground later theoretical discussion.

**Students’ Understandings of Language Difference in Peer Review Among Multilingual English Language Learners**

The studies in this section serve as the foundation to emphasize the importance of collaborative learning to peer review and how it has been approached in diverse environments. This emphasis lays the groundwork for a sustained look at Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory (1962; 1978), and a consideration of how it necessitates incorporating Horner et al.’s (2011) enumeration of responses to language difference (monolingualism/multilingualism/translingualism, described above) as stances to conceptualize language ideologies in collaboration. By looking at ideas of language difference brought to bear by individual students within peer review groups conducted among multilingual ELLs and how they play out in those circumstances, I also mean to contextualize how this dissertation expands on the research that has been conducted on how participating students experience and are affected by such difference in peer workshops.

To begin, in their microethnography of three peer review groups composed of ESL writing students, Nelson and Carson (1998) examined preconceptions of students who—though preferring negative and teacher feedback and in agreement over what comments were ineffective—disagreed about the extent that peer review should be concerned with language difference. In particular, the understandings of participating Chinese and Spanish speakers contrasted starkly (p. 120). Substantive feedback that led to tangible results in revision were
deemed effective (pp. 122, 125-126). However, the Chinese speakers placed a greater emphasis on consensus among group members while the Spanish speakers focused on textual issues (pp. 126-127). For the purposes of my study, these findings pointed to the need to investigate participants’ approaches to language difference as applied to collaboration and how the implementation of responses to writing in a diverse environment impacted their practice of peer review activities.

Previously, Mangelsdorf and Schlumberger (1992) delved into students’ stances on written language difference of their peers that informed their feedback, having had ESL students respond to a writing sample from another of the authors’ former ESL students, to explore factors including student attitudes to the work (pp. 236-238). They found that most students took a prescriptive, or corrective, stance; with the collaborative, or writer-oriented, and interpretive, or paraphrasing, stances coming in second and third, respectively (pp. 240-242). Reviewers with a collaborative stance were more sensitive to issues of content and rhetorical context (p. 248). Suggesting that promoting an environment that fosters this stance would help efforts to heighten sensitivity devoted to concerns approaching the writing situation from the perspective of how it conveys meaning, these findings called for further study of how responses to writing impact the practice of peer review activities that take place in the diverse setting of an ELL-integrating mainstream first-year composition class.

Tackling the issue of preconceptions toward language difference from the perspective of seeing what the distinctions are, if any, between how ESL teachers and peers respond to student writing, Devenney (1989) had focused on three courses (pp. 78-79). Teachers and peers were found to differ most significantly in their evaluation of grammar and mechanics, and their responses of “personal identification,” with peers making more positively evaluative comments
of the latter type (pp. 84-85). As for the former, Devenney pointed out that teachers’ greater grammatical and mechanical emphasis in responding may have involved their summative stance, as opposed to peers’ more formative stance (p. 85). In terms of its implications for teaching, Devenney writes that we should “assume students’ approaches to writing make sense by looking for the commonalities as well as the differences between teacher and student [evaluative and responding] discourse communities and not to underestimate what second language writers can do” (p. 88). Part of what I undertook in my study, then, was a closer investigation into settings where student peer communities operated.

Also distinguishing preconceptions of language difference in the form of their approach to teacher and peer feedback, Yang, Badger and Yu (2006) showed that while English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students from China incorporated revisions based on teacher feedback more than that of peers, the majority of both (though less so based on teachers’ feedback than peers’) were used toward revising effectively, with students who adopted peer feedback making more global changes, and students who adopted teacher feedback making more surface changes (pp. 188-189, 191-192). The positive reception of peers’ comments as evidenced by proactive consideration of their feedback by these EFL students showed they found it helpful alongside teacher feedback based on the students’ adopting of input from peers who are students themselves (pp. 192-193). In terms of the problem area I am studying, these findings suggested how conveying an inclusive perspective to students, by emphasizing writing as a collaborative process that involves taking comments both from their instructor and their classmates, is integral to the pedagogical context of peer review workshops.

In their (2012) review of studies conducted on collaboration in writing and feedback, Wigglesworth and Storch write, “For many second language learners, the experience of writing
with other learners in a group or as partners can be a daunting one” (p. 365). Citing Leki (2001), they state that “In these situations, they may be faced with working with more competent language users, and they may be concerned about their ability to contribute, and about the attitudes they may encounter from others in the group” (Wigglesworth and Storch, 2012, p.365). There is a need for study of the relation of attitudes to students’ participation in the peer review workshops of a linguistically diverse learner-integrated mainstream first-year composition course.

Garner and Hadingham’s (2019) article looked at this relationship between attitudes and participation in workshops among multilingual ELLs, making peer response anonymous in the context of eight classes of undergraduate students at a Tokyo-located private university. Comprised of 90 participants from across both intermediate- and advanced-level courses (p. 106), the findings of their action research study showed “that there was an increase in the mean number of proposed revisions” as a result of anonymous workshops that distinguished feedback given identifiably from that given anonymously (p. 108). Also, “for those students researched, the intermediate-level students had a higher tendency to suggest revisions when the method was anonymized, while the advanced-level students’ tendency to propose revisions was largely unchanged” (p. 109). According to Garner and Hadingham, this suggests a correlation between confidence of less-proficient L2 students in their own abilities at providing helpful feedback and their willingness to do so dependent on their degree of comfort, borne out by their other finding after inquiring about students’ attitudes toward feedback given identifiably and that given anonymously, “that anonymizing the peer response process allows East Asian students to feel more at ease” (pp. 109, 113). Observable facilitation of learning that peer review provides can
serve to highlight student sensitivities regarding approaches toward language difference encapsulated by their giving of response to the variety of feedback resulting from peer review.

In this vein of examining student sensitivities, Zhang’s (1995) study on affective advantage of peer feedback—in particular, whether they preferred peer feedback, revising on their own, or teacher feedback—reported findings of 81 students enrolled in an ESL course. The results showed 93.8% preferred teacher feedback over peer feedback or no feedback, and 60.5% preferred peer feedback over no feedback (p. 216). The majority of students who preferred teacher feedback over others’ feedback was larger than the majority preferring peers’ feedback over no feedback. Zhang notes preferences for teachers’ feedback would have been less, “[i]f power differential were a valid argument for students’ perceiving teacher-directed feedback as oppressive”—the stance that emerges from the L1 literature on the process method of writing in favor of peer feedback, and which Zhang regards the results of his study as refuting (p. 217).

Studying how response to language difference factors into these relationships served to test Zhang’s hypothesis further.

Zhang’s (1995) hypothesis calls for more study because of its contrast with the findings reported by Jacobs et al. (1998), regarding feedback, of 121 students enrolled in an ESL course, concerning whether they preferred peer review as one form of feedback, or not. Their results potentially contradicted Zhang’s (1995) findings in a way attributed to a flaw in Zhang’s methodology, with Jacobs et al. showing 93% preferred peer review (1998, pp. 307-308).

Zhang’s methodology was presented as flawed because it “created a false dichotomy by giving students a forced choice ...between only teacher feedback or only peer and self-directed feedback” (p. 308). However, in his (1999) response to methodological concerns about his (1995) study finding that second language students’ preference for peer feedback was less than
teacher feedback preference, Zhang writes that he was misinterpreted as not providing enough choice, though he did ask students to respond after they had also received feedback from teachers and self-evaluated (1999, p. 323).

Nevertheless, Jacobs et al. (1998) emphasized as flawed in Zhang’s either/or-style methodology a lack of putting peer feedback in perspective as part of an ongoing process, and the former included a participant’s quote espousing what seems to be a contradictory appreciation of approaches to language difference, informed both by a greater emphasis on substance of the content, and by a concern with correctness: “[peers] can give some suggestions by their own experience. On the other hand, they may not provide an absolute correct improvement, thus, teachers advices are also necessary” (p. 312). In doing so, Jacobs et al. (1998) provide a space to examine how students’ understandings of language difference influence and impact their participation in workshops as well as whether their experiences bear out their preconceptions—especially in ELL-integrated groups. The way that students’ understanding of language difference was implemented in their practice of peer review was highlighted by Jacobs et al. (1998) in their study, which they state “can serve the building of knowledge about how to write as well as the construction of knowledge about the topics of their writing and the contexts in which these are situated” (p. 308). These findings indicated that examining students’ reports on their experiences of actually using peer review in a given classroom setting, then, for a specific assignment, as well as how their self-reported understanding impacted these workshops, would be productive to aid in greater insight into their approaches toward language difference.

Studying these preconceptions in peer review workshops conducted in a class integrating linguistically diverse learners with the aid of informational resources, such as asking students to
recount their viewpoints and their experiences served to explore implications for applying conceptions about monolingual students to all writers, an approach which Zhang (1995) problematized. Moreover, a convergence of data sources assisted with understanding the research area of students’ understandings of language difference in peer review workshops of an ELL-integrated mainstream composition course, mitigating concerns analogous to those Jacobs et al. (1998) had with what they understood to be the “forced choice” of Zhang’s (1995) study, by presenting student perspectives in wider context. Pointedly, though Zhang stated his finding ultimately did not contradict that peer review was preferred as a feedback type, but was instead consonant with prior second language research in that it contradicted peer feedback as more preferred than teachers’ (p. 325), Zhang also writes: “Future studies are needed to determine what reasons, real or perceived, are behind the preferences” (1995, p. 220). Being mindful of this need for detailed description around individuals’ experiences of peer review feedback, linked particularly to their approaches toward language difference based on understandings of linguistic diversity in collaborative practice, I will next sift more broadly through studies looking at this type of collaborative peer group in ELL-integrated composition classrooms, for similar elaboration on the need to conceptualize students’ understandings of language difference during workshops.

**Students’ Understandings of Language Difference During Peer Review in English Language Learner-Integrated Classes**

Attention needs to be paid to the consequences that their preconception of language difference has on the social process of students working together in the collaborative participation of peer review workshops in an ELL-integrated mainstream first-year composition class. To this end, Matsuda and Silva’s (1999) shedding of light on the interactions between non-
native English speakers (NNESs) and native English speaker (NESs) student writers is instructive. The authors chronicled the offering of a cross-cultural course as a placement option for first-year composition students at Purdue University. In their piece, Matsuda and Silva clarified that segregating second language writers into composition classes of their own is problematic insofar as getting these NNESs ready for NES environments (p. 18), but that offering the cross-cultural class presumed there would be students who wanted to be placed in a course devoted to these concerns (p. 20).

The authors discussed a Korean student named Park, who “learned to turn his initial anxiety into a productive tension, which enabled him to learn from his US classmates” by coming to realize that, along with his writing needing to be understood in an American context, he could utilize the opportunity to review his NES classmates’ writing to broaden his own linguistic and cultural literacy (p. 24). On his own, Park adapted to valorize his experience of how he understood language difference in receiving as well as giving peer feedback. In addition, the authors pointed out the logistics surrounding integrating second language writers into mixed composition courses, including a dearth of effective pedagogical practices to help cross-cultural communication due to lack of preparation by composition instructors (pp. 16-18). The need for development of these practices, alongside the imperative of channeling emotion positively, informed the concerns of my study on how peer review participants engage their approaches to language difference.

Highlighting students’ understandings of language difference further legitimates the peer review environmental context as benefiting learning mutually insofar as participants draw on their understandings as a resource to make meaning. Zhu’s (2001) case study of mixed peer response groups in two composition courses asserts the significance of such collaboration in
courses integrating multilingual and monolingual students (p. 255), yet complicates it. Zhu studies three student groups, each including NESs combined with one ESL student, responding to peers’ writing, looking at their interactions pertaining to taking turns; function of oral peer feedback; and areas of overlap along with differences in written comments of native-born and ESL writers (pp. 254-255). In conducting the research, Zhu’s examination of written feedback “revealed that participants did not always discuss all of their written comments during oral response. This was particularly true for the ESL students” (p. 259), who did not have as much opportunity to respond orally as did their counterparts (p. 271). Tellingly, Zhu discovered that ESL and NES student writers provided a comparable amount of global comments in written form, focusing on the need for more concrete information (p. 268). While the NES writers also tended to focus more on “evaluative” and local concerns, as well as to provide corrections on peers’ drafts, in contrast, “All [the ESL writers’] comments, except for one, were global ... [and the] non-native speakers ... did not offer corrective feedback on their peers’ drafts” (pp. 268-269). Based on this, Zhu concluded that more effort be devoted to ensuring all students have equal opportunities to contribute to the group, underscoring the importance of written feedback in such interactions and of training students for them (pp. 271-272).

Explaining the positive effects regarding why it is that multilingual writers were just as able as their NES peers to respond to writing globally, Zhu referred to Alister Cumming’s notion of “writing expertise” to speculate that their capability for making global comments may have been due to the inherent knowledge of the writing process practiced in their first language, but Zhu stated that it could also have been due to how “the ESL students may have felt more comfortable focusing on the global rather than the local, language-related issues in their peers’ writing because of their own developing proficiency in L2” (p. 271). The qualification by Zhu of
the data, after explaining it through Cumming’s conceptualization, appears to call for further investigation of how students draw on and construct their understandings of language difference to respond to writing matters contextually and mechanically, respectively, in conducting peer review. Indeed, I found it vital to study how students engaged collaboratively with each other’s understanding based on language difference.

This outlook framing as influenced by language difference the collaborative assistance students can give each other is apparent in Jordan’s (2012) observations of the conception of language practices that a Chinese-speaking multilingual student named Melanie brings to her work in peer review sessions during a mainstream first-year composition class (p. 76). According to Jordan, the strength of Melanie’s feedback lay in “meta-discursive sensitivity[:] ... For the most part, Melanie did not seem to address grammar, focusing instead on connections between evidence and claims as well as on transitions and other meta-discursive features” (p. 77). The global emphasis was a quality her classmates appeared to appreciate, along with her balancing between positive and negative comments (pp. 77-78).

Jordan studied as well the computer-based online interactions during peer review between students in two sections of composition—one “mainstream,” one “multilingual”—piloted as an “intercultural” composition class which he co-taught at Pennsylvania State University (pp. 22, 94, 98-99, 102). Part of his reasoning in having these “cross-class groups” take place electronically was that “it would encourage students to integrate writing more closely into their interactions, since there was no way for them to interact online without writing” (p. 102).

Another notable aspect was the prioritization in feedback that electronic peer response led to on the part of the students in the mainstream section, such as having to focus on the global
issues before shifting to the most grievous error patterns, and “attempting to determine rhetorical context and purpose from the writing they saw and using that to gauge which mechanical issues were most relevant” (p. 104). Most of the comments made by the multilingual users referred to the need for support and idea development, which, as Jordan points out, is the type of feedback that lends itself effectively to peer review (pp. 80, 106-110). In fact, according to Jordan, when the semester ended, “many in both sections suggested that we include more opportunities for them to interact, especially for purposes of peer review” (p. 112). This inclination is understandable as it is important for facilitating learning with the objectives of easing academic preparedness and of introducing students to arriving at greater insight through communication to prepare them for life in multi-culturally connected 21st-century society.

According to one of the students in Jordan’s mainstream section:

I believe I adjusted some of my papers to expand to a more diverse audience. This was a direction I had never done before, and I found it interesting to write a paper more towards the general public rather than just a specific group. (p. 112)

The benefit of the feedback did seem to go in two ways, at least to an extent. Additionally, Cumming’s interpretation of what constitutes “writing expertise” was singled out, in his reference to Zhu’s study, by Jordan (pp.132-133), as supported by Vivian Cook, who, Jordan writes, “notes psycholinguistic experiments that indicate second language users can detect sentences that are rendered in translation with more accuracy than monolinguals can ... [and] are apt to code-switch—a particularly effective intercultural rhetorical strategy unavailable in the same way to monolinguals” (pp. 12-14). Jordan’s inclusion of code-switching strategies further demonstrated a need for research into the responses of students to such moves, and for potential misunderstandings. As to whether and how linguistically intercultural communication and
strategies impact a peer review situation the ostensible purpose of which is for first- and second-language speakers to cooperate, an interrogation of the preconception of language difference on the part of the involved individuals served to illustrate further implications for how workshops are conducted and unfold in relation to learning.

In considering the dynamics at work in peer review, examination of how collaborative practice is set up shows that “Many instructors’ plans to facilitate student conversations ... are crucial in intercultural composition as a means to put linguistic and other rhetorical competencies into play” (Jordan 2013, p. 133). The interplay of how these competencies shape students’ attitudes toward and perspectives on peer review was prominent in my study of workshops composed of monolingual students and multilingual ELLs in a mainstream first-year composition course integrating linguistically diverse writers. I investigated their effect based on a necessity to look into the role played by their understanding of language difference on the experiences of multilingual and monolingual students in workshops. Their interplay formed students’ responsive understanding of linguistic difference encountered in peer review.

In the next sections, I explore the sociocultural theory underpinning this type of collaboration. This research provided a theoretical lens on understanding peer review workshops conducted in an ELL-integrated first-year composition course as a space for participants to enact responsive feedback drawing on a spectrum of approaches to language difference.

Language Difference and Peer Review in Sociocultural Theory

Vygotskyian sociocultural theory on the efficacy of cognition and collaboration to learning is useful to delve further into for greater clarity on how it influences students’ experiences of responding to language difference in the context of peer review workshops. Vygotsky stressed the relationship of thought and spoken language as a unit comprising meaning
(1962, pp. 3-5). According to Vygotsky, “By unit we mean product of analysis which, unlike elements, retains all the basic properties of the whole and which cannot be further divided without losing them. ... [I]n word meaning … thought and speech unite” (1962, pp. 4-5).

Applying ideas on how communication functions to make meaning during peer review collaboration in an ESL class, Rollinson (2005) states, “Peer feedback, with its potentially high level of responses and interaction between reader and writer can encourage a collaborative dialogue in which two-way feedback is established, and meaning is negotiated” through “highly complex socio-cognitive interactions involving arguing, explaining, clarifying, and justifying” (p. 25). Specifically, I consider important the articulated exchange of ideas to the researching in my study of peer review workshop participants in collaboration during a mainstream first-year composition course integrating linguistically diverse learners, in light of individuals’ understandings of language difference.

For the purposes of this project, peer review emerges as an activity for analysis that can be interpreted as constructed by an individual’s experiences based on a set of social relations. As Vygotsky (1962) writes, “[t]he primary function of speech is communication, social intercourse” (p.6). Likewise in need of further study, writes Vygotsky, are the workings of how writing is learned so it can simultaneously inform an individual worldview, and be informed by one’s surroundings (1978, p. 106). According to Vygotsky, “Verbal thought is not an innate, natural form of behavior but is determined by a historical-cultural process and has specific properties and laws that cannot be found in the natural forms of thought and speech” (1962, p. 51). As Watson-Gegeo (2004), making the case for a language socialization paradigm in second language acquisition, states: “Linguistic concepts, like all other cognitive processes, arise from the embodied nature of human existence and through experience” (p. 333). The study of how
people actualize preconceived notions through relations directly gets at this research project’s object of study: peer review workshops in a mainstream composition class integrating linguistically diverse learners.

Mastery not only of language, but individual experience with it, emerges out of the social conditions within which it is practiced. It is, after all, due to the potential effect that cooperation has on a learner, and the importance of directing student learning to meet developmental needs, that Vygotsky writes, “the notion of a zone of proximal development [ZPD] enables us to propound a new formula, namely that the only ‘good learning’ is that which is in advance of development” (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 91). The quality of the learning in an environment including people of diverse backgrounds therefore merited studying for the ways in which it operationalized Vygotsky’s notion of ZPD. His ideas can be applied to analyzing how students in a first-year composition class integrating linguistically diverse individuals verbalize their conceptualization of language difference, and self-report their experiences in peer review workshops, along with their actions based on such group activity—both during workshops and in their resulting revisions—to examine the roles that their approaches to language difference play in their work. These are what my study was designed to scrutinize.

Addressing the issue of student engagement with each other in regard to activation of another’s ZPD, Ruecker (2011) studied implementation of peer review carried out by foreign language students in Chile, who were fluent in Spanish and English, respectively, and were grouped with peers who spoke the other language (pp. 398-399). In addition to promoting and engaging with dual-language use, the study designed helped domestic and exchange students to interact cross-culturally and to utilize their L1 skills in a mutual and more accurate way (pp. 401-402). According to Ruecker, since students’ common complaint “that they do not receive helpful
comments because their peers are either at or below their writing level” might be due not just to that actually being the case, but to their perceptions that feedback from peers is useless, the “dual-language cross-cultural method of peer review proposed…alleviates problems with activating the ZPD by pairing language learners with fluent speakers of the target language” so “that each member of the pair will feel they are matched with someone who has the skills to make peer review worthwhile” (2011, p. 399). Ruecker’s study thereby focuses on how factors infusing students’ understandings of language difference in peer review situations informed their participation in workshops.

This focus is also especially productive to consider in studying peer review in a first-year composition English class that integrates already speakers of different languages, a context the conducting of research in which Ruecker (2018) also chronicles, based on the results of his interviewing 17 L2 ELLs and surveying 14 L1 English-speaking students, all concerning their experiences in peer review while enrolled in mainstream first-year writing (p. 275). With his study’s purpose being “to better understand the dynamics of linguistically diverse peer review” by “examining student attitudes towards giving and receiving feedback to students of different linguistic backgrounds” (p. 275), he frames his results through the lens of Hollday’s (2005) theory of native speakerism and its effect on ZPD activation (Ruecker, 2018, p. 274). Describing the potential of native speakerism’s bias against NNES instructors as having “an impact on NNES students who have been shown to internalize the belief that they are inferior to NES speakers,” Ruecker elaborates that the former students’ “negative self-perception can become a problem in trying to activate the ZPD”: “Unfortunately, because of native speakerist discourses, NNES writers may not be confident in giving feedback and NES writers are often likely to question the feedback provided by a NNES student” (2018, p. 274). In actuality, the findings of
this study by Ruecker are mixed insofar as the relationship between native speakerism and ZPD activation demonstrated through participants’ extent of acceptance of their roles in giving and receiving feedback.

According to Ruecker (2018), not only were NNES students more anxious during peer review, but they reported feeling that they did not have enough time, and “any problems caused by simple time constraints are exacerbated by the ever-present belief commonly held by NNES students that they are inferior” (pp. 276-277). Nevertheless, “NNES students have the potential to be more helpful peer reviewers than their NES counterparts. … In the present study, a few NES students recognized NNES students’ ability to provide content-based feedback,” as opposed to just grammatical issues (p. 278). Ruecker contextualizes his findings by discussing the consequences of native speakerism on ZPD activation in linguistically diverse peer review as constituting somewhat of a double-edged sword: “NNES students may reach higher levels of development because they feel they are working with ‘more capable peers.’ On the other hand…NES students may perceive their NNES peers as inferior and fail to develop as a result” (2018, p. 279). He then provides strategies to promote the benefits of working in linguistically diverse environments, such as training students to insist on getting clearer feedback based on global concerns of idea development and incorporating means of first responding to peers’ drafts digitally (pp. 279-282), for the objective of helping establish an effective peer review workshop experience in mainstream first-year composition that takes into account students’ approaches and responses productively.

Likewise, my study is concerned with how linguistically diverse students approach and respond to the prospect of giving and receiving peer feedback in a mainstream first-year composition classroom integrating people from linguistically diverse backgrounds. This concern
is why I will now review the literature on how a sociocultural perspective on language can be used to conceptualize attitudes and emotion in respect to understandings of, and responses to, language difference that could impact participation in peer review taking place in integrated mainstream first-year composition.

**Sociocultural Theory, Attitudes and Emotion, and Responses to Language Difference**

Through the lens of sociocultural theory, attitudes and emotion that may affect peer review participation in a linguistically-diverse integrated mainstream first-year composition course can be conceptualized systematically as responses to language difference. According to Liyanage and Canagarajah (2019), “After a period theorizing the role of cognition in teaching and learning languages, the English language teaching (ELT) profession is turning to much-needed analysis of emotions” (p.1). Framing stances toward language difference as examples of expressing how one is affected by being “situated amid historical and structural circumstances” (p.2), my study posits peer feedback in a first-year composition class integrating linguistically diverse learners to comprise an individual’s form of response to constituted norms, heeding Liyanage and Canagarajah’s call to place “language politics and pedagogy in TESOL” within a “situated understanding” of “the ways in which different communities manage language contact” (p.22). To delve into this idea, I will first explore Swain’s connection between cognition and emotion in L2 learning (2013, p. 198).

Swain (2013) began by pointing out that cognition, or elements including “thinking, knowing, representing knowledge, attending, processing information, reasoning, problem-solving and decision-making,” had not only been researched on its own, but emphasized, in the second-language acquisition (SLA) literature (p. 196). Swain attributed this emphasis to how cognition and emotion have been framed as separate since “the birth of rationalism,” along with
the difficulty of measuring emotions as more than intrinsically individual, or causal variables in which “emotions influence language learning” so that “the reverse relationship, that language learning may influence emotions, is rarely considered” (p. 197). Certainly, this relationship would also implicate understandings of language difference to inform the social circumstances in which the language learning takes place—which, as I understand it, made peer review workshops opportunities to come to a fuller understanding of sociocultural theory-oriented dynamics at work.

Similarly seeking a fuller understanding of these dynamics, Swain (2013) turned to Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory. Examining how it could be applied to the dialogue of two French-language students, which Swain had looked at prior through the lens of the output hypothesis, or “an information-processing, cognitive perspective” (p. 198), the latter took a sociocultural perspective at three levels: stressing “collaborative dialogue”; distinguishing between “private speech and social speech”; and applying emotions, respectively (p. 199). Swain described the output hypothesis as claiming that language practice aids speakers significantly in noticing and learning to work toward self-addressing language gaps—instances of which she provided from the dialogue as examples (p. 199). In contrast, Swain writes, sociocultural theory posits that “language production ‘mediates language learning’, and so it IS learning,” along with framing language as a “goal-oriented, tool-mediated activity,” rather than a matter of “hypothesis testing” through the sociocultural use of language as “both process and product” in a collaborative attitude toward the approach of dialogue (pp. 200-201).

Like Swain, Norton (2013) employed her study participants’ attitudes to detail what she lay out as a socially oriented goal that should underlie SLA research: “SLA theorists need to address how relations of power in the social world affect learners’ access to the target language
community; learners who may be marginalized in one site may be highly valued in another” (p.2). Specifically, in her study of immigrant language learners in Canada, she partly employed her participants’ reflections in the form of diary entries to elaborate on a notion of investment that elucidates the implications outside forces can have on the language learner. Distinguishing investment from motivation, Norton theorized a sociological dynamic at work in how a learner reacts emotionally at the prospect of acquiring a language: “a learner can be highly motivated to learn a language, but not necessarily invested in a given set of language practices. However, a learner who is invested...would most likely be a motivated language learner” (p.3). Thus providing a framework for her research on identity, Norton proceeds in her study to place its significance within the wider angle of “sociocultural diversity” (p. 46). In her view, the social context in which learning occurs, with its influence on learner motivation in the form of investment in outwardly responsive and directed goals, is a main concern.

In particular, Norton’s distinction of instrumental motivation from investment sees the former as implying “a unitary, fixed, and ahistorical language learner who desires access to material resources that are the privilege of target language speakers,” and the latter as implying “the language learner as having a complex social history and multiple desires. ... not only exchanging information with target language speakers, but...constantly organizing and reorganizing a sense of who they are and how they relate to the social world” (2013, p.50). The investment Norton advocates extends to having learners understand language as a system of conventions so as “to explore whose interests these rules serve...with reference to inequitable relations of power between interlocutors” (p. 55). In other words, power relations are intrinsic to how language learners interact, in that they establish parameters within which people behave, and from which emotional appeals emanate as a result.
Yet models of SLA, in Norton’s (2013) view, neglect social reality (p. 147). To illustrate: they do not take power relations into account (p. 154). This is the case, states Norton, with Krashen’s affective filter model. Emphasizing outside affective factors involved in second language acquisition, Krashen (1987) lists such emotions as individual motivation, self-confidence, and anxiety as significant to humans’ “language acquisition device,” writing:

The Affective Filter hypothesis captures the relationship between affective variables and the process of second language acquisition by positing that acquirers vary with respect to the strength or level of their Affective Filters. Those whose attitudes are not optimal for second language acquisition will not only tend to seek less input, but they will also have a high or strong Affective Filter—even if they understand the message, the input will not reach that part of the brain responsible for language acquisition, or the language acquisition device. Those with attitudes more conducive to second language acquisition will not only seek and obtain more input, they will also have a lower or weaker filter. ... The Affective Filter hypothesis...claims that the effect of affect is “outside” the language acquisition device proper. It still maintains that input is the primary causative variable in second language acquisition, affective variables acting to impede or facilitate the delivery of input to the language acquisition device. The filter hypothesis explains why it is possible for an acquirer to obtain a great deal of comprehensible input, and yet stop short...of the native speaker level... (pp. 31-32)

For Krashen (1987), the “picking-up” of a language at a competently communicative level that constitutes acquisition, in contrast to the more formal linguistic knowledge necessitated by learning (p. 10), can be adjusted within the second language classroom setting to account for the
Affective Filter, by reducing external factors contributing to anxiety and by helping in the increasing of comprehensible input (pp. 31, 58).

Moreover, according to Krashen (1988), hypothetically, “much of what is termed [language] aptitude is directly related to conscious learning, while attitudinal factors may be more closely linked to acquisition,” so that while they both influence language proficiency, they do not interrelate (p. 19). Affective attitude promotes language intake and conversational use (p. 21), due to its impact on such traits as the above-mentioned motivation and self-confidence, as well as on empathy and approach to classroom and teacher (p. 23). For Krashen, attitude is central to acquisition to the extent that, as he states, “We might even suggest that one characteristic of the ideal second language class is one in which aptitude will not predict differences in student achievement...because efficient acquisition is taking place for all students” (pp. 38-39). Paradoxically, despite Krashen’s emphasis on individual motivation, it is clear that it matters very much to SLA the type of environment in which students are situated.

Especially in regard to Krashen’s “understanding of how affective variables interact with the larger social context,” Norton (2013) posits “that a language learner’s affective filter cannot be understood apart from his or her relationship to larger, and frequently inequitable social structures” (p. 156). In her critique of Krashen, it would appear that not only is affect in the way he articulates it lacking in socially contextual depth, but that part of what is missing is a recognition of relational inequity due to variety of understandings of language difference.

In my dissertation study, while I considered how experiences of peer review workshops affected integrated students as a reflection of their social context, my concern was in the way students collaboratively engaged their degree of investment in giving and receiving feedback to shape responses to language difference, through the lens of sociocultural theory. Nevertheless, it
is important to note Norton’s view that language learning is “a complex social practice, rather than an abstract, internalized skill” (2013, p. 166). That is why “the language teacher needs to understand how learners respond to these opportunities to practice and the extent to which learners create or resist opportunities to interact with target language speakers” (p. 174).

Continuing on this train of thought, I approach peer response as comprised neither solely of individual feeling nor just in reaction to outside circumstances, but as a social collaboration.

According to Watson-Gegeo (2004), such an approach to the socialization of language helps shift

multiculturalism…from the rather superficial and anemic treatment of cultural variability to a serious and intensive consideration of how our perceptions of the world are shaped by the interaction between our embodied experience in the world and the culturally based ontology/ies and epistemology/ies into and through which we are all socialized in the course of learning our first language(s) and cultures(s)…; and then (re)socialized or partially (re)socialized in the process of learning a second or third language and culture. (p. 342)

However, I add to understanding of a diverse collaborative situation a sociocultural theory-inflected view of Norton’s language investment, to help determine how individuals put their attitudinally influenced understandings of language difference into practical effect, and how students approach their participation in peer review workshops in an ELL-integrated composition class to imbue it with meaning.

**Language Difference in Diverse Learning Environments**

Because this dissertation explores how responses to language difference inform collaboration of participants in peer review for the purposes of better understanding how such
responses are practiced in diverse learning environments, this section will delve into issues of how meaning is made in these environments, making an argument for a translingual understanding of these learning spaces. This understanding is due in part to the need of participants for multicultural literacies through which to employ attitudes and emotion in the form of responses to language difference as semiotic resources toward collaboratively communicative ends.

Canagarajah (2013b), referring to the manner in which translingualism functions communicatively to bridge understanding, argues that a dialogical focus on language practice results in meaning emerging from situational conventional norms arising from contextual use: the term translingual enables a consideration of communicative competence as not restricted to predefined meanings of individual languages, but the ability to merge different language resources in situated interactions for new meaning construction. Competence is not an arithmetical addition of the resources of different languages, but the transformative capacity to mesh their resources for creative new forms and meanings. (pp. 1-2)

Also, Canagarajah states that “various situational norms and labels evolve from translingual English practices” (2013c, p. 70), giving insight into factors underlying understandings of language difference heading into, and subsequent experiences and results of, peer review in a mainstream first-year composition class integrating linguistically diverse writers.

Since this study looks at how the participation in peer review workshops during a mainstream first-year composition course of students from diverse language backgrounds emerges to guide, and is guided by, understandings of language differences, Canagarajah’s (2013c) elaboration of translingualism serves that purpose by invoking a cooperative version of
Pratt’s (1991) theory of “contact zone negotiations.” In her seminal piece, Pratt defines contact zones as spaces where different cultures interact with each other. Relating them to the notion of community comprised of members working cooperatively on the same terms, she calls for a reimagining of communal spaces consisting of “speakers ... from different classes or cultures” (p. 38). According to Canagarajah, instead of merely being “conflictual and stressful ... [w]e are finding ... that in many such [intercultural] spaces people also collaborate and help each other succeed in their interactions” (2013c, pp. 18, 30). Besides learning emerging from a set of individual practices, due to the dialogical focus of translingual writing, Canagarajah states that teacher development should emphasize “the classroom as an ecologically rich environment, with resources that students can turn into ‘affordances’ for learning,” and “a contact zone” (2016, pp. 267-268). In this manner of understanding, viewing collaboration through a sociocultural lens, composition students bring to peer review groups individual factors such as understandings of language difference that impact their experience.

For instance, according to Rollinson (2005), one manner in which peer reviewers skeptical of the value of the enterprise as a learning process might be encouraged to reflect on their stance to make use of it productively is to be taught as to “why peers at the same level can give helpful feedback,” including being cognizant that individuals exhibit a variety of areas in which they are better at writing than others, and cultivating a mindset of ownership toward one’s writing by defending particular efforts to their peers or by inviting their peers to defend their own efforts (p.27).

In addition:

By means of informal discussions, as well as self-report heuristics which require writers to note their feelings and reactions to the comments received, or which ask them to note
their reasons for rejecting particular feedback, and through reading of the successive
drafts and the revisions undertaken, the teacher can build up a detailed picture of the
activities and output of each group, and the individuals comprising the group. (Rollinson,
2005, p. 28)

This self-awareness by students of their handling of language difference, in accordance
with a translingual approach taken to contemplate the substance of the meaning being conveyed,
indicates a manner by which to have them start making productive use of their responses to
difference.

**Multiple Cultural Literacies**

As I see it, the experiences intrinsic to students in peer review workshops taking place in
an integrated mainstream first-year composition course, and their intersection with already-
existing understandings of language difference, provide a means to get at the variety of results
workshops can have. According to Kostogriz (2004):

> While the conception of multicultural literacies seeks pedagogical ways in which
differences could get on with one another, it drags along with it the essentialised and
static notion of cultural difference…If cultural differences were in fact static and
constituted within isolated social-semiotic places, then one could not operate across the
boundaries nor solve the problems of cultural coexistence. For this to happen cultures
should be seen as new formations characterized by heterogeneity and border-crossing
dynamics. (p.7)

Instead of a cultural literacy that, “While putting emphasis on cultural unity…promotes the
unconditional assimilation of ethnic and linguistic minorities to dominant cultural codes,”
transcultural literacy in environments of people with diverse backgrounds works so that “Textual
practices in this space are not constituted in separate cultural environments but rather in relations of cultural differences to each other” (Kostogriz, 2004, p.7). Through studying the impact that understandings of language difference has on the collaboration of peer review, this dissertation examines how participants’ receipt and giving of feedback make use of their understanding in ways that attest to their responses to language difference.

Accounting for how communication takes place in diverse environments, Shi (2006), elaborating on intercultural language socialization, writes that “Language, as a sociocultural and contextualized phenomenon, is acquired through interactive practices and socializing routines” (p.3). Peer review workshops such as those studied for this dissertation aid pedagogically not just to help overcome intercultural anxiety, but to accustom participants to difference. As Shi writes:

Theorists contend that as repetitive routines become increasingly proceduralized in learners’ interactional ability, the structural and predictable properties of the interactive practices facilitate novices’ increasing participation in them, which forms a vehicle for learners to acquire the target language proficiency and sociocultural norms. (2006, p. 3)

Still, according to Shi, “intercultural misunderstandings, communication breakdowns, ridicule and discrimination together with strong feelings of inadequacy” are also bound to come about in these integrated situations (p.4). These consequences are part of language learning:

As novices/newcomers act and react themselves in the host languacultural contexts, they individually and/or collectively make intercultural socialization choices, evaluate and contest the target cultural values and beliefs, struggle to broaden their individual agendas, and actively negotiate and reestablish their own multiple identities; ideologies; and social networks. (Shi, 2006, p.7)
In the case of peer review, it is its structured collaborative practice that makes it conducive to learning, the unpacking of which also can be communicatively fruitful, in line with translingualism.

Indeed, translingualism itself can be understood to take multiple forms. In a study conducted by Lee and Jenks (2016) of translingual dispositions emerging over a semester-long cross-cultural course, participants wrote a reflective response to peer collaboration with their cross-cultural counterparts, along with critical literacy narratives on their experiences with language. Lee and Jenks define a translingual disposition as one that “allows individuals to move beyond preconceived, limited notions of standardness and correctness, and it therefore facilitates interactions” (p. 319). As they write: “we contend that it is…the responsibility of composition to develop ways to foster translingual dispositions among students so that the inherent and continually evolving plurality of Englishes can be acknowledged and honored” (p. 323). In doing so, it can assist students in becoming familiar with and practicing a nonconforming language ideology.

As Lee and Jenks also write:

Doing translingual dispositions…does not simply mean developing an appreciation for texts that incorporate multiple languages or varieties; rather, it means going beyond the conceptual metric of “language” in the traditional sense as a basis of determining a particular enunciation’s assumed rhetorical appropriateness or social value. (p. 320)

This is why even monolingual speakers were found to be able to enact translingual dispositions: when monolingual students reflect on, and write about, linguistic plurality and difference, they are provided the opportunity to actively use language to reflect on and articulate their translingual dispositions….our findings serve as a reminder that a “translingual”
pedagogy is not just for ESL students in that there is a way for monolingual students to
tap into their translanguaging experiences, even if they do not speak an additional
language in the traditional sense. (p. 321)

Students’ competence in enacting translingual dispositions, however, can be guided through
increased attention to, and instruction in, knowledge of their linguistic resources.

Guidance of this type is needed, Lee and Jenks (2016) suggest, because while students
may have a working ideology informing their understandings of language difference at certain
points, they need help in becoming well-versed enough in understanding its effects, seeing as
they have been steeped for years in a system that has trended toward monolingualism (p. 320).
As they state:

Assumptions surrounding standardness, correctness, and legitimacy of a particular variety
of English are not inherent to the language itself but sustained through the work of
institutional agents such as public education. Students in composition are not by any
means immune to this process of ideological conditioning and arrive in our classrooms
predisposed to particular perspectives about language. (p. 320)

This conditioning is the case in spite of how adept some students might be at being receptive to
employing language to convey meaning both in how they respond to language and how they
approach it in their own writing. Being mindful that “the boundaries that differentiate one
language from another are ideological” (Lee and Jenks, 2016, p. 319), and that “composition,
like other educational-institutional spaces in which standard language ideologies are cultivated,
can facilitate the doing of translingual dispositions by inviting students to acknowledge and
confront their relation to language ideology” (p. 321), using ideological approaches to language
difference as semiotic resources—the practice with which can help harness attitudes and emotion to understand linguistic diversity—was a central question to mull over for my study.

**Semiotic Resources, Attitudes and Emotion**

As detailed by Canagarajah (2018a), beyond “looking at communicative practices as transcending autonomous languages…[is] the need to transcend verbal resources and consider how other semiotic resources and modalities also participate in communication,” or “analyzing how diverse semiotic features previously relegated to spatiotemporal context actively participate in communication,” as well as how a translingual perspective “challenges understandings of language as regulated or determined by existing contexts of power relations” (pp. 31-32).

Canagarajah calls for a reconsideration of the role of spatiality in language practice, and how language is “situated, holistic, networked, mediated, and ecological, thus integrated with diverse conditions, resources, and participants” (p. 33). He cites as examples international STEM students who utilize their knowledge of other languages to speak in a language other than English with professional colleagues about drafts of papers that are ultimately composed in English; and mediating factors such as slideshare presentation technology, visual aids, and facility making use of classroom space that contribute to multimodal communication in an “assemblage” inseparable from their use of language (2018a, pp. 37-48).

In these cases, Canagarajah (2018a) emphasizes “how diverse semiotic resources play a collaborative role as a spatial repertoire” (p. 39), with the activity of drawing a visual model giving agency of meaning to an item in that it helps, for example, an Entomology doctoral candidate revise ideas, in a manner similarly “performative, not representational” (p. 42), to how the process of working in a strategically furnished and curated writing space imbues “a performativity that orientate to doing as generative of thinking and communicating, or processes
rather than ideas as generative of meanings” (p. 47). Moreover, Canagarajah cites the collaboration that goes into an article the feedback and editing of which was done through means like the “Track Changes” feature and conversing in a language other than English with peers in regard to “accommodating resources across space and time as shaping meaning” (pp. 43, 46), and as signifying “the transformative potential of spatial repertoires…[in that the] translingual practice of the international scholars suggests that they appreciate the value of language diversity and subtly act against dominant policies and discourses” (p. 48). In this way, situational space, technology, and collaboration itself are resources that extend not only the role of language, but supplement it as a vehicle to convey ideas.

In fact, according to Liyanage and Canagarajah (2019), “preferred pedagogies motivated by integrative motivation, such as communicative language teaching, may not be suitable for all communities. We have to accommodate more diverse motivations and functions for English language learning in pedagogies that are contextually appropriate” (p.22). It is the language learning that takes place when members of different cultural backgrounds meet, and the various means through which it is facilitated, that is of interest in terms of those learners’ understandings of linguistic diversity.

Because these understandings of linguistic diversity manifest as a resourceful engagement with ideological approaches to language difference that occur alongside those present in language learning more generally, it is helpful to consider how Arnold and Brown (1999) cite Gardner and Lambert’s (1972) categorization of the language learner as having integrative and instrumental motivation. Arnold and Brown describe the former motivation type as “a desire to learn the language in order to relate to and even become part of the target language culture,” and the latter as possessing “practical reasons for language learning” (p. 13).
In both cases, they write, “learners are not anchored in a fixed state but rather are conditioned by forces in the social context affecting them” (p. 18). One of these forces they name as “culture shock,” or “as anxiety resulting from the disorientation encountered upon entering a new culture” (p. 22). This finding indicated the need to study the incorporating as a semiotic resource of an approach toward understandings of language difference that is ideologically adaptive, in order to learn language collaboratively and cultivate a translingual disposition.

The managing of ideological approaches to language difference could help redirect culturally fraught emotions described by Arnold and Brown (1999). Probing the various factors that students bring to the language learning experience, Aragão (2011) made a distinction between emotions, which “imply movement,” and beliefs, which “tend to guide the ways in which humans move in the world” (p. 302). Conducting a qualitative study on their interaction, Aragão examined the manner in which embarrassment and self-esteem emerge out of students’ beliefs about themselves (p. 303). Whereas Norton’s societally-structured psychological conceptualization of learners, as Aragão understands it, comes “at the cost of neglecting the learners’ relation to the context, as if the only process took place in individual minds, bodies or individual contexts, such as the classroom,” Aragão finds “emotions are dynamic processes related to beliefs and actions that can be observed in relation to the context of the classroom” (p. 303). Though Aragão’s reading of Norton itself appears to neglect the latter’s idea of learner investment in the form of outwardly directed goals that are contextualized socially, Aragão does attempt to get at a problem with Norton’s concept of social inequity as built-in to the learning situation. Namely, he sees the issue with Norton’s view in that it overlooks how the individual relates to his or her surroundings in a given social setting.
For the foreign language students who participated in Aragão’s study, he wanted to help rectify this issue by having them engage in reflection “to identify beliefs, emotions, challenges and how to deal with them” (p. 305). In other words, he saw having the capacity to reflect on their emotions in a cognitively critical manner as aiding the students expand their awareness of the motivational exigencies needing to be met in their situation in order to communicate effectively, and their purposes for doing so. This is congruent with Liyanage and Canagarajah’s (2019) critique that

Language pedagogies treat English as a form of positive investment (Norton, 2000), thus a desirable resource because it facilitates marketization of oneself….These perspectives are understandable, considering the power of English as global linguistic and cultural capital, but such forms of desire shape complicity with neoliberal regimes, a mechanism by which people internalize dispositions to serve market and profit accumulation purposes. (p.3)

According to Liyanage and Canagarajah, people’s internalization of a variety of language ideologies, as explained by positive investment, elides their more critically attuned awareness of integrative functions—not only in relation to the language being learned, but to one’s own status as a member of one’s community (2019, p. 16).

According to Shi (2006), this type of recognition is crucial to intercultural socialization: “On the basis of the reevaluation and repositioning, adaptive transformation occurs, which is a procedure of becoming critically aware of how and why their presuppositions have come to ‘manipulate’ the way they perceive, understand, and feel” (p. 10). Such understanding results in greater abilities for the learners, including being capable to “expand their repertoire of language resources…to promote second language learners’/users’ cross-cultural sensitivity and their
abilities to operate in different intercultural communication settings with appropriate, effective, and meaningful communicative performance” (p. 10). In order to help learners be able to do so, I propose in this dissertation that instructors have a better understanding of how factors such as ideological approaches to language difference come into play, to better articulate for themselves their conceptualization of what is taking place during peer review workshops conducted in diverse classrooms, and to employ that vocabulary toward the purpose of informing their students’ perspectives when the latter call upon their approaches to language difference as a strategic resource of understanding and making meaning.

Next, then, based on the exigency for it that has emerged from the preceding review of the literature, I specify a framework for my study on the role understood to be played by ideological approaches to language difference as practiced by monolingual and multilingual students in peer review workshops in a mainstream first-year composition course integrating linguistically diverse students. Furthermore, this framework serves as a prism through which to view how these ideological responses manifest in these students’ experiences of peer review, as demonstrated through their participation in workshop activities drawing on their understandings of language difference to practice collaboration—participation which is, again, shaped by these dynamic approaches to contribute to learning.

**Conceptual Framework: A Spectrum of Approaches to Language Difference**

In this section, I review the pertinent literature to frame students’ understandings of language difference, which for peer review workshops can aid in interpreting their relationship with and impact on dynamics among participants from diverse language backgrounds. In juxtaposition with the work of peer reviewers over the course of taking part in feedback groups, it is possible to study the contribution of ideological responses to language difference as reflected
in the understandings of individuals toward linguistic diversity in the peer review setting. Through an interpretivist paradigm, collaborating in workshops is viewed as guided by the notion “that individuals develop subjective meanings of their own personal experience, and that this gives way to personal meanings” so as “to understand the multiple realities from the perspectives of participants” (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012, p. 29). This constructivist understanding is due to the view described above on peer review participants integrated in a mainstream first-year composition course displaying potentially multicultural literacies through which to employ attitudes and emotion, interpreted in respect to ideologies of language difference as semiotic resources toward collaboratively communicative ends.

Language ideologies as related to understandings of linguistic difference have been reviewed in context of collaboration between foreign language students and reflection by English language teachers (Aragão, 2011); as the result of attitudes regarding, and social circumstances in, language learning (Arnold & Brown, 1999; Swain, 2013); and in regard to the question of how they impact students in the form of their approaches to language difference during peer review in both multilingual and ELL-integrated classes (Zhang, 1995; Matsuda & Silva, 1999; Jordan, 2012). Review of this literature indicates a need for further study of the sociocultural-theory oriented dynamics in the integration of monolingual students and multilingual ELLs working together in the mainstream first-year composition class. This project examines how understanding for peer review of ideological responses to language difference, practices related to them, and the knowledge that informs and emerges as inflected by one’s awareness of them can help develop an expanded frame of reference for conceiving individual agency within larger linguistic and other institutional forces, supplementing Norton (2013).
The ever-more heterogeneous U.S. population is part of what lies behind the tension of incorporating diversity fairly into pedagogy—therefore this tension provides much to work with in relation to mainstream first-year composition college courses featuring multilingual writers. Revisiting the sociocultural theory-oriented underpinnings of collaborative peer review group activities to examine equitable pluralism in a multilingual setting helps make productive use of that tension in student-centered composition classrooms.

Driving the tension is a socially structured system of inequity that Norton (2013) identified as being susceptible to disruption by learner investment, specifying by way of illustration the goal-oriented understanding of language as a set of conventions to be practiced and interrogated by the language learner in regard to the power of the conventions’ social authority on him or her (pp. 50, 55). Approaching as it does students’ understandings of language difference, the present project augments Norton’s emphasis on learner investment by studying how peer review workshops demonstrate and possibly undermine learners’ beliefs about language, notably insofar as how these workshops reveal the substance of the productivity through which students approach the prospect of a return on their investment.

To inform this undertaking on how students’ relation to language transpires in the diverse classroom setting, I turn to Guerra’s (2016a) piece, detailing his work with undergraduate students in a language policy course he taught in 2012. At that time, he had students write reflective essays about their use of language, as well as a critically oriented assignment analyzing Horner et al.’s (2011) article detailing “three competing ideological approaches to language and cultural difference” (Guerra, 2016a, p. 229). Guerra (2016a) states that “To make these approaches more readily accessible, I framed them as a continuum with a monolingual/monocultural approach at one end, a multilingual/multicultural approach in the
middle, and a translingual/transcultural approach at the other end” (p. 229). For Guerra, the importance of language lies in how it is used, not necessarily in seeing situations where there are multiple forms of it present as either intrinsically beneficial or detrimental.

That is why, he writes, Guerra (2016a) views as effective language pedagogy having students “call on the rhetorical sensibilities many of them already possess” (pp. 231-232), suggesting that teachers should “engage in the process of explicitly demystifying the various approaches to language difference—including the translingual—by inviting our students to consider how each of them influences the choices they make in the writing classroom” (p. 232). Indeed, this dissertation contends that such classroom community experiences be mined for navigation of differences. As mentioned, this outlook builds on Horner et al.’s (2011) definition of translingualism “as deftness in deploying a broad and diverse repertoire of language resources, and responsiveness to the diverse range of readers’ social position and ideological perspectives” (p. 308). In other words, the key focal area is that of what takes place in the use of language toward the ends of productive communication to make meaning.

Guerra (2016b) zeroed in on the idea of examining the dynamics in how language is employed:

if we hope to understand and make effective curricular and pedagogical use of the linguistic, cultural and political disruptions that recent developments in technology, modes of communication and globalization have had on the ideological approaches to language and cultural difference…we need to find ways to focus on the dialectical tension their interplay produces. (p. 6)

For Guerra, one of these ways entails understanding the need “to create conditions…that are conducive to our students’ ability to navigate and negotiate the challenges they encounter in
varied social spaces” through being “more linguistically and culturally dexterous and agile” (p. 8) in a kind of “transcultural repositioning,” or “a rhetorical ability that many disenfranchised students have learned to enact” in different contexts (2016b, p.13).

Since Guerra (2004) elaborated on transcultural repositioning as an ability to “self-consciously regulate and not simply enact intuitively” responses that “can open the door to different ways of seeing and thinking about the increasingly fluid and hybridized world” (p. 8), it is important to understand that he sees language as a matter of practical engagement with one’s surroundings (2016b, p.73). Guerra (2007) states that

This construct of transcultural repositioning enacted via rhetorical practices demands a new type of sociocultural literacy theory, one that acknowledges hybridity in identities and in cultural practices, even as it acknowledges how individuals are apprenticed into the dominant social practices of their groups. Such a concept demands attention to the question of how identities and cultures can be hybrid and transcultural, even as they are situated in and constructed through local and particular practices. (p. 138)

Thusly, looking at language practice from within a transcultural framework is applicable not just for the historically disenfranchised, but for all people.

Nevertheless, Guerra writes:

I would venture to guess that there are quantitative and qualitative differences in the range of transcultural opportunities available to the privileged and the disenfranchised. For this reason, I believe that transcultural repositioning is a rhetorical ability the disenfranchised are more likely to have at their disposal. And although many of them have learned to enact it intuitively, I want to make the point that they must learn to regulate it self-consciously, if they hope to move back and forth more productively
between and among different languages and dialects, different social classes, different cultural and artistic forms, different ways of seeing and thinking about the increasingly fluid and hybridized world emerging all around us. (2007, p. 140)

Consequently, the encounter of linguistic boundaries during peer review workshops affords the opportunity to research students communicating strategically, and in doing so to witness how they get beyond the dichotomized perspective of non-native and native speaker varieties of English central to Kachru’s “Three Circles” model of World Englishes, concentrating more equitably their preconceptions of language practices to account for its use contextually and capably (Bruthiaux, 2003, p. 175).

According to Lee and Jenks (2016), “It is crucial that compositionists understand that such dispositions are ideological: bound to and shaped by discrete social conditions, experiences, and encounters” (p. 320). This study also accordingly focused on how translingualism, described by Canagarajah (2013b) as the disposition toward communicative practices based on local norms, figured into self-reports and observations of approaches to language difference as semiotic resources (Canagarajah, 2018a, pp. 31-32) that impacted peer review preconceptions, experiences, and results in an ELL-integrated class.

In sum, the peer review situation itself can manifest and influence understanding of how language is used in a manner potentially reconcilable with viewing the students’ understandings of language difference as comprising a spectrum of responses to their experiences of workshops, at moments reinforcing or subverting certain ideologies. Workshops themselves, then, provide a forum to explore Pratt’s (1991) ideas, as applied by Canagarajah (2013c), through engagement of transcultural literacy, which, as Kostogriz (2004) writes, “is a phenomenon of the ‘contact zone’” that “refers to the space of cultural encounters and ongoing relations” (p.7). The peer review
process was thereby observed for the extent it serves the bridging of differences through the means of socioculturally understood circumstances in a first-year composition class integrating linguistically diverse speakers of English.

Chapter Summary

L2 classroom-contextualized research (Allaei & Connor, 1990; Lundstrom & Baker, 2009) finds conflicting evidence when it comes to “affective advantage”—students’ preferences for; attitudes during and experiences within; and revisions resulting from—peer review (Zhang, 1995; Jacobs, Curtis, Braine, & Huang, 1998; Zhang, 1999). Consequently, studying understandings of linguistic diversity, and students’ demonstration of such in their use of ideological approaches to language difference during a mainstream first-year composition course integrating linguistically diverse individuals through the form of peer review is significant due to its implications for the learning of all student writers. Specifically, this study aimed to deepen the breadth of information on peer review workshops by focusing on students’ experiences of them in an ELL-integrated first-year writing class, and by exploring the implications of these workshops for students’ perspectives of multilingualism as existing in the various language practices present in the classroom in accord with translingual/transcultural literacy (Guerra, 2016a). Such examination of peer review within the field of composition can inform the teaching of writing to engage critically people’s attitudes toward and views of differences, with students reflecting on their perspectives regarding the degree of helpfulness and appeal of these workshops, to empower writers with knowledge of the impact of feedback.

Keeping this objective in mind, my research questions were:

(1) What are first-year composition (FYC) students’ understandings of language difference and how do they impact peer review collaboration in a mainstream
FYC class?

(2) How do these FYC students implement responses toward language difference in their practice of peer review?

I located a gap in research between an exploration of the effects of peer review workshops participated in by students and a deeper investigation into students’ lived perspectives and experiences of them. Especially in ELL-integrated groups, applying understanding of ideological approaches to language difference would help fill that gap to render such workshops as a process of students’ dynamically juggling understandings of language difference, with peer review being situated as a venue to enact degrees of translingual literacy. Translingual, and/or transcultural literacy (Guerra, 2016a), is applicable to integrated classrooms through peer review collaboration by observing how students understand language difference as informed by practice of conventions, and whether linguistic difference can be beneficial, not a simple deficit (Bruthiaux, 2003; Park & Wee, 2009). The resulting student-centered, sociocultural theory-oriented focus is contextualized with Canagarajah’s (2013c) understanding of Pratt’s (1991) framework that visualizes communal spaces as cultural “contact zone[s]” (p. 39), and of translingualism as semiotic resource (Canagarajah, 2018a, pp. 31-32).

During peer review, students exchange drafts in order to answer questions, and then return the responses to their peers. Considering that peer review in an integrated class allows students the opportunity to manage classroom diversity in ways that draw on translingual literacy as a resource to develop students’ preferences regarding who they receive feedback from and who they give it to, my study contributes to acknowledging the functioning of language ideologies and could provide insight into the teaching of writing through peer workshops.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Overview

The purpose of this study was to explore the collaboration between multilingual and monolingual learners in peer review workshops in an English-language mainstream first-year composition course integrating linguistically diverse students, specifically through ideologies framing understandings of language variety, for significance of meaning that students make within the social settings of peer review in their implementation of responses toward linguistic difference. By investigating how students make sense of the language dynamics at work within themselves and between each other socially, this study aimed for a better understanding of the ways that students’ understandings of language difference informed their collaboration in peer review sessions. In a mainstream course that integrated English Language Learners (ELLs) and that conducted peer review workshops, the potential effect and complications such dynamics can have are particularly interesting to examine for their pedagogical implications. My research questions are:

1. What are first-year composition (FYC) students’ understandings of language difference and how do they impact peer review collaboration in a mainstream FYC class?

2. How do these FYC students implement responses toward language difference in their practice of peer review?

As mentioned in the previous chapter, whether students conceptualize language as resulting from conventional norms based on social practice in accord with translinguism (Canagarajah, 2013b) and transculturalism (Guerra, 2016a; 2016b), and linguistic difference not
as deficient, but additive (Bruthiaux, 2003; Park & Wee, 2009), is explored by interpreting the relations between and impact on collaboration that take place during peer review workshops among participants of diverse language backgrounds.

According to Guerra (2016a), translingualism “reflects the belief that every student needs to develop a critical awareness about what language does…in the context of very specific circumstances” (p. 228). Students’ collaborative participation in feedback groups of an integrated mainstream first-year composition course, then, in conjunction with their responses to language difference in that setting provides data for capturing their understandings of linguistic diversity in practice. Throughout this chapter, I lay out elements of my methodology for researching how students’ understandings of language difference are situated to influence their language use and of their relation to that of others’ language use during peer review workshop experiences in an ELL-integrating first-year composition course. In doing so, contact situations consisting of peer groups in an integrated course were studied for how they disrupted, developed, and/or confirmed student preconceptions of language practices.

**Researcher Perspective**

The qualitative research method I employed in this study is applicable insofar as its strength in “providing contextual information” and “rich insight into human behavior,” especially in regard to meaning and purpose—a characteristic not found in quantitative research methods (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 106). As an ELL who myself immigrated into the U.S., I understand the necessity of assisting students to process their perspectives in different situations.

Approaching experiences from an interpretivist paradigm permits qualitative researchers to understand these perspectives. As a researcher, I recognize that students are constantly
shifting from one cultural sphere to another, and back again. Therefore, keeping in mind that in a constructivist research paradigm, “universal, absolute realities are unknowable, and the objects of inquiry are individual perspectives or constructions of reality...[with] interpretations constructed as part of the research process” (Hatch, 2002, pp. 15-16), I went about exploring the research questions listed above to address students’ understandings of language difference, in particular how they impact and are implemented responsively during collaboration of peer review in an integrated composition classroom. I know students’ shifting spheres are difficult to detect, but that their enactment through collaboration makes them subject to rich interpretive analysis, so accounting for the vantage points of the parties involved also helped come to greater understanding, which I did through a confluence of means.

While I delve into these means in the section below, they included an examination of information sources consisting of answers to e-mail question forms on prior experiences of peer review; peer review responses in the form of drafts, revisions, and final drafts; as well as observations of workshops; and semi-structured interviews, both of relevant workshop participants and their instructor. After using the methods described in this chapter to gather data, I conducted an interpretive analysis for themes based on the understanding that such analysis is a model that “can be adapted” to kinds of research “done within paradigmatic frameworks” (Hatch, 2002, p. 190). Hatch (2002) also writes that “The interpretive analysis model provides a process for constructing meaning from data” (p 180). For the purposes of this project, interpretive analysis seemed most useful, as it constitutes an organized “framework” to “apply the processes [of analysis] directly, modify them to suit different preferences, or adjust them to suit individual studies” (Hatch, 2002, p.180). The understandings of language difference that
students employed in peer review—demonstrated through their stated perspectives on and activities of providing feedback, considering reader response and making revisions—provided the content for making “categorical distinctions,” or units of analysis distinguished “by their membership in a class or category—by their having something in common. A common reference is typical: any character string that refers to a particular object, event, person, act, country, or idea” (Krippendorf, 2013, p. 106, emphasis in original). For this study, the unit of analysis consisted of an array of words and phrases which each signaled an idea, as will be elaborated on in this chapter.

In Chapter IV, I detail my understanding of study results, guided through the adaptation of Hatch’s (2002) “steps in interpretive analysis.” These steps are as follows:

1. Read the data for a sense of the whole
2. Review impressions previously recorded in research journals and/or bracketed in protocols and record these in memos
3. Read the data, identify impressions, and record impressions in memos
4. Study memos for salient interpretations
5. Reread data, coding places where interpretations are supported or challenged
6. Write a draft summary
7. Review interpretations with participants
8. Write a revised summary and identify excerpts that support interpretation (p.181)

Adjusting Hatch’s steps to my study for purposes of interpretive thematic content analysis, I based my selection criteria of themes on the operationalizing of data to shed light on the research questions. In selecting themes recursively, my criteria accorded with that of Lee and Jenks (2016) whose examination of translingual dispositions applied content analysis to
compositions and reflections by writers sharing drafts of critical literacy narratives in a cross-cultural course among college students based in the US and Hong Kong, respectively.

Lee and Jenks’ approach is explained in the text below:

This approach first requires establishing a selection criteria (Krippendorff), which in the present study meant looking for phenomena that are characteristic of a translingual disposition. For instance, we paid particular attention to essays that used such words as *accent* (such as in reference to awareness of the sociolinguistic stratification of different Englishes), *well, correct* (such as in reference to assumptions about speaking and using English “well” or “correctly), *code-switching* (such as in reference to the usage of multiple languages and registers across different discourse contexts). These essays were selected and further analyzed, focusing on how students come to an understanding of a translingual disposition. (p. 330, emphases in original)

Similarly, the different data sources that I used as capture-able features of conceptions of language practices in relation to peer group collaboration (e-mail question forms on prior experiences of peer review/workshop observations/ peer review responses in the form of drafts, revisions, and final drafts/interviews) presented opportunities to come to a fuller understanding of the language dynamics at work found in the social learning setting of peer review workshops. Whereas Lee and Jenks (2016) looked for words and phrases portending a translingual disposition in the manner described above, I looked for patterns of those through which participants indicated an idea in regard to their understandings of language difference, “[w]hether it is direct or indirect” (Krippendorf, 2013, p. 106). So, for instance, the concept of “value”—as applied to feedback on language ability in peer review, and its relation to using peer review as a means of greater understanding—emerged as an idea, along with “judgment” of each
other’s written language, and “experience” in degree of language proficiency through and ownership of writing. By examining the intricacies of how these various understandings of language difference played a role in collaborative groups, the goal was to explore the relation of them to students’ implementation of ideological approaches to language difference, demonstrable in their understandings toward linguistic variety as practiced in peer review.

**Methodological Approach**

My methodology accorded with participant observation study research design, following Hatch’s (2002) description of this design as consisting of “Fieldwork methods that include interviewing, artifact collection, and especially direct observation recorded in field notes” (p. 22). In contrast to full-fledged ethnography, participant observation studies are more targeted: “Researchers often enter the field with specific interests…and/or specific questions…that concentrate their studies in ways that ethnographers do not” (p.22). According to Faigley, Cherry, Jolliffe, & Skinner (1985), “methods of research that reach beyond the individual student to the contexts for composing” (p.92) include “participant observation of a culture and its phenomena” (p. 93), and such data sources as field notes, interviews, and student writing.

As Faigley et al. (1985) also note, there is a case to be made that the classroom not be regarded as an insulated space, but rather, as a space of profound opportunity for learning through growth, and for grappling with ideas and people both familiar and new (pp. 90-91). The learner’s mindset therefore functions inter- and intra-structurally, with preconceptions brought to social situations, taken away from them, and formulated through reflections on them as inflected by one’s feeling and understanding. The participant observation method of data collection as I applied it, with its emphasis on factors manifested through the collaborative work of individuals with each other, put into greater focus the elements at work regarding
how participants’ variety of approaches to language difference play out in peer review workshops.

To be objective, I positioned myself between the definitions for passive to moderate participation on the continuum of involvement that Hatch cites for participant observation (2002, p. 76) from Spradley (1980). The latter states that observing through passive participation denotes the researcher “does not participate or interact with other people to any great extent” (p. 59) while a researcher engaging in moderate participation “seeks to maintain a balance between being an insider and outsider, between participation and observation” (p. 60). Considering I took actions, to be reiterated below, including interviewing the study subjects and making myself available as an optional resource for tutoring, my role was not strictly passive.

Given the various student perspectives in play, the confluence of data through multifaceted factors and variables gathered through a participant observation study seemed more strongly resonant to juggling the interests involved in studying the differing needs of a mainstream composition classroom integrating ELLs. The methodological opening in looking at these interests was filled in via an inclusive assessment of data sources to attempt to determine through a sociocultural lens the effect of language ideologies in tangible practice. Indeed, inclusive types of sources emerge in Johnson’s (2006) detailing of the significance of sociocultural methods such as reflective teaching to L2 teacher education:

The positivistic paradigm that had long positioned teachers as conduits to students and their learning was found to be insufficient for explaining the complexities of teachers’ mental lives and the teaching processes that occur in classrooms. Rather, an interpretive or situated paradigm, largely drawn from ethnographic research…came to be seen as
better suited to explaining the complexities of teachers’ mental lives and the teaching processes that occur in classrooms. (p.236)

In addition, Johnson states, sociocultural theory posits that learning takes place both in the way people interact with each other, their tools and activities; and in what they bring to bear to develop, determine, and be determined by the practices they engage in (pp. 237-238)—in this case, demonstrated as a result of the implementation of responses to language difference in peer review collaboration.

The elements at play in peer review workshops in an integrated class were unraveled for investigation of them as social situations and for participants’ perspectives over the course of collaborating in them. Through study of participants’ preconceptions, activities, and implementation of responses to these workshops, I aimed to operationalize my research questions about the relationship between participants’ understandings of language difference and their collaboration to put sociocultural theory into practice. The worth of this goal of greater insight, in terms of research, into the dynamics of peer review, is its assistance in demonstrating how approaches toward language difference converge in the collaboration of people with diverse language backgrounds engaged in workshop activities.

**Research Context of the Study**

**Site**

Contributing to the richness found in this methodological approach to various data sources is that the research was carried out at a Mid-Sized Private Research University in the southeastern United States, hereafter referred to as MSPRU. Located in a diverse metropolitan area, MSPRU enrolled over 1,100 international students in fall 2017, at which time Latino/a students comprised over a quarter of its total population (MSPRU Office of Institutional
Effectiveness, 2018, p.89, 94, 96). Due to its large population of international students along with a diverse body of multilingual and monolingual individuals from overseas and across the U.S., it has been designated as a Hispanic-serving institution, or HSI, by the Dept. of Education’s Title V of the Higher Education Act (U.S. Department of Education, 2014). Since the presence of students who are multilingual Generation 1.5 resident children is therefore a given, at the institution where I conducted my study in the fall term of 2017 the demand is built into the status quo to foster an environment friendly to multilingual writers.

These sources would make conducting the study replicable at institutions in similar contexts, as would the possibility of workshop sessions used for collecting information—in this case, such as those composed of L1- and L2-speaking individuals, as well as those composed entirely of L1-speaking individuals, respectively. More pointedly, the mainstream first-year composition classroom studied included multilingual and monolingual individuals speaking English, at a school with a Writing Fellows program component embedding an undergraduate peer consultant from the institution’s Writing Center into the work of the class.

**Rationale for Researching the Focal Population**

A classroom environment that is integrated through the presence of multilingual learners provided a form through which to study dynamics of peer review. Review of the literature has made evident that L2 classroom-contextualized research finds mixed results for students when it comes to the “affective advantage” of—or students’ preferences for; attitudes during and experiences within; and revisions resulting from—peer review (Zhang, 1995; Jacobs et al., 1998; Zhang, 1999). Though that is the case, in need of further explanation was how individuals’ understandings of language difference are expressed through their practice of collaboration and experiences in peer review workshops.
In an integrated classroom, the views on peer review’s effectiveness, or lack thereof, along with its stronger and weaker aspects, may also be contested, as student stances regarding what constitutes helpful feedback play out in the form of their responses to their peers, and their willingness to impart advice to others. This is especially the case when the peers in question are first- or second-language English speakers, and workshops are contingent on shared level of common linguistic understanding. In such a mainstream ELL-integrating first-year composition classroom, collaboration in the form of sharing and imparting linguistic knowledge through a set of interpersonal and situated understandings of linguistic diversity in practice, informed by approaches to language difference, make peer review of importance for further study, so as to showcase the perspectives of students in such situations and explore the overall impact of their experiences on their writing and learning.

Description of Participants

This project specifically studied five people at the research site who were enrolled in the same mainstream first-year college writing course. Student participants’ ages were all over 18 years old. In this section, I briefly describe them.

Out of the five participants, two spoke Spanish in addition to English. Hugo, a biology major, was an Ecuadorian native whose background might confound the stereotypical view of an international student. Having been in the US for approximately four months on a student visa when I met him, he was working as the sports editor of the college newspaper. Hugo’s prior knowledge of and proficiency in English was informed by his having been taught and acquiring the language in a school setting since he was in pre-K, which he indicated was common for the education of middle-income families in Ecuador. While he did not speak English regularly
outside of his prior academic experience other than when he visited family in the States, he did have previous practice with peer review in both English and Spanish.

Natalia, a legal studies major, was born and raised in the US—specifically, in south Florida, to Colombian parents. She told me she spoke Spanish outside of school, but English with her friends. Besides being Spanish-speaking ELLs, a trait shared by Natalia and Hugo was having studied languages other than English and Spanish. Hugo knew rudimentary Mandarin because his father wanted him to learn it to help him with his job as he expanded his business a couple of years back. For her part, Natalia described learning Portuguese and Italian, “but not fluently….I went to Brazil, and I liked it, and my cousins are Italian, so I’m learning with them.”

The other three participants were monolingual English speakers. Jessie, also a first-year biology student, was a New Jersey native who, at the time of the study, had only worked with multilingual writers in peer review workshops while in college.

A monolingual speaker from central Florida, Conrad was a computer science major who appeared to look at peer review as a form of data processing. In one of his e-mail question form responses, he wrote, “I expect my peer reviewees to give me crucial information that will help mold my essay into that of a strong and complete one, not so much looking for small grammatical errors, although, that does help still.” Yet, in answer to another form question about what his workshop experiences prior to college were like, he replied, “Bad, kids aren’t the best at spotting mistakes.”

Finally, there was Venezia, a monolingual speaker from south Florida, and a biology major as well, who was familiar with peer review since having been introduced to workshops during high school. She was the lone study participant who took me up on my offer of tutoring, outlined in the next section on the study’s research design.
Research Design

The following is a rundown of the components needed to implement the research design of this study, for which the flowchart immediately thereafter (Figure 1) serves as a visualization. The subsequent sections delve further into method, data sources, data collection and data analysis procedures.

1. Application for and receipt of Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, in line with IUP guidelines, and also done at MSPRU

2. Literature review undertaken before data collection, focusing on understandings of language difference in peer review workshops in multilingual speaker-populated classes of second language students; understandings of language difference during peer review in a diverse ELL-integrating mainstream first-year composition classroom; language difference and peer review in sociocultural theory; the relation of sociocultural theory, attitudes, and emotion with responses to language difference; and language difference in diverse learning environments

3. Selection of an ELL-integrated first-year composition class, with consent for participating in the study beginning with an explanation that it involved conducting regular work of the class, along with pointing out that class activity itself was being observed as part of a research project, and establishing meeting with me for writing assistance as an option, along with participation in the project including my interviewing study subjects regarding peer review experiences, after observing them in workshops

4. Distributing of instructions: for completion and collecting of answers to e-mail
question forms on prior experiences of peer review, in order to obtain responses of multilingual students’ and monolingual students’ perspectives on and views of receiving feedback from and providing feedback to their multilingual and monolingual peers in peer review workshops; for the studying of drafts, revisions, the final draft and written responses resulting from peer review; and for the conducting of semi-structured interviews of their thoughts after, as well as self-reports of experiences during, workshops

5. Following the observation of workshops: drafts and written responses resulting from peer review studied for progression of work/type of changes made, for fodder for interview questions, in conjunction with observations, regarding why they were made and students’ thought processes in taking suggestions or not

6. Conducting of semi-structured interviews with students of their thoughts after, as well as self-reports of experiences during, workshops, and how the workshops played out in light of potential expectations they might have had going into them; these interviews set for after they completed their final draft of the major writing assignment being studied before the end of the semester. Participants were asked such questions related to variations of “How do you see yourself in peer review workshops? How do you think others see you in these workshops? How do you see the role that others play in these workshops? What do you see the role being of workshop participants? What is it like being around multilingual ELLs in your groups? How do they relate to you? What is it like being around monolingual speakers in your groups? How do they relate to you?”

7. Putting students’ accounts in larger researchable perspective, instructor
interviewed for insight into session facilitation at end of term.

Figure 1. Research design.

Method

According to Marshall and Rossman (2011), “ethnographic approaches…study human groups” and organizational practices (p. 19). Thus, there is need for a wide range of sources from which to interpret data on matters of great qualitative complexity. This need is why, in conducting my study, the amount of data sources provided the needed assessment of “the multiple perspectives for knowing the social world” (Marshall & Rossman, 2011, p. 254). The research design of this dissertation project was meant to take situational complexity into full consideration. Peer review workshops formed an opportunity to show how the confluence of multiple data sources can be used to investigate diversity of viewpoints of participants within them.

Data Sources

a) Elicited writing – e-mail question forms on prior experiences of peer review
b) Observation of workshops
c) Writing done for the course – peer review responses/drafts/revisions/final drafts
d) Semi-structured interviews
Data Collection Procedures

I chose an ELL-integrated first-year composition class the scheduling of which made it possible for me to be present. Next, I emailed the instructor teaching that section, requesting to meet with her for the purposes of discussing the possibility to recruit her into allowing me to study her class by inviting students to take part in the project after obtaining her consent (see Appendix A for Instructor Informed Consent Form). Subsequently, I attended one of the class meetings in the first part of the semester for recruitment purposes, particularly to provide an in-person overview of the research project, along with contact information for those students who would like to participate.

Once the interested students contacted me, I proceeded to provide them with the consent form, to address questions, and to obtain their signature (see Appendix B for Student Informed Consent Form). I then distributed instructions for completion and collection of e-mail question forms on prior experiences of peer review, looking at responses of multilingual students’ and monolingual students’ perspectives on and views of receiving feedback from and providing feedback to their multilingual and monolingual peers (see Appendix C for E-mail Question Form Distributed to Students). I tracked participants for the observation of their peer review sessions; for the studying of drafts, revisions, final drafts and written responses resulting from peer review along with workshop checklist resources (see Appendices G and H for the Rhetorical Analysis: Common Problems Checklist and How do you know?: Checklist of Evidence to Support Claims in an Argument Analysis, respectively); and for the conducting of semi-structured interviews of their thoughts after, as well as self-reports of experiences during, workshops.

Observation. As Merriam (2009) states, “Interpretive research…assumes that reality is socially constructed, that is, there is no single, observable reality. Rather, there are multiple
realities, or interpretations, of a single event” (p.8). Understanding of each person’s experiencing of a situation being different from another’s contributed to my participant-observation study of perspectives on, conducting of, and responses to peer review workshops. As Hatch (2002) describes it, participant observation is “a special kind of qualitative study that involves all of the field methods of ethnography (observation, interviewing, and artifact collection) but has a narrower focus than a full ethnography” (p.72). Overall, I used the viewpoints of participants, or an insider emic perspective, based on “pieces of information from interviews, observations, or documents…combined and ordered into larger themes as the researcher works from the particular to the general” in an inductive manner, “rather than deductively testing hypotheses as in positivist research” to arrive at conclusions (Merriam, 2009, pp. 14-16).

From my observations, I followed Merriam (2009) and composed field notes, or “written accounts” (p. 129). These field notes described participants and goings-on; quoted and/or paraphrased relevant remarks; and included any comments I had regarding my observations, especially as related to potentially fraught instances of implementing various language ideologies among multilingual ELLs and monolingual speakers, and students’ conducting of their roles in workshops (see Appendix D for Observation Protocol/Sample Field Notes).

In order to establish reciprocity (Patton, 2002, pp. 414-415; Powell & Takayoshi, 2003), I made myself available as an optional resource for tutoring, so again, my role was not strictly passive, but lay somewhere between passive to moderate participation on the continuum of involvement that Hatch cites (2002, p. 76) from Spradley (1980), and which I moderated further with collection of paper drafts/revisions and, later, in semi-structured interviews.

**Writings.** Having distributed instructions for completion of and collected e-mail
question forms on prior experiences of peer review, I looked at responses of multilingual students’ and monolingual students’ perspectives on and views of receiving feedback from and providing feedback to their multilingual and monolingual peers. I tracked participants for the observation of their peer review sessions; for the studying of drafts, revisions, final drafts and written responses resulting from peer review; and for the conducting of semi-structured interviews of their experiences in workshops.

Examining drafts and written responses resulting from peer review, along with the final drafts, was useful as a source of evidence. Since these materials “are not produced for research purposes” expressly, but are the result of regular class business, they can be “used as part of the process of inductively building categories” (Merriam, 2009, p. 154), and as supplementing data points.

**Interviews.** Also, I conducted semi-structured interviews. Marshall and Rossman (2011) describe the semi-structured question format as an “interview guide” for which, once the interview is scheduled, “the interviewer comes prepared with a list of topics or questions (which may or may not have been shared with the interview partner beforehand)” (p. 144). Unlike a more standardized interview, the semi-structured interview features follow-up questions, though, as Marshall and Rossman state, “the researcher…respects the way the participant frames and structures the responses,” working on the qualitatively significant principle that “the phenomenon of interest should unfold as the participant views it (the emic perspective), not as the researcher views it (the etic perspective)” (pp. 144-145). This principle was especially important to the present project, since students’ own recounting of their expectations and experiences was researched—the reflective subjectivity of which Marshall and Rossman emphasize is crucial in justifying the method in which data is being gathered and the objective of
the study gathering it (2011, pp. 145-146).

For my interviewing of student participants, Rubin and Rubin (2005) provided a useful model that “elicits depth and detail about the research topic by following up on answers given by the interviewee during the discussion” in a “specific, *semistructured*” [emphasis in original] manner “that are suggested by the answers to the initial questions” (pp. 4-5). Such is known as “responsive interviewing,” and envisions the role of interviewer and interviewee as “conversational partners” with the “direction of the interview…shaped by both the researcher’s and the interviewee’s concerns” (Rubin & Rubin, 2005, pp. 14-15), all the while probing for a sense of deeper comprehension behind events unfolding in peer review workshops, especially in regard to participants’ conducting of their collaboration.

In a way, participants were being interviewed to “elicit *understandings or meanings*” through how they “describe and portray specific *events or processes*” (Rubin & Rubin, 2005, p. 5, emphases in original). As opposed to positivism, the responsive interview is meant to uncover what Rubin and Rubin (2005) term as “contingent truth, truth that seems to hold at a particular time under specified circumstances” (p.25), in line with an interpretivist paradigm that attempts “to elicit the interviewee’s views of their worlds, their work, and the events they have experienced or observed” and “look for the specific and detailed and try to build an understanding based on those specifics” inductively (p.28), by reflecting on them. Participants were asked questions playing on variations of “How do you see yourself in peer review workshops? How do you think others see you in these workshops? How do you see the role that others play in these workshops? What do you see the role being of workshop participants? What is it like being around multilingual ELLs in your groups? How do they relate to you? What is it
like being around monolingual speakers in your groups? How do they relate to you?” (see Appendix E for Sample Interview Questions) Through sustained questioning about their perspectives from a variety of participants, according to Rubin and Rubin (2005), “Interpretivist researchers try to sort out through the experiences of different people as interpreted through the interviewees’ own cultural lenses and then weigh different versions to put together a single explanation” (p.30). This strategy of interview as data collection method stresses the adaptability of the technique, particularly the inductive reflexivity built in to its semi-structured format. Thus, the interviews also assisted in confirming and/or reviewing interpretations of workshops with participants, adapted from Hatch (2002, p. 181).

To put students’ accounts in larger researchable perspective, I interviewed the instructor for insight as to how the sessions were facilitated. Interview questions included were along the lines of “Describe what you considered to be a successful peer review workshop that integrated both multilingual and monolingual students” and “How do you envision peer review workshops integrating ELLs working in your class?” (see Appendix E for Sample Interview Questions)

Consent for participating in interviews, and the overall study, was prefaced with an explanation that it involved conducting the regular work of the class, along with pointing out that class activity itself was being observed as part of a research project. All participants were given a consent form to read over and sign before the study began (see Appendices A and B for Instructor and Student Informed Consent Forms, respectively). Once I obtained their signatures, I retained the form securely on file. Participants in the interviews were thus informed of the study and their rights. A digital voice recording device was used during interviews. I transcribed the recordings in private, using regular transcription methods (Babcock, 2016, pp. 147-148). The
transcriptions are to be kept on a password protected computer for three years after the study (see Appendix F for Sample Interview Transcription).

**Data Analysis Procedures**

I coded and analyzed data from interviews, looking for themes based on idea patterns that emerged also from individual research participant’s responses to e-mail question forms on prior experiences of peer review; their work on drafts, revisions, and final paper; and my peer review workshop field note observations. Particularly helpful in this respect was Weston, Gandell, Beauchamp, McAlpine, & Beauchamp’s (2001) article relating the development of a coding system to analyze transcripts of interviews with professors who employed reflection as part of their pedagogy, in order to study how they went about doing so (p. 384). Applying a mixture of approaches including phenomenology, grounded theory, and case study, Weston et al. write that “we used a priori theory to frame our questions, drive our interview protocols, and structure the initial levels of the coding scheme,” shifting to a grounded method further in the process, based on what they found as they went along (pp. 382-383). Moreover, their piece places emphasis on the notion that “coding is not what happens before analysis, but comes to constitute an important part of the analysis” (p. 382). Working off a conceptual framework helped “to prestructure many aspects of our design and methods,” which kept consistent interview questions, protocols and potential interpretation of responses (pp. 384-385). As they developed the coding system, Weston et al. describe their process as “dialectical...recursive, iterative,” looking for recurring patterns of significance to provide the two main coding categories, and thematic indicators appearing more than two times for each category to illustrate ideas pertaining to each (pp. 386-387).
Likewise, I selected out idea patterns, with ideas significant to participants’ understandings of language difference and that appeared at least three times constituting a pattern for a potential theme, building in a dialectical reflexivity to my coding methodology so as to take into account research data relevant to students’ peer review practices for an ELL-integrated workshop. While “pattern [emphasis in original] usually refers to a descriptive finding…a theme takes a more categorical or topical form” (Patton, 2002, p. 453). Using idea patterns of recurring words and phrases that cropped up in my study of participants’ responses to e-mail question forms on prior experiences of peer review; their work on drafts, revisions, and final paper; my peer review workshop field note observations; and interviews, I coded to look for themes signaling the interplay of understandings of language difference and collaborative activities during peer review workshops in a first-year composition class integrating ELLs.

I developed codes using QSR Nvivo software, through word frequency queries, to assign them into NVivo nodes for the idea they represented. In this manner, I was able to code ideas such as “value,” as of feedback on language ability in peer review, and its relation to using peer review as a means of greater understanding, along with “judgment” of each other’s written language, and “experience” in degree of language proficiency through and ownership of writing, to analyze for their thematic significance in terms of participants’ understandings of language difference. Further analysis allowed me to refine codes including idea patterns of “tact,” relating to the thematic topic of reviewers’ implementation of language difference understandings in response to peers’ work, or peer reviewers’ degree of empathetic communicative directness; as well as idea patterns indicating “first language/second language” or “monolingual/multilingual” issues, relating to the thematic topic of language difference understandings in collaboration, or the range of ways students’ understandings of language difference impacted collaboration
through their drawing on ideological approaches in peer review practice. Comparison diagrams in NVivo provided me as well with the means of analytical criteria, by helping me visualize how the two male participants’ ideas on the worth of prior experience to peer response feedback differed from the three female participants’, and how one participant was not as concerned with the idea of being tactful as the others—data which will be presented and discussed in-depth in Chapters IV and V, respectively.

Moreover, I used peer debriefing to arrive at 80 percent “intercoder agreement” for 10 percent of the data (Weston et al., 2001, pp. 393-395), in order to verify validity of my representation of students’ experiences. As “[c]oding is essentially a system of classification the process of noting what is of interest or significance, identifying different segments of the data, and labeling them to organize the information contained in the data” (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012, p. 142), this verification also serves to enhance dependability. After all, “any given segment of data might be viewed differently by two different researchers or even coded using more than one label by one researcher. There is no single ‘correct’ way to organize and analyze the data,” so checking for inter-rater reliability can make the coding system as consistently dependable as possible (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012, p.143).

All of these data analysis procedures were conducted in the service of content analysis, defined by Merriam (2009) as necessitating “simultaneous coding of raw data and the construction of categories that capture relevant characteristics of the document’s content” (p. 205). In analyzing the data on FYC students’ understandings of language difference and their impact on collaboration in and responsive implementation of peer review practice in a mainstream writing class, I was in addition informed by Swain (2013), who states in her study of dialogue between two French-language students: “We were observing what
Vygotsky called microgenesis—the process, at a micro level, of acquiring an aspect of the L2,” that emerged from social interaction (p. 200). Upon closer inspection, Swain also noticed instances in the dialogue of private speech—one definition of which, citing Lantolf and Thorne (2006), she provides as “intrapersonal communication” (p. 201). For Swain, use of language, or “languaging,” through such means as private speech and collaborative dialogue “mediates our thinking. It is a psychological tool by which we internalize new ideas and talk ourselves into understanding something we did not understand before” (p. 202). That is its cognitive importance.

But here is also its emotional significance. As Swain writes, “Vygotsky made it clear that he saw emotions as having a critical role in human mental functioning,” commensurate with her own understanding, upon rereading of the dialogue, “that it is more accurate to suggest that what we are seeing...are cognitive AND emotional processes constituted in, and derived from, the dialogue” (2013, p. 202). Explaining how emotions function in the dialogue, Swain states that they are factors brought to the circumstances by the learners, whose sentiments are part and parcel both of the process and of the resulting product (p. 203).

Making a case for the link between situational beliefs arising out of emotions and the concepts intrinsic to sociocultural theory, Swain (2013) writes: “The physiology of many emotions is biological, but what the physiology means...is cultural. [...]the source of emotional meaning is social and cultural in the same way cognition is. We internalize emotional meaning from our interactions with others” (p. 204). Swain’s approach seems to advocate for placing the individually emotional forces highlighted in these communications within a sociocultural perspective of attitudes arising around classroom practices (pp. 203-205). In this study, then, I
operationalize the concept of attitudes insofar as they manifest in the form of understandings of language difference and practices of collaboration in peer review.

Limitations

The central limitation of participant observation research design methodology is that, as might be expected, its results are not replicable. According to Marshall and Rossman, “Qualitative research does not claim to be replicable. The researcher purposely avoids controlling the research conditions and concentrates on recording the complexity of situational contexts and interrelations as they occur naturally” (2011, p. 254). Additionally, since researchers have to leave themselves open to flexibility in design as warranted by the situation, qualitative research cannot be exactly replicable by design (Marshall & Rossman, 2011, p. 254). Though robustly described, this particularity is limiting because, even while informed by sociocultural theory as elaborated on in the previous section, whether the practices are produced as an effect of a situation, or whether the understandings behind those practices predate an occasion—in this study, a peer review workshop—is elusive to discern. Therefore, as an example, illustrated further in Chapters IV and V, a monolingual writer who calls a multilingual peer’s sentence wording “weird” and states also that she respects his efforts as a non-native-born speaker; or a multilingual speaker who takes care to distinguish between his proficiency in writing and that in language, serves to provide data that complicates analysis. In both these instances, it is not precisely determinable from the study conducted whether the events taking place in the social learning process of peer review evolved as a result of the workshop conditions, or whether they were informed by prior understandings of language difference.

Still, analysis of the data was enriched by keeping focus on exploring, through the research questions, how participants practiced their understandings in implementing them
in their responses toward language difference in peer review, and what their understandings were, as well as how they impacted peer review collaboration. Also, by emphasizing the notion of events in the field being subject to change, keeping detailed notes, conducting interviews with participants that I used to help select idea patterns subject to themes for coding, and guarding to make sure all data collected is well-secured and easily accessible for analysis, lack of replicability was addressed by ensuring data quality (Marshall & Rossman, 2011, p. 254).

Indeed, the feature of being able to be conducted in similar contexts attests to rigorousness of interpretivist research methods such as coding. According to Marshall and Rossman (2011), the “burden of demonstrating that a set of findings applies to another context rests more with the researcher who would make that transfer than with the original researcher” (p. 252). To determine whether transactional validity, or validity involving participants (Marshall & Rossman, 2011, p. 41), can be externalized, they state:

the researcher can refer to the original theoretical framework to show how data collection and analysis will be guided by concepts and models…Then, those who make policy or design research studies within those same (or sufficiently similar) [theoretical] parameters can determine whether the cases described can be generalized for new research policy and transferred to other settings. In addition, the reader or user of specific research can see how research ties itself into a body of theory. (p. 252)

Replicability of the study, while not direct in its results, would be guided by the objectives of those conducting the study elsewhere.

Finally, Marshall and Rossman state:

descriptive studies aimed at presenting a thick description of reality…[parallel]

traditional scientific standards…[by] emphasizing rigor in data collection, in cross-
checking, and in intercoder consistency…[nevertheless,] continuing discussions of criteria for assessing the value and trustworthiness of qualitative research are quite persuasive. Qualitative inquiry…recognizes that understanding is relative…and that, at best, we present a report that is likely to be true given our existing knowledge. (pp. 254-255)

Hence, since limitations are built characteristically into the type of study I conducted, I recognize it is my responsibility as a researcher to take these into account as to their possibly relevant influence on the results.

**Ethical Concerns**

In order for my study to be valid empirically, I considered such ethical concerns as fairness, trustworthiness, access, reciprocity, credibility, and transferability. Though there are no alternatives to participation, names were withheld from the instructor so as not to appear to influence grading. Students were not excluded as they were involved in the regular business of classroom peer review. I was open to students’ having access to data pertaining to their input, and provided my assistance in the role of writing tutor as an option.

Additionally, there was minimal risk, and all data will be retained for at least three years in compliance with federal regulations in two separate computer files (password protected), as well as in a secure location to address privacy issues. Also, for confidentiality concerns, pseudonyms were assigned upon inclusion of data, with all data—part of which contains the list correlating the pseudonyms to the original names—being retained for at least three years in compliance with federal regulations in two separate computer files (password protected), as well as in a secure location. I am cautious regarding the data I reveal about participants so that they cannot be identified even without their names. Student participants’ ages were all at least 18...
(typical for college undergraduates), with no gender restrictions, and no exclusion criteria. Finally, since there was no information withheld from participants in a deceptive way, they were not debriefed.

**Chapter Summary**

Through the research design methodology I have explained, I focused my examination of how the peer review collaboration of students in an ELL-integrated first-year composition class was impacted as demonstrated through the effect of their understandings of language difference on their implementation of ideological responses to linguistic diversity, manifested in workshop activities. For participants, this study can provide a better understanding to help reconceptualize multilingualism as it exists in the writing classroom that houses the English-language learning community of which they are a part, and of peer review workshops as a space for them to engage with linguistic diversity in the classroom. For the field, I shed light for composition instructors on what the carving out of such a space can and cannot achieve, in order to contribute to the teaching of writing, thereby augmenting learning so that it benefits students in integrated composition classrooms.
CHAPTER IV
DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

Overview

This study explored collaboration between monolingual students and multilingual English language learners (ELLs) in peer review workshops in an English-language mainstream first-year composition course integrating linguistically diverse writers, in particular how peer review workshops engage participants’ understandings of language difference through their effect on and practice of language ideologies within peer-review settings. Toward that purpose, I conducted an interpretivist content analysis with a sociocultural theory-oriented focus that looked at how responses to language difference of participants in these environments played out through their implementation in peer review workshops. The ways that language ideologies impact how peer review activity is conducted call for a practical understanding of responses to language difference, which can be framed through translingualism. Specifically, Guerra’s (2016a) adaptation of Horner et al.’s (2011) delineation of responses to language difference into a continuum of three ideological approaches toward linguistic and cultural difference (monolingualism/monoculturalism; mulilingualism/multiculturalism; translingualism/transculturalism) as laid out in Chapter II, suggest an entry point that provides a foundation for analysis of data on the role language ideologies play for students’ understandings of linguistic diversity in collaborative practice. Consequently, my research questions are the following:

(1) What are first-year composition (FYC) students’ understandings of language difference and how do they impact peer review collaboration in a mainstream FYC class?
How do these FYC students implement responses toward language difference in their practice of peer review?

Overall, the study findings put into relief how linguistic ideologies are evidenced through understandings of language difference in peer review workshops among multilingual ELLs and monolingual students in an integrated mainstream first-year composition course. In doing so, the findings contribute toward reflecting on the ongoing research project that is learning and teaching language and literacy practices in composition. The study of this data can be used to adjust and hone pedagogy through interrogating via a sociocultural lens the potential of linguistically diverse peer review workshops in mainstream first-year composition as a space of collaboration among individuals enacting a spectrum of ideological responses to language difference, informed in their practice of peer review by the various manners in which they draw on understandings of linguistic diversity.

In this chapter, I present the data on five study participants (to whom I have applied pseudonyms) through means of the following sources: responses to e-mail question forms on prior peer review experiences, observation of workshops, peer review materials, drafts, and interviews. After doing so, I delve into an interpretive analysis of themes emerging from the information, and ultimately how they function within the responses that comprise Guerra’s (2016a) framework of ideological approaches to language and cultural difference as a continuum.

In service of this analytical objective, further contextual orientation is helpful. As Canagarajah (2018a) describes it, “Challenging traditional understandings of language relationships in multilingualism, which postulates languages maintaining their separate structures and identities even in contact, translilingualism looks at verbal resources as interacting
synergistically to generate new grammars and meanings” (p. 31, emphases in original). Indeed, Guerra describes the continuum of approaches to difference as each comprising “a set of ideological beliefs, values, and practices that attempts to influence how we/students construct our/their notions of language and culture and deploy them in academic writing and beyond” (2016a, p. 229). Emerging from Horner et al.’s (2011) categorization of responses to language difference—namely, the objective of monolingualism being “to preserve what is in fact a false ideal of a uniform language and social practice” (p. 306); of multilingualism “to reify a set of forms that supposedly have intrinsic power” (p. 307); and of translingualism “to produce meaning out of a wide range of practices” (p. 308)—along Guerra’s (2016a) posited continuum are ideological positions of monolingualism/monoculturalism, multilingualism/multiculturalism, and translingualism/transculturalism (p. 229).

In reference to the ideological position of translingualism/transculturalism, since this dissertation study examined how experiences influence, and are influenced by, people’s situated literacy practices signifying their understandings of language difference (Guerra, 2004), envisioning peer review workshops as providing a culturally mediated space engages also the idea of transcultural literacy, explained in Chapter II. As Kostogriz (2004) states, “Transcultural literacy is a phenomenon of the ‘contact zone’ which, according to Pratt (1992, pp. 5-6), refers to the space of cultural encounters and ongoing relations” (p. 7). The workshops that this study examined—with the potential for collaboration among students who are explicitly acknowledging each other as peers, and through which they are being asked to assist each other—constitute such a space. Studying these workshops can result in learning insights that expand what is understood as contributing to the communicative power of language.
Before delving into data presentation, however, I summarize the key peer review workshop activities and descriptive data on student participants observed during the study.

**Summary of Key Activities and Descriptive Data on Student Participants**

Seeing as the nature of how collaborative learning took place is important to understanding its peer review social setting, I will initially detail the activities of the two peer review workshops under study. For their first peer review workshop, the teacher’s instructions included telling the students that they should, time permitting, go about looking at however many of their peers’ drafts as they could, of essays critiquing the rhetoric used in the articles they had read around a public controversy for their writing project analyzing an argument, highlighting the type of writing peers were doing in the drafts in different colors—yellow for summary, blue for analysis—to get a visual representation of what elements needed working on for balance, followed by examining the results and revising.

The first workshop occurred with the five students who had agreed to be in the study, shortly after my meeting with them that day beforehand, for purposes of thanking them, checking if they had any questions, and reminding them that they should proceed with business as usual. In the class session I was observing, the five students reviewed the draft of at least one other peer participant on their laptops. Table 1 below summarizes key descriptive data on student participants.
Table 1

Summary of Key Descriptive Data on Student Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>English Language Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hugo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>English L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Legal Studies</td>
<td>English and Spanish bilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>English L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrad</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>English L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>English L1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jessie, Hugo and Conrad switched laptops among themselves, with Natalia and Venezia switching between themselves as well. Seeing as it was an odd-numbered group of individuals, when Jessie was initially done reviewing Conrad’s draft and Conrad was done reviewing Hugo’s, Conrad and Jessie switched laptops, so Jessie could review Hugo’s, as Hugo finished reviewing Jessie’s. Venezia later exchanged Natalia’s laptop for Conrad’s, as Natalia continued to read Venezia’s draft. Ultimately, Jessie reviewed, respectively, Hugo’s and Conrad’s first drafts; Venezia reviewed, respectively, Natalia’s and Conrad’s first drafts; Conrad reviewed, respectively, Hugo’s and Natalia’s first drafts; Hugo reviewed Jessie’s first draft, and Natalia reviewed Venezia’s first draft.

Figure 2 below is a situational visual representation of the first peer review workshop’s activity (the red indicates the first set of exchanges, and the blue indicates the other).
During the second peer review workshop, the instructor began by reviewing a checklist of common problems students encounter when conducting rhetorical analysis (see Appendix G for Rhetorical Analysis: Common Problems Checklist). She then explained that students should pair off, picking three issues from the list that they needed help with, and asking the peer whom they exchanged drafts with to be on the lookout for them in their work, followed by discussing the writing among themselves. In this workshop, I was limited in what I could observe for inclusion in the study. Only one pair, Venezia and Conrad, consisted of two writers who were study participants. The other three study participants reviewed the work of peers who were not participating in the study.

In the following sections, I situate each of the five study participants individually within the context of his or her relationship to language, and the way it is employed in the college
environment through peer review workshops. In taking this approach, I aim to present to the reader the data in a descriptively holistic manner. Later in the chapter, the results of thematic content analysis will be interpreted as developed from the breadth of informational sources.

**Data Presentation**

**Jessie: “How is Someone Supposed to Give Good Feedback if it’s not Good Work?”**

For the subject of their second major writing assignment in the class, an analysis of the rhetoric used in three chosen opinion editorials dealing with a public controversy, Jessie selected to write on what she referred to as the “topic of NFL take a knee,” due to her interest in it. Though in her e-mail form responses she indicated that she had previously worked with multilingual writers in peer review workshops, when I followed up with her in our interview, she clarified she had meant that she had done so while in college. That was the basis for her response that anyone she had worked with was sufficiently proficient in English so that “there was no language barrier, making the experience peer reviewing with them no different than with a student whose only language is English.”

When I asked her about this comment in our interview, Jessie pointed to her work with Hugo, a multilingual writer who was also a study participant:

I didn’t really see much of a difference. If anything, there might have been more—not grammatical—but if something sounds weird in sentence structure, that might involve a switch of two words. So I asked him what he meant, and he said if there’s something I don’t understand, to just switch it. But that’s not his native language. I mean, I wouldn’t be able to do that, to write that well, if I wasn’t writing in my native language. So if anything, I was more impressed after reading it.
Answering the e-mail question form about whether her own language literacy ability influenced the way other students saw her in peer review, Jessie stated, “I don’t know if they viewed me any differently after the fact, hopefully if anything they saw me as a smarter person than they did before.” Nevertheless, her impression was that it did not have an effect on the task at hand: “I feel like in my writing experiences my peers do not judge each other based on topic choice or writing ability.” In our interview, she also said, “I think we all had good respect for each other, after reading each other’s work.” Based on my observation of their first peer review workshop, during which their instructor had asked that students highlight in yellow what was summary and in blue what was analysis in each others’ papers, Jessie indicated in her highlighting of Hugo’s draft that he had more summary than analysis. When I noted this to her, she replied, “Yes. And he pointed that out to me, since I definitely had that issue as well.”

In addition, she recognized other aspects of her first college-level composition course that challenged her: “I had never done an argument analysis paper to the extent that we did in this class…It was difficult to reach an upper level of analysis and go into great depth without merely summarizing.” From my observations of and interaction with her, it seemed apparent that Jessie was strategic and efficient in her approach to the work of peer review as applied to the course assignment. Asked what she hoped to come away with from the peer review process, she answered:

I definitely want to receive back comments on little things like grammatical errors, because I feel like that’s hard to pick up on your own, but then also sometimes with your own writing you become so one-minded that you think it’s totally fine and sounds normal, and it’s not until someone else is reading it that you’re like, “Oh, this is kind of weird,” and you don’t want to wait until the instructor’s reading it, and then they take
points off. So kind of look at format, and then if I’m not going in-depth enough on something, to point it out. When I did the argument analysis, I feel like peer review helped a ton because they were like, “This is in-depth enough, but this one isn’t, so just add more ethos discussion, and then you’re fine,” so it’s kind of like they gave me direction. Help on content is useful, and on organization.

In linking global, higher-order and local, lower-level concerns, Jessie demonstrated a perspective on writing that informed similarly the practicality of her take on peer review. Rather than regarding mechanics separately as discrete language practices from more conceptual issues, she regarded them as of a whole piece. And she understood peer review workshops as an occasion to help enable that viewpoint.

For Jessie, the main difference between the way she used peer review in high school and college was its productivity: “here it was actually super-helpful, because people actually gave feedback on it, which I then ended up taking literally all of it into consideration.” Before college, she said that “we’d get into the groups, and everyone would be like, ‘Oh yeah, your thing’s good, and then we’d just end up talking, and not doing anything constructive.” But with more instructor direction and structure, as well as guidelines that Jessie termed as “individualized to each assignment” (in contrast to her previous use of the AP scale, which she saw as “not real thought” and “much more robotic”), it became less a waste of time…And it’s more productive than if we were just using class time to work on our essay. We could do that elsewhere. We might as well get a second opinion and get feedback on it, as opposed to just looking at your own writing and revising it yourself. Engagement with the business of peer review was key: “everyone’s at the same step too, in the same process, and no one’s is going to be perfect.” Still, she took each draft as a serious effort:
“you don’t want to bring in half-done work, because how is someone supposed to give good feedback if it’s not good work?”

The envisioning of peer review workshops as part of a larger process was encapsulated succinctly when I put the question to Jessie of what type of feedback she found helpful, peer review or teacher feedback: “I think a combination of both, because through peer review you could figure out what to work on, and then you could ask the instructor how to do that.” As a factual matter, part of what stood out to me in my observation of their peer review sessions was Jessie’s outgoing traits of clarification-requesting persistence and straightforward characteristics when exchanging feedback with her peers. In the first peer review session I observed, she attempted to ask the instructor a question as the latter was announcing instructions for their workshop. The instructor asked her if it was okay for her to finish her announcement, pointing out that she might answer Jessie’s question while doing so, to which Jessie assented. When the instructor later broke up the session for mid-group discussion to assess class progress, indicating peer review would continue after, Jessie was the first to answer the instructor’s question on what they had found so far. Jessie stated that she thought the exercise was a good idea, since it demonstrated to her how little analysis she really had in her critique. Upon inspection of the different drafts of her project, I can see how she revised her paper by unifying supporting points to her thesis statement to rely less on personal perspective and more on analysis based partly on comments emerging through peer review.

Hugo: “They Might Think That They are Right, but They Could be as Wrong as me”

Hugo saw peer review as being valued more as a teaching tool in the US, and indicated his impression of there being a greater value placed on workshops in college. Despite this, in a
response to the e-mail question form, Hugo wrote he did not expect uniform peer review outcomes:

My expectations vary from person to person, as a multilingual speaker. I know that students like me may have difficulty with our writing skills and I believe that the best way to improve my skills is by receiving input from professors or upper-class students since they have more knowledge regarding writing. At the same time, that’s one of the reasons why I don’t usually enjoy to give feedback in a peer-review workshop since my opinion may not be accurate and instead could be misleading. In that sense, my expectation when I have peer-review workshops with my classmates is I don’t have any expectation for when I believe my paper is good as it is.

Asked during our interview for more detail regarding that last sentence, Hugo stated:

I usually like to peer review for someone who is at a level below me, because I have more experiences than them, I know more, and I could help them more. But when it’s the same—like with my classmates, for example—we’re all at the same level. Some may have more knowledge, but others may not have, or may have even less knowledge than I do.

For Hugo, there was an emphasis on an individual’s writing ability, but it seemed to be overridden, or at least increased, by that person’s degree of experience.

For example, contrasting his work as the college paper’s sports editor with that of his experiences in first-year writing, he told me:

I feel I learn more from my experience there than from peer review. I feel composition is dragging me instead of pushing me, because it’s more of a workload than anything else,
and I went to a good school, so a lot of what we’re doing—argumentative analysis, that kind of thing—I’ve already done.

And in answer to my question on whether people may have had different reactions toward him as a multilingual speaker during peer review, Hugo stated: “Not really. I don’t like to think about that. There might be, but I don’t care about that. …If I’m here, I must have done something right.”

Related to this lack of influence on him, he said it didn’t matter to him whether others in peer review workshops were multilingual. Again, what he valued more was experience, saying the following about peer review:

Personally, I don’t like it. I can see why people find it useful. However, I don’t like it, at least when I’m doing peer review with my classmates, because we’re at the same level, and for me, it doesn’t make sense. If I do peer review, I would like a more experienced person. … because they might think that they are right, but they could be as wrong as me.

For Hugo, peer review might be practical as an idea, but he didn’t tend to see it that way.

Hugo’s primary stress on experience, followed by writing ability, as playing key roles in peer review mitigated language as an issue. When asked whether language was a factor at all, he responded, “Sometimes, yeah, but generally, it’s based on their own skills.” Following up later in the interview on what feedback he found most helpful, he stated, “Honestly, the only feedback that I used was when I went to the Writing Fellows, because they have more experience and knowledge than me. So I actually value their experience.” As a multilingual ELL himself, the distinction Hugo made was not about how well Writing Center tutors knew the language, but their experience with it: “I know that I’m not as fluent in English as I’d like to be, but my writing skills tell otherwise. So I don’t judge based on language.” Considering that he was tested on
grammatical proficiency when he applied successfully for the sports editor position, the
categorization of an individual as knowing English through an L1 or L2 status was not decisive
for Hugo. He said he did not really feel the need to tell people not to judge his work too harshly.

Nevertheless, Hugo made judgments, of workshops, including his own effectiveness at
them, and of his classmates’, based on their status as peers. On the quality of workshopping, he
replied:

because my perspective is that I don’t find it too useful, I tend to make general statements
about what I find in their papers. If I see someone making a misspelling of a word, then I
tell them that. But besides that, for the structure, I try to look out for that, but because
we’re all on the same level, I prefer not to make those types of comments.

Yet when I brought up an incident to him that I had observed during peer review of when he and
Jessie returned their drafts to each other, at which point he had commented to her that he knew
he had more summary highlighted in yellow than she did, he responded, “Yes—it wasn’t perfect,
and for me personally, I tend to be very judgmental of what I write, and I didn’t like that paper at
all, because I knew that draft wasn’t good.” Asked whether he had trouble distinguishing
between summary and analysis on his project examining the rhetoric around what he entitled as
the “Protests in Charlottesville,” since he had raised with the instructor during peer review the
problem of distinguishing between opinion and summary, Hugo answered that he actually
hadn’t, “but one of my classmates had highlighted sentences that I thought were more analysis
than summary, so I wanted to ask about that.” After probing to determine if the classmate Hugo
was alluding to was Jessie, I asked him what he made of her work, to which he answered:
I did what I had to do based on the instructions, but like I told you, I don’t like to judge, so when I gave it back to her, I just kept it to the basics…I thought if there was something missing, it would be my fault.

In addition, unlike Jessie, who I described above told me she tried to bring in as well-written a draft as possible, Hugo stated of his preparedness in peer review for workshopping drafts of the project assignment they were working on: “this paper, I hadn’t been paying that much attention to it before then.” When he did eventually devote more effort, Hugo’s drafts indicate he focused on providing specific analytical details, statistics, context, and also more of a conclusion in his work.

There were also changes involving wording in the introduction. For instance, from his initial drafts to his final draft, Hugo revised the sentence “With the events that took place in Charlottesville, many people made public many different issues and opinions that the country has beyond the fact that White Supremacists are considered bad guys or not” to read: “The protests that took place in Charlottesville, Virginia, were the tipping point for many authors and many Americans about a very talked-about but often disregarded topic, confederacy.” The change corresponds with Jessie’s remark to me that part of the feedback she gave him had to do with conveying ideas more clearly through rephrasing, and in my interview with him, Hugo did mention how a difference he saw between English and Spanish is that “There are some words, maybe, that aren’t translatable from English to Spanish, and vice versa, so sometimes you have to find the appropriate word that’s not in the vocabulary.” Notably, in my interview with their instructor—whom I will dub Dr. S—she articulated how, during a class session discussing idiomatic expressions, “one that Hugo had a hard time with was the phrase ‘wearing your heart on your sleeve.’” He’s very aware not just that there is a difference, but also what those
differences are between the cultures.” Being alerted by Jessie that his wording needed clarification, Hugo’s sensitivity to turns of phrase led him to settle in the revising process on the expression of a “tipping point” in the Charlottesville controversy. It also accorded with a preference that he expressed to me during our interview: “what I like to do at least when I write in English is I like to write in a formal way.” Hugo’s revision is emblematic of how ELL writers can use peer review feedback to help achieve meaning through combining it with knowledge acquired toward their own ends.

Natalia: “We Think About it a lot More, and we Second-guess Ourselves Sometimes”

Similarly to Jessie, Natalia saw peer review workshops as being more mutually beneficial and productively organized since entering college:

    in high school people don’t really care, they just tell you everything is good. But now people actually want to help and are more mature, so they understand that you’re not trying to be rude, but to help them get a better grade.

Still, she said, “I don’t trash their essay, but I try to tell them in the same way I wish people would tell me. You always try to be as nice as you can, but you also have to tell them the truth.” Additionally, she also appreciated the guidelines the instructor set forth in their composition class, which were suited to each paper, as setting a structured tone for how the workshops were to take place: “in high school they didn’t explain it like with the guidelines we have right now. It was just like, ‘read their essay, and tell them what’s wrong.’ Now, with every assignment, the guidelines change.” The emphasis placed on aiding classmates to convey the characteristics required for every project was constructive.
Natalia apparently regarded a positive attitude toward the endeavor of assisting peers with language through writing as important, and as emerging from the objectives of a composition course, stating:

we all kind of just realize that peer review helps, and that we’re not trying to be harsh, but to help each other out. Maybe in other classes it’s different. …this is a writing class. Maybe in my criminal justice class, people would get more defensive because it’s not the same situation where we’re all trying to get better at writing, like in this class.

This upbeat perspective, shared by Jessie, ran through Natalia’s response to peer feedback:

I feel like peer review is for you to get a second set of eyes on your work before turning it in. When you’re doing something, you see it one way, but then someone else might see it another way. You don’t have to take all their suggestions, but it helps to think about them, because your professor might see it the same way.

As with Hugo and Jessie, Natalia indicated understanding her writing style as unique. What’s more, it imbued her work with ownership as well: “I take all comments into consideration, but ultimately, I have to pick and choose, since it’s my paper.” The receptiveness toward feedback was likewise expressed by Jessie, as noted above.

From my observation of their peer review workshops, though, I noticed that Natalia’s optimism was complicated and borne out of caution. When their instructor asked why students should not feel bad if there was a lot of yellow-highlighted summary in their drafts, Natalia responded that they should stay positive. Conrad, a monolingual peer of Natalia’s who also participated in this study, commented to her not to worry about how much summary she had, telling her it would go away and that he found interesting the issue she was writing about, the
Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) initiative, knowing little about it. Natalia later asked her instructor if she should delete what was highlighted since it was too much summary, to which the instructor told her not necessarily, since it might provide context for the type of evidence needed to support points in an argument analysis, examples of which they could find on the document listing each type of evidence distributed to the class. Natalia then asked the teacher if they would still get credit for a draft that needs lots of work, to which the former responded that if she produced writing for that session, she would get credit. As the workshop proceeded, Natalia asked the teacher whether each of the articles they were looking at had to have a completely different, “pro/con” type of perspective on the issue, to which the teacher replied that they needed to go beyond that binary thinking to looking at what the articles have in common so they could focus on their differences. The teacher then went on to make the point that part of the assignment was meant for students to challenge themselves—say, for example, if they analyzed articles which agreed in their central points, but for different reasons. In their second workshop session, during which students were instructed to go through a checklist of problems common to rhetorical analysis (see Appendix G), checking off ones they thought they needed help with most and looking out for the ones classmates pointed out when they exchanged drafts, Natalia asked the teacher what she should do for two of the articles, since they didn’t include the writers’ names, at which point the teacher explained the concept of an editorial-board “we.”

What I took away from all of these moments was that Natalia seemed concerned about her draft and about her grade, along with maintaining positivity as a self-reminder, with the emphasis on optimism for herself suggested in her answer to the instructor’s question about why they should not be disappointed if they were still engaging in summarizing too much. Natalia provided confirmation of these feelings when I asked her in our interview about Conrad’s
feedback to her and her own questions to their instructor about how much summary she had as opposed to analysis of the rhetoric around DACA:

the first draft, I messed up. I had written on two articles instead of three, and I had just written on my topic of DACA without analysis. So I had to get the comments, figure them out, and put it into the essay….What I found most helpful about peer review was getting someone else’s opinion. For example, Conrad didn’t know that any of that was going on with DACA, and thought it was pretty interesting.

Natalia employed Conrad’s comments as affirmative reinforcement, and revised according to what she decided was information that needed to get across to the reader.

In looking at the changes from her initial to final drafts, I could tell that Natalia revised to shift from a focus on the issue of DACA to analyzing specifically the rhetorical appeals; adding an introduction, conclusion, and thesis; and finding more common ground among the articles. The foregrounding of analysis and contextualizing framing devices of an introduction and conclusion are in line with feedback she received during the workshop process based on peer and instructor comments, an assessment that Natalia made during our interview.

When she talked about how being a multilingual ELL impacted her work in peer review with monolingual students, Natalia made evident her linguistic facility:

I don’t see any big difference. Maybe sometimes, I might have a word I know in Spanish that I’m trying to translate into English, and I have to think about it, but not much other than that, not really—at least for me, since I speak both English and Spanish, and I was born here and grew up going to school here.

She considered her multilingualism to be a source for contemplating what should inform feedback to give, and to take while revising:
as a multilingual speaker, I feel like we think about it a lot more, and we second-guess ourselves sometimes, to make sure that what we want to say is the proper way to say it in English, because maybe we thought about it in one way, and we want to make sure that it’s saying what we want to say.

Asked why she thought these events came about that way, she replied “it just kind of happens.”

As many of her experiences demonstrated, what “happens” around Natalia formed the crafting of her response toward peer review workshops, the writing process, and language practices.

**Conrad: “It’s Really Hard not Just to go in There and Just fix it”**

Conrad’s view of what comprises effective peer feedback framed it to constitute providing assistance with the qualities of overall conceptual issues while distinguishing them from more mechanically oriented concerns when doing so. During my interview with him, he elaborated on this idea:

It’s just that there are a lot of websites that deal with those kind of grammatical issues, and a lot of your grade on your paper depends on the ideas you express in it, so if you don’t have the ideas there, it doesn’t matter how well you do on grammar.

That was a reason he thought of peer review as having a more positive impact in college than previously: “the way Dr. S utilizes it here is more effective. Usually in high school it was limited to grammatical errors.” Behind Conrad’s understanding was his instructor’s guidance that, as Dr. S stated when I interviewed her, peers during workshops should “be helpful….when you see a problem, suggest a solution….I think that one they kind of struggle with because it’s easier to point out what’s wrong with something. It’s kind of hard to say ‘here’s how you can fix it.’” As
Conrad told me:

when I peer review someone’s paper, it’s really hard not just to go in there and just fix it and try to write it as my own paper, because when I see mistakes—I don’t know, but I try like not to do that and just give them criticism.

It was difficult for him to find the proper balance of focusing on grammatical concerns and being more global issue-oriented in his feedback, as that is the type of feedback he would have liked to receive as well.

Due to his striving toward the aim of having peers maintain ownership of their work, Conrad appreciated when others put forth a similar effort. Of Venezia, another monolingual participant in this study whom he was paired up with for the second workshop, he told me, “She was really helpful. She devotes attention to your paper and gives really good feedback,” which he proceeded to consider: “I thought about it, and about whether I could implement it without it hurting the structure of my paper.” On perusing his initial and final drafts, I saw Conrad taking into account Venezia’s feedback regarding providing more coherence in his revisions: for example, before an excerpt at the start of a paragraph containing the quote “For these families, my heart goes out to them, because there is nothing you can say to them that will ease that pain,” he added the following introductory sentence to set it up: “The families in the city of Chicago are suffering for nothing.” In another instance, of a paragraph that had formerly begun by stating, “The Broken Windows Theory suggests that the more decayed and run down a community appears, the more likely crime will be attracted to the area,” he changed to begin more contextually through transitional sentences, reading:

An effective solution to minimize gun violence is imperative to the restoration of Chicago. One theory, known as the Broken Windows Theory, proposed by James Q.
Wilson and George Kelling in 1982, uses broken windows as a metaphor for attempting to explain the misconduct occurring in indigent communities.

Conrad indicated his gratitude to Venezia in the workshop by reporting to their instructor that he found Venezia was more helpful to him than vice versa.

In my interview with her, Dr. S mentioned that “Conrad is a very sophisticated writer, so it was helpful to pair him up with Venezia.” Going by Conrad’s comments to me about his peer, he found Venezia’s feedback useful in further developing his writing, giving him what Dr. S told me was “an extra push” that formed part of how she placed people into pairs strategically. For Conrad, who stated on one of his answers to the e-mail question form that “I have always been very good at writing,” feedback that strengthened his work was important. In response to a follow-up e-mail from me asking for an example of a comment or feedback he didn’t take from peers in revising his draft and why, he wrote that “if they tried to fix a ‘grammatical error’ and I knew their correction was wrong, I would let them change it, but edit it later.” This course of action was consistent with Conrad’s emphasis on ownership of writing, described above.

As Conrad discussed with me, one’s multilingual status did not play a role in one’s facility with English:

Every multilingual speaker that I’ve met and worked with in a peer review workshop, it’s not like—their English isn’t terrible. Maybe they have an accent. But they’re hardworking students, so they’ve been effective at working in the English language, and pretty much on par with everyone else.

Comparable to how Dr. S shared in her interview with me that “we could all use more practice understanding accents. And Hugo has an accent and I think that’s helpful for all of us because we live in a global community,” Conrad did not assign degree of proficiency to pronunciation.
But for Conrad, another factor mattered insofar as an individual’s language and writing capability to the point that it would affect their efficacy of feedback in peer review workshops. Explaining in his interview with me why he sees instructor and Writing Center feedback as more helpful than peer feedback, he said:

In rare exceptions, if they’re a really good writer, peer review will help. But otherwise, it’s just because you’re not getting the same professional experience. Peer review can help make critical changes here and there, but the Writing Center people and Dr. S helped me out the most in re-organizing the paper.

In his valuing of extended experience, Conrad echoed Hugo’s sentiments.

**Venezia: “No one’s Ever Been Like, ‘Well, OK, let me Help you’”**

Venezia was the sole study participant who opted to consult me for tutoring as she drafted her second project, analyzing the rhetoric around the argument of whether college student-athletes should be paid. In my subsequent interview with her, she stated:

I think we had a really good session when you were helping me on the paper. I think that helped the most. Because whenever I’ve needed help on a paper, no one’s ever been like, “Well, OK, let me help you.”

Due to the fact that this statement came in response to my having asked her what feedback type she found most helpful, I found it interesting that Venezia directed her focus to the active experience of conferencing. This focus accorded with her reply to me, in e-mail question form response, that she had not found peer review to be of help in the past. In our interview, she elaborated that the reason she thought that was because “I remember that in high school, people would be uninterested in doing it, and wouldn’t even want to do it, and just want to get out of
class, so they’d just skim it, and say, ‘oh yeah, it’s good.’” Having had practice with workshops since ninth grade, she said:

I’ve seen it change throughout my years of peer reviewing. Some teachers do it differently. Like, Dr. S made us do the highlighting, and that was useful. And in high school I’ve done it where someone just reads it, and says “this is good,” or “this is bad,” and that’s not very constructive.

In conjunction with having keyed into her instructor’s guidance for peer review, Venezia indicated her preference for the second workshop in which students used the checklist of problems common to rhetorical analysis (see Appendix G) when exchanging feedback on their drafts: “I feel like it gave me a set of rules to follow.” Like Jessie, Venezia felt structure was important to peer review, and enhanced qualities intrinsically positive to it as a learning experience.

Unlike Jessie and Conrad, however—who, respectively, saw grammar concerns as part of a workshopping process or downplayed its role during the peer review groups—Venezia cast grammar as a separate issue due to lack of confidence in her grasp of it. In spite of taking an affirmative attitude toward workshops in that she believed, effectively done, they would result in “an improved paper, on both sides,” and that “when I give someone else advice for their paper, I’m also thinking of ways that I could end up using this for my own writing,” Venezia’s placing a premium on clarity of form contributed to her strategy toward feedback. Namely, she concentrated on giving feedback based on “content, because I’m not great at grammar.”

Detailing in our interview why she had written on the e-mail question form that, in previous peer review workshops, “Other students probably believed I wasn’t as great at speaking English or communicating,” Venezia said, “Well, I just felt like, since my grammar isn’t good, people
won’t understand what I’m saying.” She also said that, for her, the most effective type of response to writing during workshops was “Probably just a bunch of edits. Just edit whatever you feel shouldn’t be there, or what should be added,” and she would take feedback if she agreed.

Still, based on my observation of her work during the first peer review session highlighting how much of their drafts were summary or analysis, I saw that Venezia was attentive to higher-order content concerns: the questions she asked Dr. S included making sure she was covering all of the six elements on a checklist of evidence used to support claims in an argument analysis (see Appendix H for How do you know? : Checklist of Evidence to Support Claims in an Argument Analysis).

In addition, from having looked at her initial and final drafts, I can tell that she followed Conrad’s suggestion in the second peer review workshop that she give more of a detailing of the rhetorical elements in summary through a thesis at the end of her introduction. To wit, the last sentence of her first paragraph was changed from “The three articles written by William Boor, Grace Rozembajgier, and Josh Benjamin argue on each one’s own opinion in detail as to why the college athletes should or should not be compensated for participating on a collegiate level sports team.” to read:

The three journalistic pieces written by William Boor, Grace Rozembajgier, and Josh Benjamin provide arguments in detail as to why the college athletes should or should not be compensated for participating in a collegiate level sports team, using primarily the appeal of ethos, or credibility, through different efforts at persuasiveness.

However, in her second draft, I also noticed that Conrad had used the “Track Changes” feature to highlight the word “much” in red and the word “many” in green, indicating the changing of phrasing in the last clause of a sentence. This resulted in Venezia revising the
sentence in the following manner: “Also, Boor uses pathos at the end of his article by asking the readers to recall how much money people make while in college, or how many readers who have already graduated made in college working a part-time job.” It is evident that eliminating the word “much” after “how” and before “many readers” in that final clause changes the meaning, obscuring Venezia’s original point about how much the amount of money was for many readers. Of note is that Venezia revised it according to Conrad’s comment.

Moreover, she capitalized the word “persuading” that Conrad inserted in a comment she should, leading to the following revision in the last phrase of another sentence and turning it into more of a fragment:

William continues to state, “If we asked most students and parents in America if they would be willing to play a sport that they love and enjoy while getting $30 an hour instead of working at a bowling alley, sandwich shop or grocery store for $8-$10 an hour, what do you think they would say?” Persuading readers through means of identifying with, or ethos, to believe college athletes are getting a pretty sweet deal already.

This was in contrast to her not taking into account Conrad’s suggestion for transitional phrases instead of words, instances of which she left as they were. Venezia’s uncertainty about grammar issues, then, was demonstrated in her making changes at a surface word level, when many of her original constructions made sense.

Venezia’s actions take on added resonance when juxtaposed against her e-mail question form response at the prospect of working to receive feedback from and provide feedback to speakers/writers of another language in the course, given her status as a speaker/writer of English as a first language: “My expectations would be that they might have a different type of mindset. They may have information that I couldn’t have thought of on my own or provide a new way of
thinking about a subject.” In conversation with her, during the tutoring conference we had, Venezia told me she had not realized when she worked with Natalia that the latter was multilingual. But, though Venezia was not aware of that, she related to me in our interview, when I asked her what it was like for her to be around multilingual speakers during peer review, as opposed to native speakers, “I’ve never really sat and thought about if someone was a native speaker or not, so I feel like I’ve never noticed it making a difference.” If it did make a difference, Venezia viewed it as an opportunity to exchange ideas for greater communication:

I know…in Spanish maybe sometimes they word the same phrase differently, or they put words in different order. Or…sometimes when I talk to Spanish speakers, I’ll say a phrase, and they’ll ask me if I mean something like this, like “this is what we say in my country.”

Rather than dwelling on confusion or miscommunication, the way she resolved misunderstanding was based on deciding “if it’s something that turns out useful for my paper, I’ll add it….For me, it’s interesting. I like learning about languages. So I’ll go, ‘Oh, that’s cool. Thank you.’” As with Jessie and Natalia, Venezia’s attitude in that type of situation was to be positively appreciative through participating in the experience. She valued the expanding of horizons with which peer review afforded her.

**Interpretive Analysis**

Having presented the various sources that inform my findings, in this section I present the themes resulting from my analysis of the collaboration observed during peer review between participants that emerged from the data. They consist of the participants’ activities implemented based on their understanding of and responses to language difference, and how these are impacted by ideological approaches to language and cultural difference comprising the
framework that forms Guerra’s (2016a) posited continuum. The themes emerged from the data regarding the manner in which participants approached and carried out their peer review collaborative activities. The themes are divided into participants’ understandings of language difference; implementation of language difference understandings in response to peers’ work; and language difference understandings in collaboration.

**Understandings of Language Difference**

Some patterns recur in the data insofar as participants’ understandings of language difference, or of value of feedback in peer review based on language clarity and learning ability, and its relation to using peer review as a means of greater understanding, along with judgment of each other’s written language, and experience in degree of language proficiency through and ownership of writing. For example, there was an emphasis on the extent of using peer review itself as an opportunity to gain better understanding. For Jessie, this emerged from the helpfulness of having classmates review her writing who were at similar points in their composing process, working on an assignment with the same guidelines, to achieve the goal of fulfilling course objectives. Clarity of instructions during workshops was key, as was insightful feedback from an authentic audience. Natalia and Venezia also expressed openness to the experience of feedback delivered in a structured way, with the latter stating that learning of language through collaboration, including my tutoring of her, was what she found to be the most effective form of teaching tool. Though Jessie, who had mentioned bringing in as thorough of a draft as possible, differed from Natalia in that the latter stated her conviction of not having put the best foot forward in the first peer review workshop, their conceptualization of peer review as a language learning space shined through in their stress on needing to be prepared for it.
In contrast, Hugo and Conrad were less enthusiastic about peer review as a language learning experience, placing a greater value on prior writing experience. Hugo, for instance, admitted to not having been as prepared for workshopping of drafts on the second project as he should have been, and thought of being at a similar level to his classmates as a drawback of peer review. Like Conrad, he did not express an outlook of mutual benefit that the other three participants did. While Conrad saw the workshop guidelines as helping, and appreciated the quality of Venezia’s feedback, he, like Hugo, used them as a means of distancing himself from feedback he gave—whether to Natalia, in Conrad’s case, or Jessie, in Hugo’s case. In addition to that of others’ greater degree of experiences, Hugo and Conrad put more stock in their own previous writing experiences.

Also in regard to understandings of language difference, the consequences of being judgmental of others’ capability based on their writing over the course of peer review was another theme, whether manifested in maintaining a positive reception toward feedback, like Natalia did; avoiding just being critical, in Conrad’s case; or keeping in mind one’s own perceived weaknesses, articulated by Venezia. According to Jessie and Hugo, Jessie associated being non-judgmental with respect, while Hugo was concerned at the prospect of providing erroneous information based on his own misunderstanding.

In worrying about how his feedback would impact the writing of others, Hugo’s concern spoke to individual ownership of writing, a theme that was also common in its affecting of Jessie, Natalia, Conrad, and Venezia’s views of collaboration in peer review. For Jessie, peer review was part of a larger process in combination with instructor feedback that helped her determine what revisions she wanted to make; Natalia took the feedback into consideration while
recognizing that it was ultimately her paper; and Conrad and Venezia both stated that they decided on whether to incorporate comments based on whether they agreed with them.

Finally, their understandings in relation to employing linguistically diverse resources influenced the work of the multilingual ELL study participants during peer review in a tangible manner distinct from the monolingual students. The latter set’s participants—Jessie, Conrad, and Venezia—shared with me that a peer’s multilingualism had not made a difference to them in workshops, and reviewed the drafts of at least two other peers in the first peer review workshop. In contrast, Hugo—whose expectations of receiving higher-quality feedback from instructors or upper-level students were admittedly partly due to his multilingualism—and Natalia—whose multilingualism was an acknowledged source of greater contemplative effort—each ended up reviewing only one peer’s draft in that first workshop. This was the case though they too stated they saw no major issue as multilingual writers working with monolingual peers. By the time Hugo gave Jessie her laptop back in exchange for his, Conrad was reading Natalia’s draft, since he had exchanged his laptop with Venezia, who had given him Natalia’s, as Natalia continued to read Venezia’s draft. And by the point Natalia returned Venezia’s laptop, Venezia was still reviewing Conrad’s draft. Rather than simply asking about why the multilingual ELLs reviewed just one draft each and risk coming to anecdotal reasons for it, as opposed to concentrating on the ideological approaches informing their understandings of language difference in collaboration, in the next couple of sections I divide themes according to the manner in which study participants implemented understandings of language difference in response to each other’s work, and in which they enacted understandings of language difference in collaboration, so as to draw more finely on analytical nuance evidenced in the perspectives regarding, and conducting of, peer review heretofore detailed.
Implementation of Language Difference Understandings in Response to Peers’ Work

With further analysis emerged the thematic topic of reviewers’ implementation of language difference understandings in response to peers’ work, or peer reviewers’ degree of empathetic communicative directness, as indicated by patterns relating to their approach toward and extent to which they used concepts such as tactfulness. Straightforwardly responding to issues dealing with peers’ employment of linguistic resources, of all the study participants, Jessie was the most direct in asking for clarification on and reacting to being unable to follow a train of thought due to the language in which it was conveyed, evident in her feedback to Hugo about what she perceived as an issue of phrasing, not grammar, during the first workshop. When I asked her about the results of the highlighting exercise to Hugo during that session, indicating that he had more summary, she stated her appreciation that Hugo had pointed out to her a similar issue, signaling parity. In fact, as Hugo and Jessie returned each other’s laptops, he remarked that he knew he had more yellow on his than she did, and that is when they discussed their respective levels of analysis. Though on the surface apologetic, this comment by Hugo could be a callback to Jessie’s earlier observed discussion comment to the teacher that she had too much summary—a way for Hugo to reassure Jessie she was not the only one who did.

Hugo’s indirectness when focusing on Jessie’s draft was of a piece with what he described to be a nonjudgmental attitude and getting done what was required, due to his antipathy toward peer review. This attitude contrasted to the one he took toward his own work, in particular having told me that he judged his first draft of the paper as not good. Moreover, his indirectness extended to informing his instructor during the workshop that part of the trouble he had with distinguishing between opinion and summary was that there was not a specified order to how the information should appear—even though, as I found out in my interview with him, he
did not agree with all of Jessie’s feedback about the amount of summary he had. Hugo’s comment to Jessie about his having more summary was self-deprecating, but his indirectness around agreeing with the details of just how much summary he had revealed the complexity of how he understood her feedback to him. While Jessie clearly indicated problem areas and took feedback head-on, Hugo couched his comments, and response to hers, diplomatically.

Similar to Jessie, Natalia’s attitude toward language used in giving and getting feedback was pointedly matter-of-fact, informed perhaps by the positivity she attested to the instructor during the first peer review that it was important to maintain. Natalia’s directness was demonstrated in concerns that she voiced to her teacher about how the roughness of her draft would impact her course grade, as well as her positive outlook seeing peer review as an opportunity to receive someone else’s honest opinion on a piece of writing and relay hers constructively to peers about their writing, unlike might be the case in other classes.

Even so, Natalia was adept at indirect signaling too. For example, she and Hugo, who were writing about DACA and the Charlottesville protests, respectively, employed time during the first peer review workshop to ask the instructor questions on higher-order concerns such as tone and source validity that got at potential issues of bias around controversial topics that might be leveled by readers. And she recognized Conrad’s indirect feedback to her, about not needing to worry regarding the amount of summary she had since it would go away the more she worked on it, as constituting his alerting her to the need for substantial revision.

That Conrad’s comments of encouragement to her were meant to be taken in this indirectly critical fashion was confirmed by Conrad himself when I interviewed him. Another manifestation of indirectness was expressed to me by Conrad in describing how he responded to
feedback he did not agree with: namely, that he let his peer make the grammatical correction he
or she determined was needed, but changed it back to the original later on.

Conrad’s work with Venezia during the second peer review workshop suggests she might
have picked up on his lack of enthusiasm toward peer review. For instance, couching her
feedback indirectly, Venezia asked the instructor about the particulars of “hit-and-run” quotes,
before commenting to Conrad on his need to avoid them. Since Conrad offered his observation
during that session that he found Venezia’s comments to be more helpful to him than his were to
her, also apparent in Venezia’s indirectness is a considerable degree of empathy in successfully
conveying feedback, active collaboration through which she elaborated in interview with me was
key in her learning to apply language resources through use, in this case through peer review.

For her part, Jessie empathized with her classmates, reflected in her recognition that, as
the semester progressed, their respect for and appreciation of each other’s efforts deepened,
while they worked to assist their peers, no matter their language background. By comparison,
Hugo stated he did not talk to his classmates often due to a lack of personal connection that came
out of not wanting to take the class in the first place, yet appealed to having empathy for them in
suggesting that the quality of his feedback—sticking to general comments, or obvious structural
and spelling problems—was not as substantive as it could be due to his not wanting to critique
the work of peers who he felt were at the same level as he was, and therefore presumably knew
as much, if not more, than he did, in his estimation.

Additionally borne out of empathy, Conrad recognized that it was difficult for him not to
be overly critical in peer review, so made an effort to provide suggestions constructively.
Modeling his comments to Natalia on guidance from Dr. S, his feedback was ultimately received
positively by Natalia, who was empathetically sensitive as well to the effect her writing had on
her reader, taking time on her own feedback to Venezia, and appreciating that Conrad thought
her topic was interesting. Though arriving at their collaborative activities from different
perspectives, Conrad and Natalia, given their respective linguistic backgrounds, were able to
forge a routine that they regarded as working for each. In order to establish an analytical
explication of the variety of the translingual literacy demonstrated by each study participant,
then, in the next section I examine the data constituting enactments of understandings of
language difference in collaboration.

Language Difference Understandings in Collaboration

The findings on the study participants’ enactment of language difference understandings
in collaboration comprise the range of ways in which students’ understandings of language
difference impacted collaboration through their drawing on ideological approaches in practice
during peer review. Patterns demonstrate these enactments’ relation to the three ideological
approaches to language and cultural difference—monolingual/monocultural, multilingual/
multicultural, translingual/transcultural—outlined by Guerra (2016a). For example, Jessie, in
spite of appreciating that Hugo’s being multilingual could result in tending to make his phrasing
difficult for her to follow due to sentence structure issues, remarked that she asked him what he
meant and then switched the order of words at his request because the way it was originally
written, she pointed out, “sounds weird.” She was cognizant of and considerate of the fact that
English was not his native language, along with assessing Hugo’s writing ability as even more
admirable due to her perception that she would not be at the same functional level in another
language if she found herself in a situation for which she had to perform similarly in a foreign
tongue. Moreover, she was receptive to critique from Hugo regarding her need for more analysis,
seeing it as a straightforward an exchange of information as the one which she applied in her
persistence for clarification from the instructor, whom she had interrupted at the first peer review session to ask a question. This characteristic of straightforwardness indicated Jessie’s perspective that, no matter the language difference, she found and considered her classmates to be of equivalent capability. At the same time, approaching grammar as of a piece with the higher-order concerns that she wanted her peer reviewers to account for suggested that a concern with formal correctness was also present.

Jessie’s collaboration, then, consisted of layers of language difference understandings that revealed themselves in multiple forms. Her openness to finding meaning and communicative intent in feedback she received, despite at times not understanding Hugo’s writing, displays a translingual sensibility. Her understanding of Hugo’s efforts as being remarkable due to English not being his first language, coupled with the respect she had for him when they exchanged drafts due to perceiving that both she and him were at the same position of ability, could be interpreted as a multilingual approach in its recognition of her peer’s distinct but equally valid language practice. Still, Jessie’s characterizing of a resulting difference as “weird” was decidedly monolingual, as was her pairing of higher-order concerns with grammar, though the latter signaled acknowledgement of those elements intertwining.

Likewise, Hugo’s enactment of collaboration, implementing responses to language difference in practice during peer review, was comprised of gradations. His response that he preferred not to think about the reaction others may have had to him as a multilingual speaker during peer review, emphasizing that the achievement of his being at college as an international student indicated his ability, demonstrated a translingual approach. On the other hand, he distinguished between what he perceived as a lack of fluency in English—in a multilingual fashion—and the skillfulness of his language in writing. The latter corresponds to a monolingual-
centric ideology. In his explanation that he did not like peer review because everyone was at the same level of proficiency despite having a different language background, he was drawing on the reason Jessie gave for her enthusiasm for it in a multilingual way similar to hers, but arriving at a different conclusion that was monolingual in emphasizing correctness. His reluctance to engage more directly in the activity of peer review to refrain from evaluating peers’ work could be interpreted as leading Hugo to feel at a further remove from his classmates, however equitable the cause given for it, resulting in his having read only one peer draft in the first peer review workshop. Nevertheless, his statement that his experience as the college paper’s sports editor taught him more than peer review, valuing engagement with writing to make meaning, can be taken as a translingual stance.

Similarly, Natalia evidenced a fluidity in her collaborative language practice. Her positive view toward giving and receiving constructive yet honest feedback shows a translingual conceptualization of how to expand her communicative abilities effectively. Through her awareness of writing taking more time for her as an L2 speaker, she approached it in a multilingual perspective, yet her reasoning that more time was needed due to thinking about how to properly articulate an idea in English suggests a monolingual viewpoint—with a result being her reading only one peer’s draft in the first peer review workshop I observed.

Though a monolingual speaker himself, Conrad placed conceptual issues as being at the forefront of what he would have liked to receive in feedback during peer review, above that concerning grammar issues, in accord with a translingual mindset. Delving further as to why this was the case, however, it became apparent that it was due to his confidence in his own grammar skills. This characteristic, along with pointing out grammar issues in Natalia’s and Venezia’s drafts during the first and second workshops, respectively—despite saying elsewhere he thought
those issues to be secondary—illustrate a monolingual ideology. Like Hugo, Conrad regarded
greater breadth of expert experience as being helpful in peer review. Unlike Hugo, who thought
this because he considered peers to be at the same level as he was, Conrad’s perception emerged
out of considering effective writers to be rare. Even so, another aspect of Conrad’s approach
toward collaboration was multilingual in the sense that, as he stated, he saw L2 speakers, no
matter their maybe having an accent, as of equal skill to anyone else.

Venezia’s practicing of language through collaboration, and her understanding of
multilingualism, incorporated language difference as a net positive. In spite of understanding,
like Jessie, that different languages can result in a variety of sentence structure forms and
phrases, or a multilingual approach, Venezia submitted that she tried to turn instances where she
came across those into learning experiences, thus describing a translingual orientation. This was
consistent with her interview statement to me that, during the session in which I provided her
with tutoring, “I got a better understanding of what was actually expected of me because it was
more hands-on, and I think I just learn better that way.” Indeed, her outlook might have been the
reason she was the only one of the participants to take up my offer of tutoring assistance.

However, this willingness to engage in collaborative learning was balanced with
Venezia’s monolingual-based concern with grammar, worrying about her ability at it and
accepting Conrad’s feedback for revisions related to it even when they were unnecessary, at the
expense of incorporating higher-order revisions based on feedback he also gave. As can be seen,
one way to apply Guerra’s (2016a) framework of the continuum for three ideological approaches
to language and cultural difference is by analyzing the manner in which the approaches are each
manifested as they vie for a student’s understanding to attend to them in practice.
Thus, at differing points, all the participants in my study demonstrated their use of the various approaches to language difference as a resource for understanding, ranging at times from monolingual, to multilingual, to translingual—and adapted by the individuals depending on the circumstances. Indeed, this dissertation contributes toward the project of becoming more knowledgeable regarding the interplay of ideological approaches to language difference on a spectrum during mainstream first-year composition course peer review workshops, in order to capitalize further explicitly on the capabilities of linguistically diverse students present therein.

**Chapter Summary**

In this chapter, I have presented and analyzed the themes gleaned from the data compiled on the study participants through their responses on e-mail question forms, observation of peer review workshops, reviewing of peer review materials along with drafts, and interviews. Divided into participants’ understandings of language difference; implementation of language difference understandings in response to peers’ work; and language difference understandings in collaboration, these findings were presented based on the data sources, the content from which was then recursively, analytically interpreted for greater significance. Themes in the first set included the extent to which participants approached peer review as a space of learning through their understandings of language difference, the resulting degree of judgment on each other’s work, and the importance of individual’s ownership of writing; themes in the second set included directness of expression, tact, and empathy with which they implemented language difference understandings responding to others’ work; and themes in the third set included language difference understandings in collaboration responding to peer review feedback, taking a range of forms. The third set was determined by the context of which ideological approach to language difference participants were using as a resource in how they understood linguistic diversity as
reflected in their peer review practices, drawn from the framework of the responses that comprise Guerra’s (2016a) posited continuum of ideological approaches to language and cultural difference. A tangible consequence of considering the continuum as a spectrum of responses to language difference from which to draw on in collaboration could be posited as being how, in the first peer review workshop, the two multilingual writers were the sole participants who reviewed the draft of one other peer—rather than of two, as the three monolingual students did.

The sociocultural theory-oriented environment in which peer review collaborative activity takes place was thereby examined. Particularly in the form of Hugo’s perspective that his dislike of the workshopping process came from being of similar experience as his peers, since as a multilingual speaker he preferred receiving feedback from individuals with greater experience; and Natalia’s view that her multilingualism was a reason for her devoting more time to exchange of ideas in peer review, the study findings called for greater understanding. Toward that end, Guerra’s (2016a) description of a continuum laying out ideological approaches to language and cultural difference comprised a framework to interrogate the space of peer review as a collaborative social setting.

The findings ultimately show evidence of an awareness of language manifested in peer review on the part of study participants, arising from their employment of language ideologies, drawing on them intuitively, consistent with fluidity of placement at points along Guerra’s described continuum. These findings can be useful in harnessing productively the approaches to language difference already present in peer review workshops, to help students engage in translilingual literacy and recognize stances as needed in particular instances. In Chapter V, I discuss how the study findings respond to my research questions, along with further implications.
recommending opportunities for informing teaching of linguistically diverse students, and directions for further research.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overview

In considering multilingual and monolingual participants’ understandings of language difference with their use of those understandings in practice, this study has sought to analyze them through what Guerra (2016a) frames as a continuum of ideological responses to language and cultural difference, based on Horner et al.’s (2011) understanding of language ideologies being responsive to linguistic variety, to contextualize their impact on peer review collaboration in an English-language mainstream first-year composition class integrating linguistically diverse students. In particular, this research has been guided by the following questions:

1. What are first-year composition (FYC) students’ understandings of language difference and how do they impact peer review collaboration in a mainstream FYC class?

2. How do these FYC students implement responses toward language difference in their practice of peer review?

In this chapter, I discuss how the study findings answer these questions, along with implications of and recommendations suggested by the data for teaching linguistically diverse students, as well as directions for further research.

Discussion

Rather than just conceptualizing approaches to language difference as competitively exhibited by different individuals, the data analyzed in Chapter IV suggests they can be considered on a spectrum, gradations of which the language user attends to adaptively at certain moments. Thinking of them in the context of peer review as orientations that vie for attention of
students, implemented in the form of collaborative activities, accords with Horner et al.’s (2011) explanation that “a translingual approach takes the variety, fluidity, intermingling and changeability of languages as statistically demonstrable norms” (p. 305). However, it is a translingualism more in line with Guerra’s (2016a) statement for students “to call on the rhetorical sensibilities many of them already possess” (pp. 231-232). It puts into sharper focus Guerra’s notion of a continuum, as a spectrum of potential responses along which individual treatment of three ideological approaches toward linguistic and cultural difference is indicative of engaging language ideologies and understanding of linguistic diversity in practice.

Indeed, on the part of those involved, the perspective that comprises their employment of language, along with perceiving use of language in workshops and applying that perception in providing feedback to peers, emerges from what Guerra (2016a) describes as their interplay with factors along the continuum demonstrated in collaboration with participants. At an individual level, the approaches shown in Figure 3 are present, to varying effects:

![Figure 3. Three ideological approaches to language and cultural difference.](image)

Such understanding of students’ engagement with language ideologies can help promote a nuanced degree of literacy around them. It is akin to Guerra’s idea of the “transcultural repositioning” he describes taking place specifically among Latino/as:

This rhetorical skill is one that members of our community must self-consciously regulate and not simply enact intuitively, if they wish to move back and forth with ease and
comfort between and among different languages and dialects... If enacted critically, transcultural repositioning can open the door to different ways of seeing and thinking about the increasingly fluid and hybridized world that is emerging around us. (2004, p.8)

As Guerra (2004) explains, “educators need... to encourage all of our students... to expand their intuitive horizons and engage in the practice of transcultural repositioning from a strategic site of power and agency that requires a critical and self-reflective attitude” (p. 15). The data analyzed in this dissertation study can help to extend the conversation on workshops as a space for increased literacy around language ideologies, and as a forum to exchange ideas.

**Peer Review as an Exchange of Ideas**

While the greater critical awareness that comes with recognizing peer review workshops as a vehicle for variety in language practices can be thought of as itself portending a translingual disposition, the interpretive analysis detailed in Chapter IV of themes emerging from the data indicates the complexity of the understandings toward linguistic diversity that participants demonstrated in the variety of the ideological approaches to language difference they drew upon in practicing peer review activities. The interactively non-fixed shaping of language practices by ideological stances was evidenced in this study through three sets of themes in the data: the first set consisting of participants’ approaches toward peer review as a means of greater understanding, the consequences of being judgmental of others’ capability based on their writing, and individual ownership of writing; the second set consisting of the degree of communicative directness and empathy evident, to one or extent or another; and the third set consisting of the range of ways in which students implemented language ideologies in practice during peer review, as a consequence of context, in relation to the three ideological approaches to language difference during workshops examined for this study. The first thematic data set consisted of
participants’ understandings of language difference; the second their implementation of language difference understandings in response to peers’ work; and the third their language difference understandings in collaboration. Figure 4 summarizes these data sets of themes, which were analyzed as present in study participants’ collaborative conducting of peer review based on language practice through activities of providing feedback, impacting interactively students’ implementation of understandings regarding and responses to language difference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understandings of language difference</th>
<th>Implementation of language difference understandings in response to peers’ work</th>
<th>Language difference understandings in collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>participants’ approaches toward peer review as a means of greater understanding</td>
<td>peer reviewers’ degree of tact/empathetic communicative directness</td>
<td>range of ways students’ understandings of language difference impact collaboration through drawing on ideological approaches in peer review practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consequences of being judgmental of others’ capability based on their writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual ownership of writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4.* Thematic data sets on participants’ collaborative language practice activities of peer review.

Considered systematically, the data sets into which these themes are divided act as stages that provide a conceptualization of peer review as a recursive process of communicating through exchanging ideas. The prism of peer review as a recursive process is due to the possibility of stages overlapping, and being interdependent—hence, interactive. As an example: Jessie, being direct in her indication of his language use to Hugo during the first peer review workshop, related to me how she told him that she could not understand his wording and so asked him what he meant. In collaboration with him, she then switched the order of words after consulting with
him as she proceeded to go about the work of providing him with feedback indicative of his language use, implementing an understanding of language difference in practical response to his work and employing peer review as a space of language learning. In other words, Hugo collaborated with Jessie by revising according to her feedback based on his practical understanding of language difference, and she went back to giving him more feedback by further indicating to him her response to his use of language in his work, incorporating his response to her directness into her stance on workshops as learning experiences that in themselves offer opportunities in the form of a space to practice understandings of language difference.

Thus, the stages comprising the peer review process are shown in Figure 5.

![Figure 5: Peer review as an exchange of ideas.](image)

In this representation, the understandings of language difference each peer review participant brings affects his or her implementation of language difference understandings in response to another’s work, feedback which then impacts collaboration through means of revision. Like Guerra’s posited continuum, the process is not cut-and-dried: depending on the circumstance, a step in the process might influence another as well as impact an individual’s approach to peer review from then on. I discuss each of these stages more in the next few sections.

**Understandings of language difference.** An understanding of language difference that emerged from Hugo and Conrad was one that prioritized most the level of peers’ prior experience with language. Conrad, telling me when I interviewed him of what he considered to
be negative workshop experiences, said that “Maybe just because they’re [his peers] not at the same level in writing as another person. There’s always that difference in degree of understanding.” Hugo, for his part, considered a peer being at a similar level of experience to him to be a flaw of peer review: “Some may have more knowledge, but others may not have, or may have even less knowledge than I do.” While the latter’s viewpoint seemed to stem from an approach that could be described as translingual in its pointing out that he and his classmates were at the same level of communicative experience, the former’s appeared to be based on a monolingual ideology that held effective writers to be few and far between. Both of their viewpoints influenced their subsequent outlooks on peer review as a collaborative learning space to practice understandings of language difference.

**Implementation of language difference understandings in response to peers’ work.**

As for implementing understandings of language difference to respond to each others’ work, Hugo and Jessie’s differing approaches to giving and responding to feedback—with Jessie being more verbally direct, and Hugo less so—might have been shaped by the vantage point through which each saw the work in the class, including peer review and its participants, as being conducive to helping understanding in the way it called on students to employ their linguistic knowledge. Based on my observation of their first peer review workshop, during which their instructor had asked that students highlight in yellow what was summary and in blue what was analysis in each others’ papers, Jessie indicated in her highlighting of Hugo’s draft that he had more summary than analysis—which I noted to her, and with which she agreed: “Yes. And he pointed that out to me, since I definitely had that issue as well.” This sense of helpfulness in understanding transpired because Jessie took Hugo’s comments to her when returning her draft—that he knew he had more summary than she did—as a reassuring callback from him to
her discussion comment to the teacher, which I mentioned having observed in Chapter IV, that she found the exercise beneficial in pointing out that she had insufficient analysis. On the surface seemingly apologizing for having too much summary, Hugo’s exchange with Jessie during peer review workshop, which I referenced to him in our interview, was prompted by Jessie’s remark to the instructor about the highlighting exercise.

Later, Hugo asked for further clarification from the instructor due to his not necessarily agreeing with his peer’s feedback, an assessment that he shared with me diplomatically. According to Hugo, “I don’t talk to my classmates usually that much…. I guess, we haven’t connected as well. I didn’t want to take composition, so it’s like I have to come here. I have to attend it and that’s it.” For Hugo, who saw his work in the class as a demonstration of the quality of his individual writing abilities, being required to take composition, given what he perceived as lack of necessity arising from being already familiar with the type of writing they were doing based on his prior experiences in his home country—let alone having to participate in workshops with peers of whose expert language proficiency he was uncertain—led him to maintain a critical distance. Paradoxically, since he stated his dislike of judging the work of his peers, Hugo’s preconception of results that might emerge from peer review was nevertheless judgmental: he did not see it as a productive enterprise. To what degree his trepidation was in fact due to feeling as if his skills were beyond what was being asked of him, or perhaps a sign of insecurity at having to share his writing given his multilingual status, is difficult to ascertain. As he mentioned in conversation with me, the reaction others may have had to his language fluency was not an issue he cared to think about. In this case, his ideological approach was a combination of monolingual in its valorizing of correctness, multilingual in its approach to understanding his own English fluency level, and translingual in using writing itself as a resource to help overcome
perceived miscommunication non-judgmentally, in the sense that he did not like to judge others’ work and considered his own thriving at a U.S. university to be evident of academic achievement. However, this last aspect, in its lack of willingness to engage critically with others’ work, may in itself have been due to a monolingual-inflected rationale of not trusting the quality of his own feedback, as well as of his classmates’ due to their being at what he considered to be the same stage of knowledgeable understanding as he was.

By comparison, Jessie’s regard toward peer review as a space of language learning was reflected in my interview with her, during which she pointed out: “how is someone supposed to give good feedback if it’s not good work?” This productive attitude informed her workshop collaboration:

I think we all had good respect for each other, after reading each other’s work. Also, our discussion got more in-depth after reading each other’s work, because at the beginning, you don’t know each other’s writing style. And that goes for whether they’re multilingual speakers or not.

As mentioned above, she reported having taken into account the helpfulness of Hugo’s comments to her regarding needing more analysis. For Jessie, the indirectness, or tactfulness, with which Hugo approached his exchange with her, with its allusion to her earlier comment to their instructor, was part of his feedback style. Similarly to Hugo, she stated that one’s multilingual status did not make a difference to how she approached their work—a translilingual stance, given the productive manner in which she attempted to make meaning of peers’ writing. Her appreciation for the effort it took for second-language learners to write in another language was a sign of a multilingual approach. Yet her phrasing of certain points sounding “weird” due to
being lost in translation spoke to a certain monolingualism in her feedback to Hugo—which, while direct, contrasted sharply with his indirectness.

An indirectness also manifested itself in the form of Conrad’s feedback to Natalia in the first peer review workshop, noted in Chapter IV to have been taken by her as encouragement from his part to reassure her that though she had much yellow-highlighted summary, it would go away as she kept working on it. When I asked him about it in our interview, Conrad replied, “I just told her not to worry, there’s always room for improvement. I made some grammatical changes.” Asked what lay behind his comments to her, Conrad answered, “There was a lot of summary.” In tandem with his statement regarding pointing out grammar issues despite saying at a different moment that he typically thought of those as secondary and not another’s concern, it can be concluded that Conrad was utilizing his feedback response to Natalia as a means of pointing out what he judged to be problematic areas in his peer’s writing, albeit framing it in a better light.

Put another way, no matter his judgment, Conrad’s feedback was constructive—which is what Natalia made of it, as she revised what was needed, in line with her own productive attitude toward peer review as a collaborative space of language learning, to which she alluded when I interviewed her: “What I found most helpful about peer review was getting someone else’s opinion.” Her attitude also affected her own directness in responding to peer work, as she told me: “You always try to be as nice as you can, but you also have to tell them the truth.” This goes along with a guideline their instructor set out for peer review, as Dr. S stated in her interview with me:

be encouraging. They—we all—are very emotional about our writing. It’s a very personal process, so the product becomes very personal. So I remind them, if you read a sentence
and you’re like, “Damn that was a good sentence,” write that! Tell your colleague, “man, you said that so clearly, that’s awesome,” because if we only see negative feedback, it’s really disheartening. And that doesn’t motivate behavioral change. That can really interfere.

In his own behavior, Conrad acted out what his teacher modeled. In doing so, he demonstrated an effort to adopt a translingual approach, providing his peer with the type of expansively constructive feedback he would have liked to receive himself. By the same token, his stance perceiving second-language writers’ efforts to result as potentially capable of effective writing as that of L1 speakers in spite of the former perhaps having an accent signified a multilingualism in its differentiation of languages. However, his pointing out the rarity of classmates being effective writers could be considered a monolingual frame of mind. It was consistent with his having admitted to being concerned with correctness during peer review, and recognizing having to go beyond that to get at more substantive content-based issues. Similarly to Hugo, Conrad was employing an indirect form of judgment on peers’ proficiency.

Moreover, due to the “hot-button” nature of their chosen topics dealing with marginalized/minority/interest-group concerns—that of DACA and the Charlottesville protests, respectively—it made sense that there were questions asked by Natalia and Hugo of their instructor, during peer review workshops, requesting explanation about such elements as tone and source validity. For instance, Hugo asked their teacher how to approach the articles in the thesis statement, and the teacher replied that the thesis should make a claim in regard to their use of rhetoric, as opposed to a claim about the subject matter over which the writers were arguing. Natalia asked the instructor whether, in regard to perspective, it mattered if all the articles came from the same source, and the instructor said no, as long as they had different viewpoints. Both
queries targeted the mitigation of potential contentiousness around their issues, in a higher-order fashion that could be understood as indicative of a translingual approach.

Shedding further light on how Hugo and Natalia’s practice of implementing language difference understandings contributed to their response to peers’ work is that, in the first workshop, and as the sole two multilingual study participants, they each only reviewed one peer’s draft, as opposed to what was the case with their L1 peers, who each reviewed two. As they both acknowledged in a stance steered by a multilingual approach, their multilingual status may have played a role in informing their work in peer review for themselves, though they did not see it as making a major difference in their collaboration with their peers. Whether feeling that a peer’s similar level of experience was a drawback that made him doubt his own level of feedback, as in Hugo’s case (“they might think that they are right, but they could be as wrong as me.”); or because it caused her to devote more time to thinking through the quality of her feedback, as was the case with Natalia (“as a multilingual speaker, I feel like we think about it a lot more, and we second-guess ourselves sometimes, to make sure that what we want to say is the proper way to say it in English”)), the consequence of their ideological approaches in practice was ultimately monolingual. This was manifested in Hugo’s unease at giving feedback directly during the first workshop to Jessie, whom he saw at a similar point of writing development as he was but whom he felt disconnected from, as much as it was in Natalia’s attending of more time on feedback response to Venezia during that workshop.

According to Shi (2006), “resistance to adaptation and significant sociocultural discontinuities not only impede L2 learners’ language practices but also mediate their learning opportunities” (p.5). In accordance with the language socialization paradigm for second language
acquisition (SLA) research that posits “All cognitive processes are…embodied.” Watson-Gegeo (2004) states how, complicating Cartesian dualism:

*mind* is a better term than *cognition* [emphasis in original] because the latter tends to focus on only parts of the mind, typically what Vygotsky (1981) called the higher mental functions of voluntary memory, logical reasoning, language, metacognitive skills, and some forms of categorization…(pp. 332-333)

It does this without taking into account a collaboratively interpersonal dimension, as she writes: “Vygotskian theory is subject to the critique of not being social enough, and as yet continuing to treat the mind as a container for the transfer of knowledge” (p. 333). Being cognizant that “In any situation, people will learn, even if what they learn is to fail” (p. 337), and seeing learning as situated insofar as “everything that happens in the human world is in a context with specifiable characteristics” from which those involved develop new knowledge interpersonally (p. 338), the language socialization paradigm clarifies “that language and language varieties adapt to human circumstances and biology, that culture shapes development (including language learning), and that language, culture, and mind interactively shape each other through interactive practices and discourses” (p.339). In terms of the present study, the self-understanding of Natalia and Hugo may have influenced their limited collaboration in peer review integrating their monolingual peers, the stage to which I turn next.

**Language difference understandings in collaboration.** Finally, there is the matter of how language difference is understood by peers through their response to and approach to feedback received during collaboration. During the second workshop—for which they were instructed to pick three issues they each needed help with from a checklist of what trips students up when doing rhetorical analysis (see Appendix G), and to ask their peer to be on the lookout
for them when they exchanged drafts, followed by discussing among themselves—one of the elements Conrad asked Venezia to look at his paper for was coherence. For her part, when she returned his draft analyzing the rhetoric around gun violence in Chicago, she remarked that it was well-written, but that it needed more context for information from articles, incorporating transitions before quotes, in a translingually oriented global-level holistic approach. In that same workshop, Venezia told her instructor that she found Conrad’s feedback extremely helpful, and gave him what I knew from my interview with him he found to be insightful comments. Similar to Hugo’s strategy of checking up on his peer’s feedback through commenting to the teacher about it, Venezia couched her feedback on issues regarding lower-level concerns indirectly, asking the teacher whether introduction for a quote was necessary before including it, then suggesting to Conrad that he avoid “hit-and-run” quotes. This style of peer review could be interpreted as resulting from a multilingual approach, in that Venezia considered how differences in sentence form and structure might be engaging language differently, but nevertheless equally validly. In her second draft, I also noticed that Conrad had inserted comments, using the “Track Changes” feature, about avoiding first-person (as in “us, the readers”) and employing “an idea to transition, not a single word.” However, given that Venezia did not take up those comments in her revisions, instead focusing on Conrad’s more grammatically-inflected corrective adjustments, she also demonstrated a monolingual approach. Her worrying about her ability at grammar and accepting Conrad’s feedback for revising it, even when, as documented in Chapter IV, it was not needed—and coming as it did with the exclusion of higher-order revisions based on his feedback—belies Venezia’s otherwise productive outlook toward peer review as a space of collaborative language learning, as reflected in her having taken advantage of tutoring as a resource for what she described as “hands-on” engagement.
Implications/Recommendations

As can be seen from the preceding discussion, the data gleaned from the study served as a means of providing a methodical response to my research questions about the impact on participant students in a mainstream first-year composition class of their understandings of language difference, and implementation of these responses in collaborative peer review practice. In the next sections, I make recommendations for teaching and lay out conceptual implications based on the findings.

Pedagogical Implications/Recommendations for Teaching

What the data resulting from my study implies is that the approaches to language difference brought to bear on peer review workshops, by all participating students in the mainstream first-year composition course I observed, were implemented in ways that called on students to shift their understandings of and ideological responses to language difference in order to employ language resourcefully in activities of collaboration. Contingent on the situation of their circumstances, the integrated environment in which the students found themselves seemed to encourage varying approaches in the substance of their peer feedback at different points on an individual basis dependent on the peer with whom he or she was collaborating, as well as to bring about introspection regarding their language practices. Jessie, for one, though coming to peer review as a space of language learning in her initial outlook to it in a translingual sense, also mentioned to Hugo directly that some of his phrasing was hard to follow, noting in her interview with me that it sounded “weird”—responses more discretely separating language through standardized conventions and less open to difference, in a multilingual and monolingual manner, respectively. Nevertheless, through negotiating collaboratively, she and Hugo worked out a process for exchanging feedback, demonstrated by Jessie’s taking his indirect comment on her
having too much summary constructively, and his turning to the instructor for the latter’s input regarding feedback he received from Jessie.

This collaboration took place despite Hugo’s perspective on peer review, as shown in the data, in itself being influenced by a more monolingual approach in seeing workshops as not too productive due precisely to the differences in experiences with language that participants bring to it. In conjunction with his distinguishing multilinguistically between fluency in English proficiency and in writing (“‘I know that I’m not as fluent in English as I’d like to be, but my writing skills tell otherwise.’”), along with his translingual understanding that his achievement as an international student bespeaks the obsolescence of seeing language as a barrier (“If I’m here, I must have done something right.”), a pattern emerges of students managing to call upon ideological responses to language difference as needed in their collaborative work. This pattern is reinforced in the data on Conrad, who, like Hugo, saw differing levels of proficiency as a drawback to peer review workshops in a monolingual way, but who also understood his multilingual approach to feedback as in need of adjusting (“it’s really hard not just to go in there and just fix it”) and saw the importance in adopting an open tone to difference constructively, such as in his encouraging comments to Natalia, in a translingual manner.

In sum, the findings of the present study imply a form through which to apply Lee and Jenks’ (2016) conceptualization of translingualism as somehow transcending language. In their study of translingual dispositions emerging over a semester-long cross-cultural course, participants were asked to write, in addition to critical literacy narratives on their experiences with language, a reflective response to peer collaboration with their cross-cultural counterparts. That study confirms that monolingual speakers can enact translingual dispositions, and that “even students who can be considered monolingual in the most traditional sense of the term have
the capacities to develop translingual competence” (p. 321). This competence results from their communicative resourcefulness.

Similarly, a pedagogical implication of my study findings is consequently the need for harnessing learning development in order to for students to capitalize productively on a growing awareness of their dispositions toward language. Going beyond monolingualism and multilingualism, translingualism—understood to include an expansive approach toward communicative resources at people’s disposal—supplies a frame through which students can view understandings of the approaches, attitudes and responses to language difference comprising language ideologies that inform their conveying of ideas in peer review workshops, and how to make effective use of them.

A familiarity with the mindset involved in communicative facilitation of language would help students’ understanding in a way that could inform an array of options for how they proceed with peer review. This facilitation, which Guerra (2016b) refers to as included in “transcultural repositioning” (p. 13), needs to be practiced more explicitly and purposefully by students of all backgrounds. By having students acknowledge instances of monolingualism-centric and/or multilingualism-centric thinking, with their emphases on “the universal applicability of a single language” and “use of a plurality of languages, though each in a discrete site in hierarchical relations to others” (Horner et al., 2011, p. 307), respectively, a framework of translingual literacy can aid “fluency across language differences in our reading and writing, speaking and listening, so that we can become adept at processes of making and conveying meaning” (p. 307). In particular, Horner et al. (2011) define fluency typical of translingualism to constitute “openness to linguistic differences and the ability to construct useful meanings from perceptions
of them” (p. 308). Peer review can be posited to students as a means through which to foster such translingual dispositions.

Through modeling of peer review response building on the type of substantively encouraging feedback espoused by this study participants’ writing instructor, whom I have dubbed Dr. S, explicit teacher guidance can become the means by which to tap into pertinent aspects of workshopping that take advantage of its potential strengths in an integrated composition classroom. To help students avoid the pitfalls of being so tactlessly direct that other participants shut down (which might be a risk with students who have outlooks as contrasting toward peer review while collaborating, such as the head-on direct feedback style of Jessie and the more diplomatic style of Hugo), perhaps instructors could draw up guidelines for how to conduct feedback sessions that emphasize how students should ask more questions of peers verbally, instead of concentrating on responding to each other in writing when reviewing peers’ work. This practice would help empower students and teach them positive ways to be direct and straightforward, while empathetic, regarding not only the feedback they give, but that which they receive. It would be especially conducive to imbuing students with an authority insofar as being the ultimate source of knowledge about their own writing, no matter their language background, and be useful to respond non-judgmentally in cases where they might not understand or where they might even disagree with their peers’ ideas.

Also, considering that the multilingual participants in the present study were not able to provide feedback on more than one of their monolingual peers’ drafts during the session that those monolingual peers reviewed two of their peers’ drafts, maybe providing learners in such integrated groups with time for verbal discussion along with written response would help, by supplying them with another modality for response. Parallel to Zhu’s (2001) findings in a case
study of mixed peer response groups that “Combining oral and written response or alternating them perhaps would better allow native and ESL students to contribute to, and benefit from, peer response” (p. 273), the findings of this present study suggest that it might be effective to facilitate workshops in which participants are authorized clearly to ask questions of each other, given the need to make sure all students are provided equal opportunity to participate. Whereas the ESL students in Zhu’s study were found to have more opportunity to participate in the form of substantive written feedback, my study findings indicate the need for further training in efficient response strategies. Ruecker (2018) suggests meeting with peer review groups to “focus on getting the writer to play a more active role in the peer review process” by stressing for “the writer to ask for more specific feedback,” as needed, that is “content-based…explaining that all students are equally capable of providing this type of feedback and that it is the most valued” (p. 280). This type of instruction can assist in mitigating concerns of language difference contributing to time consumption in peer workshops, whether involving uncertainty regarding level of feedback (Hugo) or quality of second-language proficiency around it (Natalia).

Finally, honing the role of technology, such as adjusting the incorporation of laptops to ease collaborative practices, should be understood as assisting in developing for greater learning the communicative power of peer review workshops in a mainstream first-year composition course integrating linguistically diverse students. Indeed, according to Canagarajah (2018a) in his study of international STEM students, resourcefulness of practices—including employing “Track Changes” features in collaboration, digitally visual resources, and physicality of classroom space—enable the nurturing of a translingual disposition. The reliance on laptops during the workshops observed for this study, rather than having students read each others’ drafts
before class, points to the impact of communicative modalities on expanding a translingual orientation.

**Conceptual Implications/Recommendations**

Conceptually, the data suggests that the idea of “space” works specifically as a metaphor through which to envision writing in terms of involving a relationship with one’s surroundings, whether separate and apart from them, or immersed in and a part of them, to the extent that language users bring their experiences in other places to bear on their literacy practices, as demonstrated in situations highlighted by Canagarajah (2018a, 2018b). Whether informed by their negative perspective on peer review—as this chapter has detailed Hugo and Conrad were—or by a more productive outlook on workshops as opportunities for learning—as demonstrated by Jessie, Natalia, and Venezia above in this chapter—preconceptions participants brought with them influenced their collaboration at least partly, given that they were able to negotiate with each other by calling on their understandings of language difference resourcefully.

These findings appear to bear out Canagarajah’s (2018b) notion of “a connection between inhabiting transnational social spaces and engaging in translingual practices,” and that “Those who occupy a transnational social space develop the dispositions to engage in translingual communication” (p. 43). Explicating the link between translingualism and transnationalism, Canagarajah (2018b) writes that “the term transnational looks at relationships that transcend the nation-state” (p. 42). Citing Faist, Fauser, & Reisenauer (2013), Canagarajah (2018b) applies their distinction of “place” from “space”: “While place is a geographical entity, identified by physical boundaries and governed by the nation-state, space is liminal. It is socially constructed and affectively experienced. From this perspective…one doesn’t have to leave one’s usual habitation…to adopt a transnational positioning” (p. 42, emphasis in original). Likening
transnationalism to translingualism in the sense that the latter “treats communication as mobile verbal resources that are appropriated by people and used beyond their separate language labels as suits their purposes,” Canagarajah (2018b) takes care to point out that “translingual processes characterize all communicative practice even when words identified as belonging to separate languages may not appear in the finished product. For example, one might translate ideas between languages mentally, even though the essay is in academic English” (pp. 42-43). In relation to the present study, therefore, conceptualizing peer review workshops broadly as transnational social spaces could facilitate guiding students to use strategically the variety of understandings of language difference they bring with them in their approach to collaborative learning.

Making the conceptualization explicit might provide further support for students’ drawing on the ideological approaches to language difference outlined by Horner et al. (2011) in an adaptable way. It could also supplement the resolution on employing these approaches as a continuum toward which Guerra (2016a) arrives. Examining why, in her writing, his student Mina was critical of translingualism as leading to a lack of communicative credibility, even as she had shown an appreciative understanding of its rigor in use previously, Guerra writes:

> despite the fact that I had encouraged my students to perform and produce language in the midterm and final essays in much the same way they had done in the self-reflective ones, Mina and her classmates balked, not because they are incapable of calling on their rich repertoires of multilingual practices, but because the school context lacked the social, personal, and inter-relational stakes—as well as the intimate, rhetorical familiarity—that they readily found at home with their friends and families.

The mistake I made…is that I inadvertently assumed that students can ignore the
circumstances they face in the new rhetorical situation (an assigned essay in a classroom) and can easily transfer their language practices from one site to another. (2016a, p. 231)

While Mina’s stance in familial settings was more open to language difference, in other words, she called on a monolingual approach in the place she regarded standard language conventions as more appropriate: at school.

However, as Guerra (2018b) concludes, framing ideological approaches to language difference as a continuum means that they should be understood by students as “rhetorical and semiotic resources they need to have at their disposal” (p. 232). The data found in the present study, then, showing how participants call upon a continuum of ideological approaches in their understandings of language difference to accomplish various collaborative objectives, displays that Guerra’s framing can be taken to proceed one step further: as opposed to separating the school context from that of others, spaces can be established within it not contingent on place. Peer review workshops constitute such transnational social spaces. Conceptualizing them as such could encourage students to see ideological approaches to language difference as tools to employ rhetorically dependent on the situation, applied adaptively by students as Guerra (2016a) advocates, but not tethered to specific contexts, nor necessarily fixed within themselves.

After all, particularly underlying communicative practice in the type of integrated first-year composition courses featuring the peer review workshops I looked at for my study is the following notion:

Participation in such an intercultural dialogue then implies a shift from fixed cultural meanings and towards the open space of in-between-ness in which the very fact of being located outside of monadic cultures and identities may result in the “surplus of vision” and creative understanding of both self and the Other. (Kostogriz, 2004, p. 6)
As Kostogriz goes on to state:

the concept of literacy in multicultural conditions needs to be re-defined as transcultural literacy. The rethinking of literacy practices within ethnic communal places can be commenced by situating them in a networked space of sociocultural and semiotic relations. It can not be merely tied to geographical or physical places. (p. 8)

Peer review workshops in an ELL-integrated mainstream class are in this way themselves locations in which members of different cultures can encounter each other, or contact zone spaces. The idea of spatiality thus provides a direction for further research in this area, other directions for which I explore in the next section.

**Directions for Further Research**

Given that the sole male participants in the study, Hugo and Conrad, were the only ones who stated that they most valued the level of prior experience in peer response feedback, the concept of gender provides one direction for further research. Additionally, whereas the present study was focused on collaboration within peer review sessions of an integrated mainstream first-year composition course based on the participants’ understandings of language difference, and how these participants implemented their responses toward language difference in their practice of peer review, another direction for further research would be looking at primary characteristics of students’ understandings of language difference and how workshops influenced their understandings. That type of study could generate data on students’ changing understandings of language difference, to be conducted on a longitudinal scale, and/or to look for changes in particular that emerge from participants individually.

Moreover, Carol Severino’s adaptation of the stances Min-Zhan Lu outlines as responses to second language writing, as discussed by Paul Kei Matsuda and Michelle Cox (2009), serves
to delineate an overlap of these reading stances with ideological approaches to language and cultural differences, delineated by Horner et al. (2011) and framed as a continuum by Guerra (2016a), that could be researched further. Defining the assimilationist stance as the one that “reads differences as deficiencies—errors to be corrected”; the accommodationist stance as the one that “reads differences as, well, differences, explaining to the writer how some differences may be seen as deficiencies by some readers,” but leaving it to the writer to decide whether to make changes; and the separatist stance as the one that “reads to overlook and therefore preserve difference” (p. 45), Matsuda and Cox shift the discussion to reading for clarity of meaning in context, as the distinction between global and local errors is difficult to discern otherwise (p.47).

In doing so, Matsuda and Cox lay out strategies including respondents reading the paper aloud to determine where comprehension breaks down, and marking the areas in the writing at which questions occurred so as to ask the writer about them later on, in a way that is responsive to it as a sincere attempt at communication (p. 48). This approach to reading second language writers’ work, consistent with the accommodationist stance, is one that also calls on a multilingual approach as defined by Horner, et al. (2011), yet also lies somewhere between that response and a translingual response on the continuum of ideological approaches to language and cultural difference (Guerra, 2016a). Future research could investigate whether the balancing of these two approaches as falling along the spectrum of language ideologies constitutes the stance that engages students as fairly as possible in peer review by establishing the status of workshops to be meaning-making vehicles explicitly, and whether it should therefore comprise the basis on which instructors present their students with peer review response options that are inclusively applicable and collaboratively appreciative of language difference, particularly in a linguistically integrated mainstream first-year composition classroom.
Conclusion

Throughout this dissertation, I have delved into the significance of approaches to linguistic diversity for students’ understandings of language difference in collaboration during writing workshops in a mainstream first-year composition class integrating multilingual and monolingual students, and the implementation of these language ideologies through students’ employment of their understandings of language difference in peer review. Ultimately, conceptualizing peer review as an exchange of ideas focuses on thinking critically about how language affects meaning, foregrounding the central purpose of conveying information as clearly as possible to the reader and putting the role of workshops in perspective as integral to clarifying understanding. In my own experience as a writing teacher, one of my students, reflecting on peer review, opined that the ability to give and receive constructive criticism made her a better writer and a better person. As a means of bringing forth effective peer review collaboration, cultivating a translingual disposition can be of much consequence.

A translingual disposition is a stance that requires the ability to decide what to prioritize in responding to writing, taking into account the writing’s situation, purpose, and its effect on the reader—but it is delineated as one approach on a spectrum of responsive language ideologies. I have studied the space of peer review workshops in order to capture the impact on participants’ collaboration of the understandings of language difference in the form of the ideological responses they draw on and how they are demonstrated in an integrated ELL environment. For composition as a field, applying these approaches as a framework socialized in multilingual settings—precisely with their prevalence in mind—means being aware continuously of the strategic importance of their interplay. This awareness, in turn, is one through which a greater sense of equity can be fostered, to benefit linguistically-diverse students.
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Appendix A

Instructor Informed Consent Form

Consent Form for Participation in the Research Study Entitled

Affective Advantage of Peer Review in an Integrated English Language Learner First-Year Composition Class

Principal Investigator
Reymond Levy
Doctoral Candidate
Email: DZYS@iup.edu
Phone: 954-612-6891
Department of English, Composition and TESOL Program
Indiana University of Pennsylvania Indiana, PA, 15701

Statement of Age of Subject: I state that I am over 18 years of age and wish to participate in a research study being conducted by Reymond Levy.

Purpose: The goal of this study is to investigate expectations and experiences of writing students with diverse language backgrounds who are collaborating in peer review workshops in a first-year composition class.

Procedures: I will be asked to permit the researcher to: 1) attend designated class sessions in which students are carrying out peer review; 2) conduct out-of-class interviews with students (for approximately 60 minutes); and 3) tutor students (for 30 min.) as needed outside of class in a supplementary role to become familiar with them/their writing, and without having authority over their grades in the course. To purposefully sample the class for participants in integrated English language-learner peer review workshops meriting observation, the researcher would also need to 4) collect literacy autobiographical narratives from the students electronically, instructions for completion of and collecting of which will explain that they will not be graded and will be looking at responses of multilingual students’ and monolingual students’ perspectives on and views of receiving feedback from and providing feedback to their multilingual and monolingual peers.

To put students’ accounts in larger researchable perspective, 5) at an interview location convenient to me, I will be asked to respond (for approximately 60 min.) to questions looking for insight as to how the peer review sessions were facilitated, toward the end of the semester.

Interview questions to be included will be along the lines of “Describe what you considered to be a successful peer review workshop that integrated multilingual and monolingual students” and “How do you envision peer review workshops integrating multilingual and monolingual students working in your class?”

I will be able to ask the researcher to stop audiotaping, if at any time, I feel uncomfortable about being audiotaped.
To participate, students need to be at least 18 years old. I will not be informed of student participation, so as not to appear to influence grading in the course. Before collecting any classroom work or producing any data, the researcher will receive informed consent from students toward the beginning of the semester for participating, which will include an explanation that it involves conducting the regular work of the class; collecting literacy narrative autobiographies on their experiences with peer review and language backgrounds; observing of students in peer review workshops for any one of their major assignments; tutoring of students as needed for 30 min. outside of class in a supplementary role to become familiar with them/their writing; studying of drafts, revisions, the final draft and written responses resulting from peer review; and interviewing suitable participants regarding peer review experiences, after observing them in workshops and after they have submitted their assignment.

Confidentiality: As mentioned, this research project will include audio recording of the interview. This recording will be available to be heard by the researcher. The recording will be kept securely on a password protected computer. The recording will be kept for 36 months from the end of the study. The recording will be destroyed after that time by deleting the recording, meaning that while anonymity cannot be promised, confidentiality can. The researcher will limit access to the digital file and transcripts of the interviews will not have any information that could be linked to the participant. All information obtained in this study is strictly confidential unless disclosure is required by law. Also, for confidentiality concerns, pseudonyms will be assigned upon inclusion of data. The researcher will be cautious regarding the data revealed about participants so that they cannot be identified even without their names. The transcripts of the interviews will not have any information that could be linked to participants. The IRB or regulatory agencies may review research records.

Risks, Benefits: I understand that there is no more than minimal risk to me since confidentiality will be maintained at all times for all participants and all institutions. I understand that although I may not benefit directly from participation in this study, I have the opportunity to enhance knowledge necessary to improve the experiences of multilingual and monolingual speakers during peer review workshops in mainstream linguistically integrated first-year composition classes at MSPRU. This in turn may contribute to the teaching of writing and to the larger field of composition at large.

Freedom to Withdraw and Ask Questions: My participation is voluntary, and I understand that I am free to ask any questions or to withdraw all forms of participation from this study at any time. I can contact the principal investigator using the information indicated above, or contact the study co-investigator using the information below.

Other Considerations: If the researcher learns anything that might change my mind about being involved, I will be told of this information.

Site Information
MRSRU

Co-investigator
Dr. Curtis Porter
Assistant Professor
MA TESOL Program Coordinator
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Voluntary Consent by Participant:
By signing below, I indicate that

- this study has been explained to me
- I have read this document, or it has been read to me
- my questions about this research study have been answered
- I have been told that I may ask the researchers any study-related questions in the future or contact them in the event of a research-related injury
- I have been told that I may ask Institutional Review Board (IRB) personnel questions about my study rights
- I am entitled to a copy of this form after I have read and signed it
- I voluntarily agree to participate in the study entitled *Affective Advantage of Peer Review in an Integrated English Language Learner First-Year Composition Class*

Participant's Signature: _______________________________ Date: ______________

Participant’s Name: _________________________________ Date: ______________

Signature of Person Obtaining Consent: ______________________Date: ___________
Appendix B

Student Informed Consent Form

Consent Form for Participation in the Research Study Entitled

Affective Advantage of Peer Review in an Integrated English Language Learner
First-Year Composition Class

Principal Investigator
Reymond Levy
Doctoral Candidate
Email: DZYS@iup.edu
Phone: 954-612-6891
Department of English, Composition and TESOL
Program
Indiana University of Pennsylvania Indiana, PA, 15701

What is the study about?
You are invited to participate in a research study. The goal of this study is to investigate expectations and experiences of writing students with diverse language backgrounds who are collaborating in peer review workshops in a first-year composition class.

Why are you asking me?
You are invited to participate because you are an English speaker, at least 18 years of age, and are taking first-year composition at MSPRU.

What will I be doing if I agree to be in the study?
Aside from literacy narrative autobiographies on your experiences with peer review and language backgrounds, that will not be graded, and being asked follow-up questions in an interview, you will be conducting the regular work of the class, which is being studied as part of a research project. Classroom work I collect will take the form of drafts, revisions, the final draft and written responses resulting from peer review for any one of the course’s major writing assignments. In addition, you agree to my observing of selected peer review workshops for this major assignment and my potential tutoring of you as a suitable student participant as needed for 30 minutes outside of class. Further, you agree to my interviewing of you as a suitable participant regarding peer review experiences (for 60 min., approximately), after my observing workshops and after submission of the selected major writing assignment. This interview will be in regard to your experiences after, as well as experiences during, workshops; and how the workshops played out in light of potential expectations you might have had going into them. The interview will take place after you have completed the final draft of the major writing assignment being studied, before the end of the semester. Participants will be asked such questions as “How do you see yourself in peer review workshops? How do you think others see you in these workshops? How do you see the role that others play in these workshops? What do you see the role being of workshop participants? What is it like being around multilingual English
speakers in your groups? How do they relate to you? What is it like being around monolingual English speakers in your groups? How do they relate to you?"

**Is there any audio or video recording?**
This research project will include audio recording of the interview. This recording will be available to be heard by the researcher. The recording will be kept securely on a password protected computer. The recording will be kept for 36 months from the end of the study. The recording will be destroyed after that time by deleting the recording, meaning that while anonymity cannot be promised, confidentiality can. The researcher will limit access to the digital file and transcripts of the interviews will not have any information that could be linked to the participant. All information obtained in this study is strictly confidential unless disclosure is required by law. Also, for confidentiality concerns, pseudonyms will be assigned upon inclusion of data. I will be cautious regarding the data I reveal about participants so that they cannot be identified even without their names.

**What are the dangers to me?**
Risks to you are minimal, meaning they are not thought to be greater than other risks you experience every day. Participating or not will not affect students' grades in the course. All data will be retained for at least three years in compliance with federal regulations in two separate computer files (password protected), as well as in a secure location to address privacy issues. It is possible, but unlikely, that sharing information about your language background and your experiences at MSPRU may make you uncomfortable. If this happens, you may choose not to answer a question or even leave the interview altogether. Your participation is entirely optional. The instructor of record will not know who is participating.

**Are there any benefits for taking part in this research study?**
There are no direct benefits for participating. However, I will potentially tutor you as a suitable student participant/as needed for 30 minutes outside of class. I am a trained and experienced writing instructor with experience in working with students one-on-one with their writing. Help with writing is an ongoing student need, and I would be assisting with your writing in a consulting role.

**Will I get paid for being in the study? Will it cost me anything?**
All students in the course, whether interview participants or not, will have the opportunity to meet with the researcher for tutoring over the duration of the semester. There are no costs to you for participating in this study.

**How will you keep my information private?**
The transcripts of the interviews will not have any information that could be linked to you. As mentioned, the digital files will be deleted 36 months after the study ends. All information obtained in this study is strictly confidential unless disclosure is required by law. The IRB or regulatory agencies may review research records.

**What if I do not want to participate or I want to leave the study?**
You have the right to refuse to participate in interviews. If you decide not to participate, you will not experience any penalty or loss of services you have a right to receive from the researcher. If you choose to withdraw, any information collected about you **before** the date you leave the study will be kept in the research records for 36 months from the conclusion of the study, but you may request that it not be used. You can contact me using the information indicated above, or contact the study co-investigator using the information below.

**Other Considerations:**
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If the researcher learns anything that might change your mind about being involved, you will be told of this information.

Site Information
MSPRU

Co-investigator
Dr. Curtis Porter
Assistant Professor
MA TESOL Program Coordinator
Department of English
724-357-3965
Curtis.Porter@iup.edu
Sutton 348,
IUP

THIS PROJECT HAS BEEN APPROVED BY THE INDIANA UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS (PHONE 724.357.7730)

Voluntary Consent by Participant:
By signing below, you indicate that
• this study has been explained to you
• you have read this document, or it has been read to you
• your questions about this research study have been answered
• you have been told that you may ask the researchers any study-related questions in the future or contact them in the event of a research-related injury
• you have been told that you may ask Institutional Review Board (IRB) personnel questions about your study rights
• you are entitled to a copy of this form after you have read and signed it
• you voluntarily agree to participate in the study entitled Affective Advantage of Peer Review in an Integrated English Language Learner First-Year Composition Class

Participant's Signature: _______________________________ Date: ______________

Participant’s Name: ___________________________________________ Date: ____________

Signature of Person Obtaining Consent: ___________________________ Date: ____________
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E-mail Question Form Distributed to Students

Instructions for E-mail Question Form

The goal of this e-mail question form is for you to provide answers that will be ungraded, in response to questions about your previous experience with peer review that includes your perspectives on and views of receiving feedback from and providing feedback to peers who speak English as a first language and to peers who are multilingual. The questions can be found after the next couple of paragraphs below.

Use the body of the e-mail text or the attachment. Try to address all the questions that apply to you below to the best of your ability. If a question does not apply to you, please type “N/A”. Please e-mail me if you have any questions. Please respond directly under each prompt. If I need further clarification, I will email you with specific questions. I want to thank you in advance for sharing your thoughts.

1. Where were you born?

2. Pick a or b: Are you a) speaker/writer of English as a first language; or b) multilingual speaker/writer?

3. If you were born outside the United States, how long have you been in the US?

4. Have you used peer review/workshopping/exchanging of paper drafts with other students for feedback or comments in writing classes? If so, how?

5. If you answered yes to question 4, what was/were the experience/s like?

6. If you answered yes to question 4, were there were any participating students that you know of who spoke a different language?

---

1 These questions have been adapted from Park, G., UNSILENCING THE SILENCED: THE JOURNEYS OF FIVE EAST ASIAN WOMEN WITH IMPLICATIONS FOR U.S. TESOL TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS, 2006
7. If you answered yes to question 6, do you know which language/s they spoke?

8. If you answered yes to question 4, how do you think your language literacy skills influenced the way other students saw you?

9. If you are a speaker/writer of English as a first language and answered yes to question 6, what was it like being around multilingual speakers/writers in peer review? How did they relate to you, and you to them?

10. If you are a multilingual speaker/writer and answered yes to question 6, what was it like being around speaker/writers of another language in peer review? How did they relate to you, and you to them?

11. No matter whether you have participated previously in peer review workshops or not, talk about any expectations you might have for working to receive feedback from and provide feedback to speakers/writers of another language in this course, given your status as

   a) speaker/writer of English as a first language; OR b) a multilingual speaker.
Observation Protocol/Sample Field Notes

### Observation Field Notes

**Researcher:** Reymond Levy  
**Site:** College writing classroom  
**Purpose:** To observe the experiences and interactions of ELLs in integrated peer review workshop  
**Participants present:** Hugo/Natalia/Jessie/Conrad/Venezia  
**Date/time:** October 31, 2017 from 1-2:15 pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagram of setting:</th>
<th>Teacher/Board</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher begins to give directions for the revision exercise students are to engage in as part of their peer review workshop. Jessie tries to interrupt. Teacher asks Jessie if it is OK for her to finish giving the instructions, and points out that she might answer Jessie’s question by time she’s done, hopefully having anticipated it. Jessie assents. The rest of the teacher’s instructions consist of reminding the students that the workshop guidelines for them to adapt can be found in the A2 folder on Blackboard. Basically, she reiterates, they should go about looking at however many of their peers’ drafts that they could as time permitted, of essays critiquing the rhetoric used in the articles they read around a public controversy for their 2nd writing project, highlighting the type of writing peers are doing in the drafts in different colors—yellow for summary, blue for analysis—to get a visual representation of what elements they need to work on for balance, followed by revision based on the results. Before the class separates into groups, teacher asks Jessie if her question is satisfied. She says yes.</td>
<td>Teacher has provided me with a copy of the exercise instructions, which students are to have downloaded from their Blackboard course web page for themselves.</td>
<td>Jessie seems comfortable asking for instant clarification. Initially, Jessie and Conrad still seem unsure of how to proceed. Jessie asks Hugo for confirmation that they have to switch laptops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

Sample Interview Questions

For Students:

1) How do you see yourself in peer review workshops?
2) How do you think others see you in these workshops?
3) How do you see the role that others play in these workshops?
4) What do you see the role being of workshop participants?
5) What is it like being around multilingual English language learners in your groups?
6) How do they relate to you?
7) What is it like being around monolingual English Language Learners in your groups?
8) How do they relate to you?

For Instructor:

1) Describe what you considered to be a successful peer review workshop that integrated multilingual and monolingual students.
2) How do you envision peer review workshops integrating multilingual and monolingual students working in your class?
3) Did the workshops integrating people from different linguistic backgrounds proceed as expected?
Appendix F

Sample Interview Transcription

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have a list of questions here. This is based on the email form that you</td>
<td>Reymond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responded to, as well as on my observation of the peer review group work,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>along with the drafts for the 2nd project, the argument analysis, so I’m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’m also going to ask you questions regarding that as well. Do you speak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any languages other than English and Spanish?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little bit of Mandarin.</td>
<td>Hugo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin—where is that from?</td>
<td>Reymond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My dad wanted me to speak Mandarin to help him with his job, so I tried</td>
<td>Hugo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to learn it, but at that time I wasn’t willing to do it, so I just</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learned the basics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK—interesting. How long ago was that?</td>
<td>Reymond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three, four years ago.</td>
<td>Hugo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK—so yeah, definitely, the importance of languages is something that</td>
<td>Reymond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you’ve been taught growing up. Your father does business in that part of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the world?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, but in general, he wants to expand.</td>
<td>Hugo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK—great. So when did you start learning English?</td>
<td>Reymond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since I have memory, I think. Since I was in pre-K.</td>
<td>Hugo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Along with Spanish?</td>
<td>Reymond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Hugo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And is that typical for someone in Ecuador? You learn both languages?</td>
<td>Reymond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the middle class and above, yes, because the curriculum tends to be</td>
<td>Hugo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>based on what school you’re going to.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So did you speak it outside of school?</td>
<td>Reymond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not too much. Just when I used to come visit my family here.</td>
<td>Hugo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So it was more in a learning environment where you acquired the</td>
<td>Reymond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language—in kind of a school setting?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Hugo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK. And in terms of peer review…since when have you used peer review?</td>
<td>Reymond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have always used it since middle school, I think. That’s when they</td>
<td>Hugo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>started teaching me how to use peer review, so from that moment on I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have been using it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both.</td>
<td>Hugo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So when you were back in Ecuador, you were using it in English?</td>
<td>Reymond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because you’re here for school. You said you had been here for 4 months.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You really moved to the States, at least for the time being, as a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I have a student visa.</td>
<td>Hugo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK. And have you found peer review is different in the way it’s used</td>
<td>Reymond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>here?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. I mean—they value it more here, I think. But besides that, no.</td>
<td>Hugo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Rhetorical Analysis: Common Problems Checklist

☐ The paper’s introduction addressed the topic and provides context for the articles being analyzed. The author does not make claims about all of human history or events occurring “since the beginning of time.”

☐ Introduction includes a thesis about the analysis itself, not about the arguments the three authors are presenting. Example: “All three authors utilize pathos to support their arguments regarding corporal punishment.”

☐ Did you include a rhetorical précis for each article?

☐ I should be able to go through your paper and find a balance of summary and analytic claims (The author proves credibility by...).

☐ Have you supported EVERY claim with quotes, summary, or paraphrase? (Using evidence to support the claim you make.)

☐ Have you introduced EVERY quote? No hit-and-run quotes.

☐ Did you take time to explain EVERY quote/summary/example and connect it back to the thesis? Direct connections!

☐ Do you use ideas to transition from one paragraph to the next? An example might include, “Where Potter discusses the advantages of marijuana legalization for states, Malfoy articulates how the federal government will benefit.” Do not write, “The next article…” Next in what? Just no.

☐ Does your conclusion include assertions of the argument? This is not an optional way to approach the conclusion; it is a requirement of the assignment. Where do the authors agree? Where do they disagree?

☐ Is your paper free of your personal opinion? Remember, this is an analysis paper. Your work is to analyze others’ arguments, not to make your own.

☐ Articles cannot talk, discuss, argue, or otherwise speak because they are inanimate objects—they don’t have mouths, silly! Authors, on the other hand, can talk, discuss, argue, explain, etc. Please do not write a sentence that include something like, "the article talks about...."

☐ You/Your/We/Us: Do not use these pronouns unless you are directly addressing your audience. Do not use these pronouns because you cannot think of another way to say, "the audience," or "readers." Find an alternative without using these pronouns as a crutch. When you want to use them, ask yourself, "Am I using this purposefully to evoke a response from my reader?"

☐ Citation style is your choice, but you must choose an established citation style to cite your articles. You cannot just put authors’ names in parentheses and then copy and paste a website link at the end of the paper. Use the guidelines of styles like APA, MLA, Chicago, CSE, or IEEE—to name just a few.

☐ Proofread. Errors are distracting to readers and, even worse, they end up drawing attention away from your good ideas. Make an appointment with the Writing Center. You have many, many resources at your disposal. No excuses.
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How Do You Know?: Checklist of Evidence to Support Claims in an Argument Analysis

Consider what evidence you can use to support claims in response to the following questions:

1. AUDIENCE Who is the intended **audience** for the text?
   a. Conclusion, introduction (pronoun use, “we” “us” “you” “our”)
   b. Topic itself (who has a stake in this issue?)
   c. Publisher (circulation and demographic information)
   d. Editor/section editor (Sports section)
   e. Language: broad vs. specialized
   f. Existence/Content of bibliography or works cited

2. PURPOSE What is the **purpose** of the text?
   a. Writing: thesis statement
   b. Title
   c. Where it’s published (political leanings of the publisher)
   d. Tone (angry, sarcastic, humorous, satirical, calm, enthusiastic)
   e. Vocabulary (reveals intended audience which hints at purpose)
   f. Evidence used by author (stats or unbiased sources intend to inform; humor may reveal satirical aims, quotes might hint at people they admire, etc.)
   g. Writing: asking the audience to consider a question or make a decision
   h. Overlaps with ethos: does the author have experience that is motivating them to talk about this topic?

3. ETHOS Does the author seem **credible**? Why or why not?
   a. Author’s identity: Title, profession, experience as evidence, demographic information
   b. Publisher (the credibility of the publisher)
   c. Sources/experts she quotes
   d. Language use (knowledgeable about the topic, speaks in depth)
   e. Use of colloquialisms/unique language marker (identity their cultural associations)
   f. Attempt to provide an unbiased/fair retelling of other sources or opinions
   g. Appropriateness of author identity/knowledge in relation to the topic, place/date of publication, etc.

4. PATHOS What **emotions** does it evoke?
   a. Tone/Language (“abhor” vs. “dislike”)
   b. Details or lack of detail (graphic descriptions, imagery, vs. straightforward facts etc.)
   c. Images of children and or puppies “Won’t someone think of the children?”
   d. Personal experiences than the reader can empathize with
   e. Organization (begins with emotional hook to gain reader investment)

5. LOGOS How are the elements arranged or **organized**? Why? Does the arrangement seem **logical**?
a. Use of “objective” relevant evidence: statistics, graphs, charts, science (vs. personal experience which is considered subjective)
b. Organization/subheaders or sections (logical order of argument; flow)
c. Where it’s published
d. The author uses evidence appropriate for the audience (moral, scientific, ethical, and experiential, etc.)
e. Meets/Doesn’t Meet reader’s expectations (is the perspective radical compared to mainstream discourse on the topic?)

6. CONTEXT/KAIROS When and where was the text written? Was it timely given the context? Why or why not?
a. When it was published (date, day of the week, month, year, in relation to event discussed in the article)
   i. Information that has been published/revealed after the publication
b. Where it was published (publication title, country of origin)
c. Who published it (identity of publication company, how long they’ve been in business, etc.)
d. Other current events at the time of publication
e. Author makes argument about the past or references decision-making in the future
f. Author’s experience is relevant to topic
g. The author makes it explicit that she is responding to a recent event