2018

A Phenomenological Study of Faculty Perceptions: Non-Native Speakers of English (L2s) in Bachelor Degree Programs

Leisha Cali
Nova Southeastern University, leisha.cali@gmail.com

Share Feedback About This Item

A Phenomenological Study of Faculty Perceptions:
Non-Native Speakers of English (L2s) in Bachelor Degree Programs

by
Leisha Cali

An Applied Dissertation Submitted to the
Abraham S. Fischler College of Education
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Education

Nova Southeastern University
2018

This applied dissertation was submitted by Leisha Cali under the direction of the persons listed below. It was submitted to the Abraham S. Fischler College of Education and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education at Nova Southeastern University.

Louis J. Traina, EdD
Committee Chair

David Weintraub, EdD
Committee Member

Kimberly Durham, PsyD
Interim Dean

Statement of Original Work

I declare the following:

I have read the Code of Student Conduct and Academic Responsibility as described in the *Student Handbook* of Nova Southeastern University. This applied dissertation represents my original work, except where I have acknowledged the ideas, words, or material of other authors.

Where another author's ideas have been presented in this applied dissertation, I have acknowledged the author's ideas by citing them in the required style.

Where another author's words have been presented in this applied dissertation, I have acknowledged the author's words by using appropriate quotation devices and citations in the required style.

I have obtained permission from the author or publisher—in accordance with the required guidelines—to include any copyrighted material (e.g., tables, figures, survey instruments, large portions of text) in this applied dissertation manuscript.

Leisha Cali_____
Name

April 22, 2018_____
Date

iv

Abstract

A Phenomenological Study of Faculty Perceptions: Non-Native Speakers of English (L2s) in Bachelor Degree Programs. Leisha Cali, 2018: Applied Dissertation, Nova Southeastern University, Abraham S. Fischler College of Education. Keywords: English as a second language, teaching methods, retention, higher education, praxis

This applied dissertation was designed to explore the experiences of faculty teaching L2s in bachelor degree courses at a private university in South Florida and to identify potential approaches and teaching methods that influence L2s' learning and success. L2s comprise 10% of the nation's college enrollment and are four times less likely to graduate with a bachelor degree than their socioeconomic peers who speak English as a first language.

The researcher examined the meaning of bachelor degree completion for L2s, perceived characteristics of successful L2s, and teaching methods influencing L2s' success to understand how L2s succeed in bachelor degree courses. After conducting a purposeful sampling of five faculty members and interviews with open-ended questions, the researcher explored their experiences and perceptions of L2s' academic success. A six step IPA protocol was used to analyze final data and answer three issue questions and one central research question.

The researcher identified that L2s succeed when graduation means achieving the American dream, when L2s have psychological grit, and when faculty accommodate L2s via student-faculty partnership. Teaching methods influencing L2s' success included mediation of doubt, knowing, noticing, and responding to L2s, and student-faculty partnering.

This research can be a source of information for universities with L2 enrollment. This study fills the research gap of faculty perceptions of L2s in bachelor degree courses and contributes to literature concerning the academic success of L2s.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

Statement of the Problem

The problem is the low graduation rate of 25% among undergraduate students at the research site, a private, not-for-profit Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) in Florida (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System [IPEDS], 2018). Because 39% of the undergraduate class were L2s, or non-native speakers of English, (Hodges University [HUa], 2017) who were underexplored as a student population, it was in the university's interest to explore its emerging L2 population and identify potential approaches and teaching methods that influence L2s' learning and academic success. Between the years 2010 and 2016, the foreign-born, or immigrant, population in Florida increased by over two million residents (United States Census Bureau [USCB], 2017). Between 2004 and 2016, the university's English as a Second Language (ESL) program's overall percentage of increase for enrollments was 2523%, and its English for Academic Purposes (EAP) program's overall percentage of increase was 188% between 2015 and 2016 (Enrollment Numbers, 2016). Because L2s present distinct instructional challenges to faculty (Starkey, 2015) and low academic achievement (Almon, 2014; Diaz, Cochran, & Karlin, 2016; Kanno & Cromley, 2013), an institution with a significant L2 population has an opportunity to influence degree completion by discovering and understanding the characteristics and methods of success that support the persistence, teaching, and learning of its particular L2 population. The problem was addressed by meeting two of the university's strategic goals: Programmatic Excellence via increasing the likelihood of student enrollment, retention, graduation, and employment and Operational Effectiveness via implementing process improvements that improve the quality of service to students

and other stakeholders (Summary of Strategic Planning, 2017). The problem statement was supported by the university's President, who stated, "This study will help the university better understand the unique constraints faced by the L2 population and inform strategies to better serve and support them through graduation" (J. D. Meyer, personal communication, November 9, 2017).

The major driver of U.S. diversity and population growth is international immigration (USCB, 2013). Between 2014 and 2060, the immigrant population is projected to surpass that of native-born Americans, comprising a growing part of the future U.S. population (Colby & Ortman, 2015). Today's immigrants can generally be described as having the following characteristics: a) they lack educational credentials, b) they have low-income backgrounds, c) they belong to racial/ethnic minority groups (United States Department of Labor [USDL], 2017), and d) they come from countries where English is not the primary language (Gambino, Acosta, & Grieco, 2014). Immigrants and the characteristics that define them are impacting all sectors of U.S. culture, especially education (Anonymous, 2012-2013).

Immigrant students are the most rapidly growing population in the American educational system, including higher education (Ousey, Brown, & Goldschmidt, 2014). They are believed to make up 10% of the undergraduate population (Arbeit, Staklis, & Horn, 2017). Compared to college students whose first language is English (L1s), L2s. perform more poorly in academe due to a variety of social and linguistic obstacles and challenges (Almon, 2014; Diaz et al., 2016; Kanno & Cromley, 2013). College students who are immigrants and speak English to varying degrees of fluency are expanding the notion of an economically, racially, and ethnically diverse student body to include

linguistically diverse students (Kanno & Cromley, 2013). In one study, L2s were found to be four times less likely to graduate college than their L1 racial/ethnic peers with similar socioeconomic constraints (Almon, 2014). In another study, 1 in 8 L2s completed a bachelor degree or higher in 8 years compared to 1 in 3 L1s (Kanno & Cromley, 2013). The Institute for Higher Education Policy reported that L2s fall significantly behind the U.S. population, especially in the completion of bachelor's degrees (Erisman & Looney, 2007). Because they are still learning English while enrolled in college degree courses, L2s struggle to meet the linguistic demands of academic coursework (Almon, 2014; Kanno & Cromley, 2013). As a result, L2s are less likely to persist in higher education and more likely to self-eliminate from bachelor degree programs (Almon, 2014; Kanno & Cromley, 2013).

Since World War II, Florida has not met state workforce needs for bachelor degrees (Bilsky, Neuhard, & Locke, 2012). In response to existing and emerging critical needs in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields and in order to expand the knowledge and innovation economy, bachelor degrees are now offered at all colleges in the State University System of Florida (Florida Board of Governors [FLBOG], 2016). The strategic plan for bachelor degree completion for 2012 to 2025 outlined academic learning compacts, two of which included enhancing faculty and student collaboration and promoting a teaching-learning dynamic throughout the system (FLBOG, 2011). The plan also included a productivity component to "increase access and degree completion for students, including students from traditionally underrepresented groups, returning adult students, and distance learning students" (FLBOG, 2011, p. 15). While the essence of the strategic plan has not changed, the

Florida Board of Governors amended the 2012 to 2025 plan in 2016 due to "the greater sophistication of employer demands and resulting specialization needed in the workplace . . . [and] the need for greater baccalaureate production" (FLBOG, 2016, p. 6). With the Florida Legislature, the Board has implemented a performance-based funding model based on graduation goals change how funding allocations are made throughout the university system (FLBOG, 2016). For example, a Florida state university's increasing its national rankings is one way to be rewarded with funding under the new model (FLBOG, 2016). The Board's main focus is bachelor degree productivity to meet the state's critical workforce needs (FLBOG, 2016). While seven public universities in Florida significantly increased their rankings according to the U.S. News & World Report (Travis, 2017), there is no reference to or performance indicator for L2s in the Florida State University System 2025 Strategic Plan (FLBOG, 2016). Likewise, L2s are not included in national retention agendas and statistics (Almon, 2014). According to Almon (2014), institutions with large populations of L2s have an opportunity to impact and expand the college retention movement by engaging in research on L2s and publishing their results on this unique population of learners (Almon, 2014).

Setting of the Study

Florida, the location of the research site, has not kept up with the workforce demand for baccalaureate degree production for over fifty years (Bilsky et al., 2012). Legislation has been adopted to authorize site-determined bachelor degrees at community colleges in order to meet workforce needs, but bachelor degree attainment "for residents over the age of twenty-five still lags behind the majority of the ten most populated states" (Bilsky et al., 2012, p. 35). In 2014, 20% of the population in Florida was foreign-born,

and the top five languages spoken were Spanish, Haitian Creole, Portuguese, Arabic, and Vietnamese (Sugarmen & Lee, 2017). Florida has a higher share of immigrants than the entire US, which is 13%, (Sugarmen & Lee, 2017) and is ranked fourth in the nation for an immigrant population (Krogstad & Keegan, 2014).

The research site for the study is a private, not-for-profit accredited university in Florida that awards associate, bachelor, and master's degrees in career-oriented disciplines such as business, health, and technology (HUb, 2017). In 2016, the ESL program enrolled over 1200 immigrants and international students, and the English for Academic Purposes (EAP) program enrolled over 75 immigrant and international students (Enrollment Numbers, 2016). In fall 2017, 39% of undergraduate students identified themselves as L2s speaking the following top five languages: Spanish, Haitian Creole, Portuguese, Vietnamese, and German (HUa, 2017). In 2013, a mixed-methods institutional survey from the office of diversity and inclusion reported findings that included comments regarding L2s and multicultural populations on campus:

- I have been told not to speak to students in their language since they are here to learn English.

- I have also heard stories of [L2] students who have rewritten first term essays 12 times and not been able to improve their grades . . . 12 times!!! Something is not right here.

- Get people on board with enhancing their teaching methods to enhance sustainability of a multicultural population and integrate this as we have with writing across the curriculum. (Summary of Survey, 2013)

Deficiencies in the Evidence

When students live off campus, as is the case for the proposed research site, interactions with institutional agents mostly consist of experiences in the classroom with faculty (Tovar, 2015). Most qualitative and quantitative studies that include or address L2s' ability to persist in bachelor's degree programs focus on L2s' socioeconomic characteristics, their experiences interacting with faculty, and/or their perspectives of academic needs to complete coursework (Almon, 2014; Bliss & Sandiford, 2015; Chase, Dowd, Pazich, & Bensimon, 2014; Diaz et al., 2016; Kanno & Cromley, 2013; Karthanos and Mena, 2014; Tovar, 2015). Some research on L2s in bachelor degree programs begins with the premise that most faculty lack the skills to effectively teach L2s and marginalize and/or chronically label L2s as deficient (Becker, 2011; Bednarz, Schim, & Doorenbos 2010; Ousey et al., 2014). While there is a small but growing body of literature of L2s' perceptions of faculty, there is very little from the faculty perspective, and these studies are coming mostly out of the healthcare fields in the United States and Canada (Donnelly, McKiel, & Hwang, 2009; Starkey, 2015). While research often emphasizes the importance of faculty's influence on ethnic/minority students' efficacy in college, "the absence of practitioners in the scholarship on postsecondary student success is particularly noticeable in comparison to the scholarship on K-12," which is rich in "studies of efficacy and collective responsibility" (Bensimon, 2007, p. 444).

Audience

Exploring faculty's perceptions and experiences of L2s in the classroom is important to all stakeholders inside a university, especially one in which large numbers of L2s are enrolled in degree-seeking programs. Everyone who works and studies there is

invested in ensuring learning outcomes and attainment for all students as they are indicators of institutional integrity, success, and sustainability. Faculty's perceptions of L2s are important to the president, who can mediate between the board and administrators to leverage and adapt institutional practices, and they are important to state and national policy makers, who can influence institutionalized constructs and change so that all students, especially the most vulnerable ones, can learn, develop, and access opportunity via educational attainment. This study is important to faculty who are advocates of student learning and academic success because they, more than any other institutional agent, can transform the dialectical tensions of theory and practice with students in their classrooms.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, several terms are defined below.

Banking model of education refers to Freire's (2001) term of an ideology wherein educators bestow formulaic knowledge on students who passively receive it. Both educators and students, as present and future workers within a socioeconomic paradigm of constraint, are silenced from participating in transformative teaching and learning.

Conscientization is Freire's (2001) theoretical term for developing a critical awareness of a social reality, its problems and needs, thereby engendering transformative action.

Dialogue is Freire's (2001) theoretical term for a safe encounter in which dialoguers question the codification of their reality by naming perceived contradictions in their world.

L1(s) refers to college students who speak English as a first language or only English.

L2(s) refers to college students who immigrated to the US, do not speak English as a first language, and speak English to varying degrees of fluency.

Praxis is Freire's (2001) theoretical term for the process of reflection and action in and from dialogue which allows one to see and act upon his/her own reality through conscientization.

Validation is Rendón's (1994) theory that institutional agents can enhance nontraditional/minority students' learning success by acknowledging, honoring, understanding, including, and accommodating social and cultural differences through interactions, or acts of engagement.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to understand and describe the lived experiences of faculty teaching L2s in bachelor degree courses at a private SACS COC institution of higher learning in the South and to identify potential approaches and teaching methods that influence L2s' learning and success. The most prevalent data on the literature of nontraditional/minority student success in retention excludes faculty's qualitative input (Witham, Chase, Bensimon, Hanson, & Longanecker, 2015). Literature on the retention of racial/ethnic minority students posits that educators' participation is central to the academic success of these students (Bensimon, 2007; Rendón, 2002; Rendón et al., 2000). In terms of L2s, research is especially lacking in how non-ESL faculty who teach non-ESL courses can help L2s learn in the classroom (Ousey et al., 2014). The exclusion of faculty's perceptions and participation in solving educational problems is consistent

with Freire's (2001, 2005) theory of the banking model of education. In Starkey's (2015) study of faculty teaching L2s, Freire's theoretical framework of conscientization emerged as the core category in faculty's developing a critical awareness that led to changes in their beliefs, actions, and teaching behaviors. Because educators genuinely and deeply care about students and student learning, their thoughts and participation in solving educational problems are needed to transform teaching and learning in substantive ways (Freire, 2001, 2005; Witham et al., 2015).

Disaggregated research on postsecondary degree completion of nontraditional students is vital to increasing national degree completion rates (Miller, 2014). L2s, the fastest growing subgroup in education, are not disaggregated from national statistics, nor is their success in higher education being discussed nationally (Almon, 2014; Kanno & Cromley, 2013; Oropeza, Varghese, & Kanno, 2010). The United States is currently experiencing STEM and healthcare skills gaps due to the low completion of bachelor's degrees (Bilsky et al., 2012; Business Higher Education Forum [BHEF], 2013), especially in states like Florida (Bilsky et al., 2012), where immigration is high (Sugarmen & Lee, 2017). By understanding and exploring how L2s succeed in bachelor degree courses according to those who educate them, institutions with high L2 populations have an opportunity to discover and explore characteristics and methods of success that support the persistence, teaching, and learning of linguistic minority students.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

The purpose of this study was to understand and describe the lived experiences of faculty teaching L2s in bachelor degree courses and to identify potential approaches and teaching methods that influence L2s' learning and success. The literature review includes the theoretical framework of Freirean thought and a sociohistorical overview of U.S. immigration, adult education, and higher education, a definition of validation theory, the current state of degree completion, a description of nontraditional/minority and L2 students' constraints and faculty primacy, a review of (in)validating interactions and teaching practices that influence L2 failure or success, and a summary of the relative gaps and need for faculty perceptions in L2 research.

Theoretical Framework

Education and social theorist Paulo Freire (2005) stated that educators teach because they love learning, they love the process of teaching, and they love their students. Freire's (2001, 2005) concept of the educator's love for the student and the process of teaching is not to be interpreted as a sentimental love. The educator's love is an act of freedom and commitment to the liberation of the mind via teaching practices that stimulate critical thinking in students who can then become self-empowered change agents who can act upon their world (Freire, 2001). Within classrooms and institutions, the democratic intervention and participation of the educator is necessary for progress in education to occur (Freire, 2005).

Freire's (2001, 2005) theories on the teaching and learning of both children and adults stem from two guiding principles: Contradictions in the education system stem from a dominating ideology of socioeconomic and sociopolitical power, and educational

activity should be concerned with eliminating undemocratic social relations by liberating the oppressed consciousness of those within the system through dialogue, praxis, and conscientization. Freire defined the interaction and interrelationship of dominating socioeconomic and sociopolitical powers within the educational system as a *banking model of education*, a hierarchical bureaucratic structure of both concrete and abstract phenomena which educators and students are subject to and oppressed under (Freire, 2001). Within this model of education, the educator, the expert and transmitter of knowledge, and the student, the initiate and recipient of knowledge, are separated by domains of power and powerlessness (Freire, 2001). Educators disseminate knowledge, which is often prepackaged within a text and static curriculum, and students receive the prepackaged knowledge, which remains abstract and outside of students' reality and experiences of the world (Freire, 2001, 2005; Walsh, 2009). Knowledge is delivered in a uniform and unidirectional way that disallows dialogue and differing opinions in order to preserve a societal power structure wherein students, or future workers, are passive, they are not identified as knowers, and they do not become creators of knowledge (Freire, 2001). In order to be academically successful, students must undergo a process of deculturalization and integration into a social system seeking to sustain its power structure, including its oppressive forms, (Freire, 2005).

A banking model of education silences both educators and students as it limits and restricts them from the democratizing effects of education, which are to think, know, create, and, therefore, act upon the world in which they inhabit (Freire, 2001, 2005). A banking model negates the transformative power of education, which is to share and create knowledge through critical inquiry of subjective reality to become more fully

human (Freire, 2005). Educators who internalize a position of hierarchy and teach from the dominating ideology marginalize themselves and their students, perpetuating an oppressive system that mechanizes the mind (Freire, 2001, 2005). When dialogue, which is an existential necessity, is denied or withheld, it oppresses educators and students and sustains subjugating social structures and hierarchies (Freire, 2001).

According to Freire (2001), dialogue is rooted in humanism, or love for the world and people. Freire (2001) defined *dialogue* as a safe encounter in which dialoguers unite and question their own codified versions of reality through *praxis,* or reflection and action, by naming perceived contradictions in their world, thereby transforming it. Dialogue is a co-investigation which engenders *conscientization*, critical awareness that perceives reality as a process and not as a static entity separate from transformative action (Freire, 2001). Transformation, whether in thought or act, results from dialogue because only then can individuals separate themselves from a static world and their own activity and position themselves as conscious decision-makers and change agents (Freire, 2001). Freire stated:

> The art of knowledge must be organized as a function of these two moments of the gnosiological cycle—the coming to know the produced knowledge itself, and the creation of the new knowledge. These two moments constitute education and cannot undergo dichotomy. (as cited in Escobar, Fernández, & Guevara-Niebla, 1994)

When the production and creation of knowledge are denied, students do not learn or stay in school, and educators do not teach or solve problems in education (Freire, 2005).

Educators are generally excluded from governmental and administrative dialogue and decision-making aimed at solving problems in education (Freire, 2005). They are also blamed for failures within the education system and labeled as obstacles to change. This labeling is pervasive in socioeconomic systems where the banking model of education is instituted as an ideology for educating a workforce (Freire, 2001). Punitive or fear-based measures administered by institutional or external governing agents do not improve teaching and learning indicative of authoritarian power structures (Freire, 2005). According to Freire (2005):

> The project of democracy must never be transformed into or understood as a singular and individual struggle, even, as often happens, in the face of cheap persecution against this or that teacher for reasons that are purely personal. (p. 12)

Furthermore, when educators are seen as the problem but not as a part of the solution, substantive changes in teaching practices and learning experiences cannot occur (Freire, 2005).

To effectively evaluate teaching practices, educators must be engaged in their own evaluation of practice because teaching as a practice consists of two activities in permanent relationship with each other: the program of action and the ongoing evaluation of the program objectives (Freire, 2005). Evaluation which engages faculty reflection and input affords insight to the educator, who ultimately improves practice via the evaluative experience of conscientization through dialogue (Freire, 2005). Neither faculty nor students should be evaluated within a construct of overt or covert punishment; on the contrary, faculty and students should be evaluated to order to increase awareness and become self-empowered teachers and learners (Freire, 2005). For Freire (2001, 2005),

research should be seen through a paradigmatic lens of participatory action, which is dialectal and focused on inducing change and engendering new knowledge. Dialoguing with educators is essential to solve educational problems because they are not only in a position to advocate for students but they also have the "experience of living the dialectical tensions between theory and practice" (Freire, 2005, p. 12). When educators can safely dialogue and reflect on educational and social realities, they can act upon their environments and transform systemic problems through conscientization, or ongoing critical awareness (Freire 2001, 2005).

Freire stated that "the university environment should be pluralistic and even dialogical" as tension and disagreement are mechanisms that generate critical thinking and new understandings through dialogue (as cited in Escobar et al., 1994, p.96). For dialogue to be authentic, it must start on the content of the dialogue and not on a premise of proposal or punishment (Escobar et al., 1994; Freire, 2005). Educators, who are also learners, need to be safely engaged in evaluating their practice through a theoretical lens, not a threatening one, in order to expand both theoretical constructs and more effective means of practice (Freire, 2005). The dialectical tensions between standards, practice, and theory as well as conscientious reflection and action toward solving educational problems were seen in the findings of the university's institutional survey from the office of diversity and inclusion. Statements that cited acts of facilitating communication by speaking a student's first language, allowing L2s multiple opportunities to rewrite essays, and calling for institutional change in teaching methods for a multicultural population exemplify conscious efforts to enhance interactions with students and solve learning problems. Interestingly, research indicates that faculty who provide personalized

advisement and adapt coursework such as giving extra time for writing revisions contribute to L2s' self-efficacy and persistence in degree programs (Bensimon & Dowd, 2009; Boesch, 2014; Karathanos & Mena, 2014). Faculty who employ traditional teaching and learning paradigms, on the other hand, create an oppressive learning environment, which heightens the marginalization experiences of socially marginalized learners (Freire, 2001). Marginalized populations live in both a personal culture not immediately applicable to academe and a social culture that is silent and without a voice to determine its own participation and destiny in the world (Freire, 2001). If the curriculum is a static entity upheld by the faculty and/or administration and circumscribed as subjects, methods, and techniques removed from the sociological, economic, and political realities of the students and the world, it does not transmit the intended knowledge, nor does it create new knowledge (Escobar et al., 1994). In other words, it denies praxis, conscientization, and, therefore, personal and social transformation (Freire, 2001).

The educator who internalizes and reproduces oppressive societal structures that induce fear, passivity, and compliance is as silenced, oppressed, and marginalized as the student (Freire, 2001, 2005). Due to bias, fear, discomfort, passivity, or apathy, faculty may intentionally or unintentionally exclude the cultural and social realities of their students from the curriculum and teach from a dominant paradigm of assimilation (Cuyjet & Meriwether, 2016; McDermott, Shelton, & Mogge, 2012; Sue, Torino, Capodilupo, Rivera, & Lin, 2009). American attitudes toward immigrants and immigration are rooted in U.S. history, society, politics, economics, and culture (McDermott et al., 2012), and Americans are becoming increasingly divided about their views toward immigrants as

burden or benefit (Jones, 2016). Uncovering and exploring internalized beliefs and biases

can be particularly uncomfortable for faculty who belong to a dominant class

(McDermott et al., 2012; Sue et al., 2009). However, one study of preservice teachers'

perceptions of immigrants, researchers implemented a praxis that engaged participants in

dialogue about their preconceived notions and assumptions of U.S. immigrants

(McDermott et al., 2012). From this engagement experience, more conscious and

empathetic attitudes toward immigrants emerged among participants (McDermott et al.,

2012). This review does not suggest that L2s' perceptions and learning experiences of

their professors are more or less significant than their professors' teaching perceptions

and experiences of L2s. Instead, it uses a Freirean framework, which posits that

contradictions in education cannot be resolved unless both faculty and students can safely

dialogue on the objects by which they are mediated, such as the curriculum, teaching

methods, and student learning (Freire, 2001).

History

   United States immigration. Throughout the 18th and 19th centuries,

immigration was an essential part of U.S. occupation and expansion strategy of the west

(West, 2010). These immigrants, mostly coming from northern and western Europe, had

relatively simple paths to entry and naturalization if they were in good health and could

demonstrate an industrious and moral character (West, 2010). Towards the latter part of

the 1800s and early 1900s, social and political attitudes toward immigration changed as

waves of immigrants from China and southern and eastern Europe populated the western

and urban landscape (Dorsey, 2007; West, 2010). Nativism surged in response to these

less desirable groups who did not assimilate well, were poor and uneducated, had

unfamiliar languages and customs, and differed physically from the characteristic

Europeans of the north (Dorsey, 2007). The Chinese Exclusion Act allowed for mass

deportations of Chinese who could not provide documentation and a white witness to

testify to their industrious and moral character (West, 2010). By 1924, both the

Emergency Quota Act and the Johnson-Reid Immigration Act allowed for the

establishment of immigration quotas for specific, or undesirable, countries (West, 2010).

Dorsey (2007) posits that it was from this xenophobic, anti-immigration sociopolitical

climate that President Theodore Roosevelt tried to give hope to immigrants and

consolation to white Americans by claiming that immigrants, provided that they cut all

ties to their previous national origin, assimilated culturally and linguistically, and were

industrious, could be the new frontiersman of expansion and become trustworthy,

responsible Americans.

     In the first half of the 20th century, restrictive quotas, preferences for northern

and western European immigrants, the Great Depression, and both World Wars

characterized and influenced social attitudes and public policy on immigration (West,

2010). Postwar prosperity, the need for workers, and a change in public attitudes toward

foreign talent, however, shifted U.S. policy back toward immigration (West, 2010). In

addition, the United States strategically began to position itself in the world as the land of

freedom by welcoming political refugees living under communist regimes during the

Cold War (West, 2010). The Hart-Celler Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, likely

influenced by the Civil Rights Movement, then moved to abolish quotas based on

national origin, to give preference to family unification rather than employment

categories, and to exempt spouses, children, and parents from numerical limits for family

unification (Lopez, Passel, & Rohal, 2015). Finally, the Immigration Act of 1990 increased the number of visas for families, employment, and relief from extraordinary and temporary conditions due to war and environmental or health disasters (Lopez et al., 2015). Since 1965, when the nation's foreign-born totaled 9.6 million people, the foreign-born population has increased exponentially, totaling 45 million, or 27%, of the U.S. population, in 2015 (Zong & Batalova, 2017). Coming mostly from Latin America and Asia, the immigrant population in 2015 had an average age of 43 compared to 36 for the U.S. born, they spoke mostly Spanish, Chinese, or Vietnamese as a first language, 29% had a bachelor degree, and 29% did not have a high school diploma or General Education Development (GED) certificate (Zong & Batalova, 2017).

While 51% of American society sees immigrants' impact on society as positive, issues of legality and socioeconomic burden dominate negative perceptions of today's immigrants (Lopez et al., 2015). Furthermore, Americans view immigrants differently depending on their region of origin, perceiving immigrants from Asia and Europe more positively than immigrants from Africa, Latin America, and the Middle East respectively (Lopez et al., 2015).

English language in a sociohistorical context. In the sociohistorical context of the U.S.' ambivalent relationship with immigrants, the English language has always symbolized American identity (Borden, 2014). This contentious yet persistent theme of the adoption of the English language as a marker of American citizenry and loyalty is summed up in Theodore Roosevelt's words:

> We have room for but one language here and that is the English language, for we
> intend to see that the crucible turns our people out as Americans, of American

nationality, and not as dwellers in a polyglot boardinghouse; and we have room

for but one soul loyalty, and that loyalty is to the American people. (as cited in

Dyer, 1992, p. 134)

While Roosevelt's statement can be interpreted as disparaging toward other languages

and, therefore, cultures in terms of honoring different ways of life in a pluralistic society,

his sentiments are still felt and accepted in American society. For many Americans,

understanding and using English is an important obligation of the immigrant as it shows

not only a commitment to this nation but also good manners (Farkas, Duffett, Johnson,

Moye, & Vine, 2003). In one study, 65% of 1002 randomly selected immigrants reported

that learning English is an ethical obligation, and 85% reported that it is difficult to find

work or upward mobility without learning English (Farkas et al., 2003). Although 52%

who came with little to no English reported that learning English was their greatest

challenge upon immigration, they believe it was essential for finding work and

overcoming social and economic marginalization (Farkas et al., 2003). With few

exceptions, most immigrants today will be tested on American civics in English in order

to qualify for naturalization (United States Citizenship and Immigration Services

[USCIS], 2017).

According to Zong and Batalova (2016), 49% of the immigrants living in the

United States were Limited English Proficient (LEP) in 2015. Compared to the

population that was English-proficient, the LEP population had less education and were

more likely to live in poverty (Zong & Batalova, 2016). English language proficiency

plays a critical role in integrating immigrants into the American culture and economy

(Migration Policy Institute [MPI], 2017).

Beginnings of adult education. Adult ESL education was first established by Hull House in 1889 as a social-services endeavor for immigrants from southern and eastern Europe (Ullman, 2010). During this time, ethnic organizations promoting bilingualism emerged offering afternoon and weekend classes in English for working immigrants (Ullman, 2010). In 1910, the International Institutes, emphasizing the protection of women and immigrants, emerged (Ullman, 2010). During World War I, the Sedition Act was passed, making the use of a language that could be seen as disloyal to the United States illegal (West, 2010).

After the war, Americanization laws sponsored by the Federal Bureau of Naturalization were enacted in thirty states and hundreds of municipalities; both school districts and Chambers of Commerce provided ESL and civics instruction that included lessons on the American way of life, which included instruction on American practices for childcare, cooking, and hygiene (Ullman, 2010). Springing from the Chicago School in the 1920s, the sociological assumption regarding the assimilation of immigrants became that all immigrants would anguish from the Americanization process, but they would also lose their native language and culture over time, which was the desired outcome (Ullman, 2010). These Americanization practices defined adult ESL education up to the latter part of the 20th century, when federally funded ESL programs with new emphases on workforce preparation became available through public education and community colleges and organizations (Burt & Mathews-Aydinli, 2007). Adult ESL programs funded by the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) of 1998 represented the most prominent type of immigrant integration agendas, their goals being to foster immigrant

workers into the U.S. economy and immigrants more broadly into American society (Pandya, 2012).

Workforce Investment Act ESL programs, still running but currently changing, focus on social and workforce skills such as asking for clarification, giving directions, and expressing a lack of comprehension, all of which are immediately transferable for work environments and social interactions in a community (Burt & Mathews-Aydinli, 2007). The challenge with WIA programs is that the focus on English for rapid re-employment and short-term skills is not preparing low-skilled, limited English adults for one-third of all job openings and nearly half of all new jobs between 2008 and 2018, which require postsecondary degrees and credentials in high growth fields such as healthcare and technology (Pandya, 2012). The length and depth of these programs did not allow for the language accuracy, extensive reading, critical thinking, and writing skills required for college degree programs and, therefore, today's workforce needs (Mathews-Aydinli, 2006; Pandya, 2012). In 2014, President Obama signed the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), which redefined and expanded the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (AEFLA) programs to include career pathways either to work or college and private sector partnerships (WIOA, 2016). English language programs under AEFLA will need to show expected and negotiated levels of program performance for the years 2019-2020 (Wooten, 2018).

Different from WIA adult ESL programs but also emerging at the turn of the century, EAP programs, funded under Title V of the Higher Education Opportunity Act (1980), help low-income immigrants learn academic English in order to mainstream into degree-seeking programs (Hernandez, Thomas, & Schuemann, 2012). EAP programs,

housed on college campuses, provide short-term, intensive instruction in academic

English to prepare L2s for the kinds of work and assignments they will have in degree-

seeking courses (Hernandez et al., 2012). They focus on grammatical use of language,

extensive and genre-based reading and writing, less-frequently used, or academic,

vocabulary, and the development of conceptual and critical thinking skills (Mathews-

Aydinli, 2006). In contrast to the objectives of traditional workforce ESL programs, these

skills are not immediately transferable and require extensive time to master. Language

experts recognize that it takes two to a maximum of five years to develop oral fluency

and five to a maximum of ten years to master academic fluency commensurable to the

fluency of native speakers (Bialystock & Hakuta, 1999; Burt & Mathews-Aydinli, 2007;

Ousey et al., 2014). Unlike children, who have the advantages of neuro-cognitive

development in language learning, educational support, and time to learn (Bialystock &

Hakuta, 1999), adult immigrants acquire academic English after seven years of living in

the United States provided that exposure and academic opportunities to read, hear, and

use it have been reinforced over time (Scarcella, 2003). Most federal funding models that

promote English language acquisition do not take into account the extensive amount of

time that is needed for an individual to master the complexities of reading, writing,

speaking, and listening at a fluent, or academic, level (Burt & Mathews-Aydinli, 2007;

Eaton, 2011). For L2s to have academic success in higher education, they must continue

to develop advanced levels of proficiency in reading, writing, speaking, and listening as

well as an extensive vocabulary that can be used across academic disciplines (Scarcella,

2003). However, many non-ESL faculty do not recognize that vocabulary must

continually be expanded upon from the first year of college for L2s to be successful in

meeting discipline-specific reading expectations throughout their college career (Hartshorn, Evans, Egbert, & Johnson, 2017).

Today's EAP programs and their faculty tend to be socially, culturally, and academically isolated from the university community (Becker, 2011; Hernandez et al., 2012; Ousey et al., 2014; Kanno & Varghese, 2010). Though there is an increasing awareness that the success of L2s is important to everyone on campus, the isolation of EAP students and the labeling of L2s as deficient due to their English language challenges persist (Oropeza et al., 2010; Ousey et al., 2014; Kanno & Varghese, 2010). Students who leave EAP programs are still learning English, but "the notion that every teacher is a language teacher remains a foreign idea" in higher education (Kanno & Varghese, 2010, p. 311). Faculty cite major linguistic deficiencies in L2 reading and writing as discordant with their course curriculum, holding to the notion that L2s' English language gaps and challenges are the responsibility of EAP programs and EAP faculty (Hartshorn et al., 2017; Matsuda, Saenkhum, & Accardi, 2013; Ousey et al., 2014; Scarcella, 2003; Zhu, 2004). While most adult immigrants are drawn to ESL programs because they need to work, fewer enroll in EAP programs, citing financial, personal, and linguistic deficiencies as reasons for postponing or opting out of EAP programs (Becker, 2011; Kanno & Varghese, 2010). As non-English speaking workers comprise an ever-increasing share of the U.S. employment base, adult ESL and EAP practitioners and programs are being called upon by regional employers and universities to increase learning opportunities, fuel academic enrollments, and drive employment (Anonymous, 2012-2013).

Higher education. Since the Middle Ages, the European model of higher education has persisted, establishing the university as an institution that transmits knowledge and provides training (Altbach, 2016). In the 19th century, the contemporary university as a knowledge creator and distributor emerged, subsequently adding to its basic composition and prominence important societal growth functions by contributing a system of research and knowledge via books, journals, and databases and by becoming a home for the sciences, career specializations, and sociopolitical thought for a civil society (Altbach, 2016). The institutionalization of science and scientific research established links between the university and local, national, and international economies, thereby increasing the dominance of the western academic model throughout the world (Altbach, 2016).

Just as access to the United States increased for nontraditional immigrants in the latter part of the 20th century, so did access to higher education for nontraditional students, such as women and African Americans (Smith, 2015). Diversity concerns led to student and faculty activism resulting in the creation of race, ethnic, and gender studies as well as research and equity legislation that addressed disability rights, working-class communities, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and questioning (LGBTQ) issues (Smith, 2015). In the last 50 years, equity conversations have reframed from diversity as essential for the well-being of American society by expanding the curriculum to diversity as critical for the well-being of a global society by increasing educational quality and equity (Smith, 2015). Changing demographics throughout the nation and within universities have spurred criticism and efforts to make diversity central in conversations regarding disparities in STEM fields, workforce capacity, and student graduation rates

(Smith, 2015). As a center of knowledge sharing and creation with outcomes that can impact both national and global economies, universities are under increasing pressure from both public and private sectors to ensure institutional accountability for all students and for a changing economy (Smith, 2015; Williams, 2013). According to Douglass and Thomson (2010), the world has been experiencing unprecedented shifts due to immigration and globalization. Postmodern nations receiving waves of immigrants with low socioeconomic capital need to examine how higher education intersects with immigrants as it is the means by which postmodern economies create socioeconomic mobility (Douglass and Thomson, 2010). How immigrants fare in society will determine the future of nations, yet they are underexplored as a group by most major universities in the United States and the world (Douglass and Thomson, 2010).

Degree Completion

Low bachelor degree completion rates have business, higher education, and state leaders concerned and working together on initiatives to increase bachelor degree completion to meet today's workforce needs (BHEF, 2013; Bilsky et al., 2012; FLBOG, 2016). Institutional policy reforms, however, do not generally include structured processes to engage faculty in efforts to define and solve problems (Witham et al., 2015). Indeed, faculty are often avoided and not engaged in structured practices concerning graduation rates and the institutional delivery of higher education in order to prevent controversy (Witham et al., 2015). This occurs when policymakers and boards believe that faculty "reflexively fight to protect the status quo" and are, therefore, "an obstacle to change" (Witham et al., 2015, p. 8). Witham et al. (2015) posit that faculty must be

engaged in retention and attainment agendas because faculty care about students and they are eager to help their institutions improve.

Excluding faculty voices in academic governance, reform, or policy conversations which relate to the teaching and learning of students and/or blaming faculty for the failures in education is characteristic of corporatizing trends that monetize higher education (Escobar et al., 1994; Leatherman, 1998; Stein, Scribner, & Brown, 2013). These corporatizing trends have given rise to state performance incentives and funding formulas' being adopted across states to increase graduation rates (Umbricht, Fernandez, & Ortagus, 2017.). Multiple studies on public four-year colleges and universities have found that not only has performance funding not increased graduation rates but it has also resulted in universities' rejecting weaker students and shrinking the incoming freshman class (Umbricht et al., 2017). Because performance metrics tend to value efficiency over equity, they can inadvertently result in enrollment that limits distributional equity while restricting access, especially for those who would gain the most from accessing higher education (Umbricht et al., 2017). Furthermore, performance funding and policies do not reward faculty and staff nor do they acknowledge that university employees tend to be motivated by prosocial values (Umbricht et al., 2017).

All institutional agents and their various expertise need to be engaged in degree completion agendas in order for sustainable change to occur (Witham et al., 2015). The current state of reliance on external assessments to quantify what happens in the classroom remains at the expense of understanding what actually happens or can happen in the classroom from a pedagogical perspective (Stein et al., 2013). When faculty voices are excluded in research or decision-making processes that involve teaching to meet

educational goals, creative thought and action to change systemic problems cannot occur (Bastedo, 2016; Freire, 2005; Stein et al., 2013; Witham et al., 2015).

College degree completion produces both human capital and equal opportunity (Williams, 2013). Institutions of higher education are expected to produce graduates, meet degree completion agendas, and ensure access and equity for students with fewer and fewer public resources available (Umbricht et al., 2017; Williams, 2013). Institutional problems, especially those involving unequal outcomes among diverse student populations, cannot be solved through funding formulas if attention is not given to practices that produce or fail to produce graduates (Witham et al., 2015). While dialogue and reflection about systemic failures and structural inequities may be uncomfortable, they have been found to help faculty take greater responsibility for the success of their students (Witham et al., 2015). According to Witham et al. (2015), degree completion agendas are more likely to be realized if faculty are involved in change-making processes.

As national and state initiatives call for higher education to graduate more students with bachelor's degrees in order to meet workforce demands (BHEF, 2013; FLBOG, 2016), institutions are being called to address their degree attainment agendas, especially in light of unequal student experiences (Williams, 2013; Witham et al., 2015). Understanding and meeting the needs of nontraditional/minority student populations in bachelor degree programs is increasingly becoming a moral and socioeconomic imperative as well as an opportunity to create and ensure institutional excellence (Almon, 2014; Borden, 2014; Miller, 2014; Smith, 2015; Tovar, 2015; Williams, 2013). To address bachelor degree attainment gaps among racial/ethnic minority students, college

and university administrators are urged to examine and disaggregate student populations to explore and create institutionally specific solutions in order to avoid applying inappropriate and/or one-size-fits-all methods to attainment agendas (Smith, 2015; Williams, 2013; Witham et al., 2015). While access and enrollment of racial/ethnic minorities have exponentially increased for more than a decade, bachelor degree completion among them lags (Krogstad & Fry, 2014; Labi, 2015). In 2012, young adults between the ages of 25 and 29 with bachelor's degree had these racial/ethnic profiles: 69% White, 9% Black, 9% Hispanic, and 11% Asian (Krogstad & Fry, 2014). L2s, who are mostly racial/ethnic minority immigrants, are not usually disaggregated from racial/ethnic categories in degree completion research and statistics (Almon, 2014; Boesch, 2014; Kanno & Cromley, 2013). In terms of L2s, though universities are enrolling more of them into degree programs, their low retention is not being discussed in the nationally (Almon, 2014; Boesch, 2014; Kanno & Cromley, 2013). According to Boesch (2014), colleges and universities need to recognize L2s as a significant population and explore how their learning so that their retention challenges are considered and their academic success is considered. In the case of linguistic minorities, L2s are not identified nor disaggregated from or within demographic data in national research and statistics on college retention (Almon, 2014; IPEDS, 2017-2018; Kanno & Cromley, 2013). Furthermore, faculty voices and experiences teaching L2s are relatively unheard in retention literature (Starkey, 2015) though faculty are often cited as having major influences on L2s' ability to persist (Boesch, 2014; Diaz et al., 2016, Tovar, 2015). Because L2 engagement research is not being discussed nationwide, institutions with

large L2 populations have an opportunity to make an impact on their institutions and on the college retention research movement (Almon, 2014).

Curriculum reform. In order for universities to respond effectively to changing student demographics and state and labor market demands, curriculum reform is needed (Bastedo, 2016). The curriculum, including its requirements, should accord with a university's programs and departments and be accommodating and adaptable in both its content and form (Bastedo, 2016). When curricular change occurs from understanding the organizational culture and the ways that faculty and students construct the meaning of knowledge, the curriculum can be constructed among and by those who interact with one another to make meaning (Bastedo, 2016). In addition, when decision makers proactively, but not reactively, assess from within, those faculty who are adaptable and innovative can be identified as change agents to lead initiatives that reform the curriculum, improve practice, and influence institutional outcomes for diverse student populations (Bastedo, 2016; Gardner, 2015; Williams, 2013).

In a world of increasing societal complexity, curriculum reform is needed to increase graduation rates and respond to the multitude of external and internal demands being made on higher education (Bastedo, 2016). However, due to the growing influence of state and marketing forces on the curriculum and public policymakers' distrust of faculty's ability to diligently assess undergraduate learning, external assessments are increasingly being employed to evaluate institutional productivity, teaching and learning (Bastedo, 2016; Stein et al., 2013). As a result of these trends and influences, administrative structures in higher education are grows stronger as the influence and autonomy of faculty weakens (Altbach, 2016; Stein et al., 2013). In Florida, faculty

working for state universities have reported that they fear for their jobs, they are losing contracts, and they are being excluded from state policy talks as political and business agendas increasingly dominate higher education (Bakeman, 2017). Despite their establishing a performance and incentives model based on graduation goals that determines funding allocations for Florida's state universities in the 2025 System Strategic Plan, the Florida Board of Governors also stated that both critical thinking and knowledge innovation, or the gnosiological cycle, are outcomes that result from high quality teaching and are skills that bachelor degree holders must have to meet critical workforce needs (FLBOG, 2016).

Validation Theory

In the United States, progressive educational practitioners and practices that result in student learning and success are needed to meet today's accountability demands for graduation disparities and workforce capacity among diverse student populations (Williams, 2013). Validation theory posits that an education model that requires students to compete, assimilate by shedding their culture, and think in only abstract ways to succeed in academe is inappropriate for nontraditional/minority and L2 students as it increases doubt, fear, and frustration in those who may already feel compromised by perceptions and experiences of societal discrimination and marginalization (Rendón, 1994). These students often bring to college their own doubts about their ability to succeed academically, which are often reinforced by experiences in their personal and social lives (Rendón, 2002). Validating interactions with institutional agents, especially faculty, have been shown to decrease self-doubt and increase L2s' and nontraditional/minority L1s' personal development, learning outcomes, and transition to

college, including transferring to bachelor degree programs (Barnett, 2011; Bensimon & Dowd, 2009; Rendón, 1994, 2002; Rendón & Jalomo, 1995). Validating interactions consist of institutional members' intentionally reaching out to students to help them learn, navigate, and participate in college in contrast to the traditional model, which assumes that academic success is contingent upon the students' ability to integrate (Barnett, 2011; Bensimon & Dowd, 2009; Rendón, 1994, 2002; Rendón & Jalomo, 1995). The traditional academic model is upheld by the assumption that students who self-initiate and devote considerable time to studying will succeed in academe (Rendón, 1994).

An academic validating model consists of interactions that recognize, value, and encourage a diverse student body; it also includes accommodating instruction such as modifying the curriculum and assessments, providing students with academic support in and out of class, and structuring learning so that students can see themselves as powerful learners (Rendón & Jalomo, 1995). According to Rendón (2002), for nontraditional/minority students to succeed in higher education, it is essential to expand teaching and learning theories that support educators with models that work with these students. According to L2 literature, faculty's employing validating interactions in and out of class and accommodating L2s' learning needs via curriculum enhancements and course instruction are central for these students to succeed in their courses and degree programs (Aminy & Karathanos, 2011; Boesch, 2014; Becket, et al., 2007; Diaz et al., 2016; Junious, Malecha, Tart, & Young, 2010; Karathanos & Mena, 2014; Sanner & Wilson, 2008).

Nontraditional/Minority Students

Traditional institutional assessments and assumptions focus on a student's finances, educational background, and social and academic integration into college as key factors contributing to academic persistence and retention (Rendón et al., 2000). This predisposition to interpreting unequal student outcomes upholds a culture of individualism, self-determination, and conceptions of deficit that reinforce academic norms positing individual effort as a predictor in academic success (Bensimon, 2007). Research on the persistence and retention of low-income, first-generation, racial/ethnic minority students including L2s, however, focuses less on the students' abilities and efforts to integrate into the institutional environment and more on the social and academic interactions that these students experience with institutional agents as salient factors contributing to academic success or departure (Almon, 2015; Rendón, 1994; Tovar, 2015).

According to theorist Rendón (1994), the role of the institution is to initiate and foster nontraditional/minority students' academic and personal development by actively reaching out to them via acts of *validation*. Validation consists of institutional actions that demonstrate respect for cultural and personal differences, recognition that social experiences of oppression and discrimination intensify the need for social acceptance, and confirmation that one belongs in a community of learners (Rendón, 1994). L2s, who are mostly nontraditional/minority students, have the additional characteristic of being linguistic minorities (Kanno & Cromley, 2013; Kanno & Varghese, 2010; Oropeza et al., 2010). In higher education, L2s often go unacknowledged for their multilingual assets and are instead labeled within a framework of deficit (Kanno & Cromley, 2013; Kanno &

Varghese, 2010; Oropeza et al., 2010). The deficit label is rooted in the sociohistorical

perception of the poor, unskilled non-English speaking immigrant (Douglass & Thomson,

2010; Kanno & Varghese, 2010). L2s are at risk of internalizing the deficit label and,

therefore, may self-eliminate from bachelor degree programs (Kanno & Varghese, 2010).

Douglass and Thomson (2010) and Erisman and Looney (2007) see higher education's

role in developing ways to facilitate L2s' academic success and graduation as an

imperative for the nation's economy and global economic competitiveness in the 21st

century.

Faculty Primacy

For nontraditional students living off campus, institutional interactions, which

include perceived experiences, personal engagement, and knowledge sharing, mostly

consist of experiences in the classroom with faculty (Barnett, 2011; Bensimon, 2007;

Bensimon & Dowd, 2009; Crisp & Nora, 2010; Tovar, 2015). In a study of 4,501

undergraduate students, Lundberg and Schreiner (2004) found that faculty

encouragement, feedback, and assurance of belonging predicted nontraditional students'

learning more than it did with traditional students. Moreover, in both qualitative and

quantitative studies of Hispanic students, findings indicate that faculty engagement and

their interactions with students influenced both academic performance and the self-

determination to persist to associate and/or bachelor's degree programs (Barnett, 2011;

Bensimon, 2007; Bensimon & Dowd, 2009; Crisp & Nora, 2010; Rendón, 2002; Tovar,

2015).

For L2s, the primacy of the faculty-student relationship is particularly salient

because L2s may not feel comfortable speaking or asking questions in class due to their

culturally embedded notions of classroom propriety, feelings of social and linguistic alienation among L1 peers, and fears of making grammatical mistakes and/or not being understood because of their accents (Boesch, 2014; Diaz et al., 2016; Starkey, 2015). Overarching themes in L2 literature indicate that L2s need and desire to be culturally and linguistically valued, accepted, and guided by faculty (Aminy & Karathanos, 2011; Becket, Benander, & Kumar, 2007; Diaz et al., 2016; Junious et al., 2010; Sanner & Wilson, 2008; Starkey, 2015).

Experiences of L2s in College

L2s report that the marginalization they feel on campus is due to their linguistic identities and struggles (Almon, 2014; Starkey, 2014). They cite institutional culture as one which dishonors their linguistic minority position and labels them deficient (Boesch, 2014; Kanno & Cromley, 2013). L2s understand that they are at a cultural and linguistic disadvantage, yet they rarely reach out for help or ask questions for fear of sounding stupid or wrong (Bliss & Sandiford, 2015). This fear, or hesitation to participate, is well-established in literature and theory regarding racial/ethnic minority students' experiences in higher education (Bensimon, 2007; Bensimon & Dowd, 2009; Howard-Hamilton & Hinton, 2016; Rendón, 1994). For L2s, already coping with cultural and linguistic barriers to comprehension, intercultural communication in English can be a major source of fear and stress (Borden, 2014; Diaz et al., 2016).

When L2s get into college classrooms, dissonance often arises between their expectations of college and course expectations of language performance (Ousey et al., 2014). If an L2 turns in a paper riddled with grammatical errors, a professor may conclude that the student does not belong in his/her course or in college, in general

(Ousey et al., 2014). L2s may come to the same conclusion and self-eliminate from a bachelor degree program, determining that linguistic and cultural marginalization is too big a gap to close and too high a price to pay if one must lose one's self by conceding to a social system that awards knowledge, opportunity, and membership for English accuracy (Almon, 2014; Borden, 2015). Language is an important marker of identity and pride, and when L2s feel that they are compromising their identity, it can negatively impact their self-development (Hernández & Ortiz, 2016). When educators teach, albeit inadvertently, from a historically oppressive ideology that excludes human experiences or variations as it preserves dominant voices, it silences marginalized groups, inhibits them from self-determination, and prevents them from learning (Bensimon, 2007; Cuyjet & Meriwether, 2016; Freire, 2001; Howard-Hamilton & Hinton, 2016).

Studies focusing on the persistence and transfer of L1 and L2 racial/ethnic minority students from community college to bachelor degree programs often cite negative or unaccommodating interactions with faculty as having more influence on these students' self-efficacy to persist academically than other socioeconomic constraints (Bliss & Sandiford, 2015; Tovar, 2015). Research on L2s' self-efficacy and persistence in bachelor degree programs often cites faculty's lack of support and/or inability to teach linguistic minority students as major obstacles (Almon, 2014; Boesch, 2014; Diaz et al., 2016; Karathanos & Mena, 2014). In the classroom, for example, faculty might unconsciously riddle their speech with idioms or make cultural references that L2s are not familiar with, both of which contribute to heightened experiences of linguistic and cultural marginalization (Almon, 2014). College students who perceive marginalization and barriers to self-development and/or group membership may choose institutional

departure over experiences that denigrate or marginalize their sociocultural identity (Howard-Hamilton & Hinton, 2016).

L2s report that their professors avoid, abuse, embarrass, and discriminate against them because of their linguistic inabilities and challenges (Almon, 2014; Boesch, 2014; Diaz et al., 2016; Starkey, 2015). Conversely, faculty teaching L2s report that they not only see the value of growing a linguistically diverse workforce but they also want their L2s to be graduated from college (Starkey, 2015). Faculty cite English language knowledge and cross-cultural communication as major impediments to both teaching and learning (Dubose, 2017; Starkey, 2015). They also highlight the difficulty of addressing and balancing the linguistic diversity of L1s and L2s, including L2s with various first languages and cultures, in the same course (Dubose, 2017; Starkey, 2015). In one study, faculty reported that they felt constrained when teaching L2s because they had had no training in how to teach L2s nor institutional support or resources to support L2s' learning needs (Starkey, 2015). They reported that teaching L2s put them in the dubious position of learning how to teach different linguistic minority groups while also having to teach course content and meet course learning outcomes (Starkey, 2015). In fields such as nursing, faculty are further pressed by socioeconomic demands to graduate a needed workforce while ensuring that service sector policies and practices are met (Starkey, 2015).

L2s' learning perceptions and experiences of their professors are as equally significant as their professors' teaching perceptions and experiences. Contradictions between faculty and students cannot be resolved unless both can safely dialogue on the

object by which they are mediated, such as the curriculum, teaching methods, and student learning (Freire, 2001).

Validation and L2 Learners

With increasing college enrollment of immigrant and international students, faculty cannot feasibly know about every world culture nor how to teach, engage, and interact with every cultural group (Bednarz et al., 2010; Dubose, 2017). A vulnerability that one does not have all the answers and an awareness that cultural competence is an ongoing and interpersonal learning process are needed if faculty are to succeed in teaching culturally and linguistically diverse student populations (Bednarz et al., 2010). Bednarz et al. (2010) recommend that faculty teaching L2s become familiar with the regions and cultures from which their students come, and they stress that faculty should always approach the global classroom by acting locally. Acting locally means that the best way to know one's students is by engaging and actively observing the students in one's class (Bednarz et al., 2010). This can be done through a variety of ongoing survey instruments that include feedback on students' backgrounds, learning styles, wants, and needs followed up by discussion, negotiation, and accommodation to the curriculum in accordance to class feedback via consensus (Bednarz et al., 2010). For example, in one study of L2 teacher candidates, the professor worked with students to develop and modify rubric criteria to be used in their own writing assignments, thereby accommodating the curriculum through democratic means while also enhancing the transferability of a professional skill (Aminy & Karathanos, 2011). Accommodating the curriculum through validation can also mean that exercises and assignments include students' subjective experiences and backgrounds on themes related to their personal histories so that their

voices are given equal privilege to academic voices (Rendón, 2002). These academic validating methods position faculty and students as partners in learning and affirm students as valuable and proprietary knowers and creators of knowledge within a safe learning environment as opposed to a traditional and, therefore, fearful or punitive one (Rendón, 2002; Rendón & Jalomo, 1995). Being validated as a knower is especially important for L2s, many of whom report perceived experiences of intellectual inferiority and pressure to prove one's worth to classmates and professors based on their linguistic minority status (Almon, 2014; Boesch, 2014; Diaz et al., 2016). In one study, L2s reported that a professor who enjoyed interacting with students and was dedicated to enhancing their teaching and students' learning created a positive educational experience (Boesch, 2014). Validation via curricular accommodation aligns with Freire's (2001) theory of a liberating pedagogy wherein democratic, participatory, and relational teaching and learning can transform both the learner and the traditional teaching-learning paradigm (Rendón, 2002).

L2s often report feeling self-conscious and intimidated by their professors and English-speaking classmates as well as by the academic demands of coursework (Aminy & Karathanos, 2011; Becket et al., 2007; Diaz et al., 2016; Junious et al., 2010; Kanno & Varghese, 2010). These fearful perceptions of the American academic environment may originate from L2s' own cultural background, in which professorial power and distance was customary, and/or from perceived social experiences of stereotyping and discrimination in relation to their accent, cultural background, or English language abilities (Almon, 2014; Aminy & Karathanos, 2011; Becket et al., 2007; Diaz et al., 2016; Junious et al., 2010; Sanner & Wilson, 2008). Since open sharing in the classroom

may be uncomfortable or frightening for L2s, it is incumbent on faculty to actively

participate in their own development of cultural competence by surveying and learning

about their L2s' culture of origin and by considering sociocultural biases that may be

present within the dominant society, the classroom, and themselves (Bednarz et al.,

2010). When faculty mediate by intentionally creating an inclusive classroom, they

reduce stress and increase success among L2s (Boesch, 2014; Diaz et al., 2016). Boesch

(2014) found that when professors created a climate of respect among all students and a

space for diverse viewpoints, L2s reported positive classroom experiences. In contrast,

glossing over an L2's language or culture contributed to heightened feelings of

invisibility and created a negative learning environment (Boesch, 2014).

In one survey of L2 nursing students, all participants reported perceptions that

both their American classmates and faculty were culturally incompetent and did not

understand or respect foreign values and traditions (Junious et al., 2010). Perceiving such

environments, marginalized students may avoid academic engagement due to fears that

they might be judged incompetent or reinforce negative stereotypes about their culture

(Bensimon, 2007). In research, L2s reported personal and perceived feelings of inferiority

and high anxiety about their abilities to understand and use English in the classroom and

with their professors (Almon, 2014; Boesch, 2014). In an academic validating

environment, the professor reaches out to students, designs learning standards in

collaboration with students, and includes contributions from marginalized populations in

the curriculum (Rendón & Jalomo, 1995). These intentional acts of inclusion are

especially important for L2s, whose previous culture, prior knowledge, and or

expectations can lead to confusion in understanding and navigating the culture of the

classroom, course expectations, and learning objectives (Sanner & Wilson, 2008). In contrast, educators who employ a banking model, or traditional paradigm, teach from a fixed position of curricular expectations and standards that college students can either conform to meet or fail to meet (Boesch, 2014; Scarcella, 2003). When educators assume what college students should already know and lack knowledge of their students' cultural lives and backgrounds, they are limited in their ability to respond to and adapt incongruences in the curriculum and the nontraditional/minority student body (Bensimon, 2007). They are also more likely to interpret marginalized students' low motivation, indifference, or avoidance as academic lacks rather than learned coping strategies (Bensimon, 2007).

Because nontraditional/minority students are at significantly higher risk of not persisting or graduating due to a variety of personal and socioeconomic challenges and stressors, validating interactions within an institution need to be consistent and ongoing to ensure that students do not self-eliminate from college (Rendón, 2002). Fear of failure, social isolation, and self-doubt often plague nontraditional/minority students, and academic validating measures can be as rudimentary as professors' praising students' success and encouraging motivation (Rendón, 1994, 2002; Rendón & Jalomo, 1995). In studies that include suggestions for faculty improvement, L2s asked not only for curricular accommodation but also for faculty's encouragement and empathy in regards to their linguistic minority status (Becket et al., 2007; Boesch, 2014; Junious et al., 2010; Karathanos & Mena, 2014). For example, L2s reported that professors who acknowledged students' lives out of class and expressed understanding for their personal and academic challenges and pressures created a comfortable atmosphere in the class that

contributed to positive learning experiences (Boesch, 2014). In addition, faculty who continually checked in with the class while instructing fostered an atmosphere of clarification via questioning, which enhanced communication for L2s (Aminy & Karathanos, 2011; Diaz et al., 2016). Because L2s often get lost and overwhelmed in the traditional unidirectional lecture, they can experience these professors who do not check in as authoritative, marginalizing, non-accommodating, and unapproachable (Almon, 2014; Diaz et al., 2016). For instance, when L2s asked for clarification and were met with faculty's responses that either stated or implied that they should already know the answer to the question or were told to look up answers on their own, L2s reported feeling stupid, discriminated against, and/or afraid of their professors (Boesch, 2014; Diaz et al., 2016). When professors responded critically or unsupportively to them in front of their class peers, it was especially humiliating and intimidating (Boesch, 2014; Diaz et al., 2016).

Professors who projected unwillingness to help while teaching or through their classroom interaction styles were perceived as fearful, unavailable, and unapproachable to L2s (Boesch, 2014). On the other hand, professors who were approachable and provided academic support and advice in and out of class were favored and appreciated highly among L2s, who often require extra clarification on course content or guidance on personal and career decisions but are reluctant to interact with professors due to their cultural upbringing and linguistic minority status (Almon, 2014; Boesch, 2014; Diaz et al., 2016; Karathanos & Mena, 2014). When L2s cannot find a safe connection with a professor in or out of the classroom, they may dissociate from the learning environment and choose to self-eliminate from a course and/or the college (Almon, 2014; Becket et al., 2007). Validating instructional models consist of faculty's actively supporting

nontraditional/minority students in a learning environment that allows for multiple perspectives, differences, and imperfection (Rendón & Jalomo, 1995). When faculty cultivate learning partnerships with L2s, it contributes positively to their self-perceptions of empowerment (Becket et al., 2007). Because L2s have lowered self-competency due to cultural and linguistic marginalization, validating professorial relationships can not only increase L2s' motivation to persist but also transform their preconceived notions of academic inferiority (Aminy & Karathanos, 2011; Boesch, 2014; Diaz et al., 2016; Sanner & Wilson, 2008).

Validation and L2 Learning

The demands on L2s are not only personal, social, and cultural but also academic. They denounce their professors who do not appreciate or understand the intense pressure of academic demands on L2s, who are simultaneously learning vocabulary as well as discipline-specific material in a new and different language (Almon, 2014; Diaz et al., 2016). One of the major challenges that L2s face is understanding and developing academic vocabulary across disciplines in reading assignments and during classroom interactions (Hartshorn et al., 2017; Kanno & Varghese, 2010). Being able to read, understand, and respond critically to multiple types of texts across a variety of genres and fields is a vital skill for all college students and one with which L2s struggle (Hartshorn et al., 2017; Scarcella, 2003). For example, professors who did not allow L2s to use bilingual dictionaries, enforced rigid deadlines, or did not review reading assignments in class were seen as unaccommodating and unhelpful in their learning to meet course demands (Almon, 2014; Boesch, 2014). While many L2s appreciate a strict class environment, they do not appreciate one in which their learning needs are not considered

in the organization of course content, presentation, and delivery (Boesch, 2014; Diaz et al., 2016). In Diaz et al. (2016), one L2 disclosed to his professor that he was under intense pressure and could not keep up with the reading and writing assignments within the allotted time. The professor divided the reading up into sections, reduced the comprehension questions, and met with the L2 periodically throughout the term (Diaz et al., 2016). This L2 reported increased confidence in his abilities to complete course assignments and expressed appreciation for his professor's support because he was in college for one reason: to learn (Diaz et al., 2016). In this study, researchers found that "the emotional responses that [L2s] expressed when receiving motivational help from their instructor included admiration, feeling proud, determined, purposeful, not feeling dumb, lifted up, being mentally supported, confident, able to learn, and hopeful" (Diaz et al., 2016, p. 162).

L2s experience time constraints with new vocabulary in timed tests and communicative contexts as well (Becket et al., 2007). In Becket et al. (2007), one L2, who eventually withdrew from college, could not process new vocabulary in context of the lectures nor with sufficient speed to understand and complete test questions, reasons for which she and her professor determined she failed the course. In the same study, another L2 attributed her acquisition of new vocabulary to her professor's explicit and public praise of her comments during group discussion, from which her class participation increased as well as her ability to use new vocabulary in academic critiques (Becket et al., 2007). She also attributed her vocabulary learning gains to her professor's teaching style and explicit modeling of new vocabulary within course-specific contexts (Becket et al., 2007). In research, L2s complained about professors who give unclear

explanations of the course material, spoke too quickly, and did not write new vocabulary on the board while lecturing (Almon, 2014; Boesch, 2014; Diaz et al., 2016). L2s reported that they need course material to be organized, broken down, and explained concretely in order for them to understand and learn (Boesch, 2014; Diaz et al., 2016). When professors explained clearly and ensured that the class understood course material, L2s experienced greater confidence and learning outcomes (Boesch, 2014; Diaz et al., 2016). In an academic validating model, faculty support students in learning by fostering a climate of success with students, such as modifying curricular demands, and by employing active learning techniques, such as explicitly modeling course material (Rendón, 1994; Rendón & Jalomo, 1995).

In academe, L2s must not only understand and use advanced vocabulary and grammar but they also must use it accurately in writing, the academic medium by which inaccuracies do not go unnoticed (Evans, Hartshorn, & Strong-Krause, 2011; Scarcella, 2003). In a bachelor degree program, students are assigned a variety of writing tasks that include but are not limited to summarizing, reporting, synthesizing, researching, and connecting theory and data (Zhu, 2004). L2s experience both the challenge of writing across the curriculum and the difficulty of meeting the writing demands and preferences of different faculty (Kanno & Varghese, 2010; Roberts & Cimasko, 2008; Zhu, 2004). For example, research indicates that cross-discipline faculty focus their feedback on organization and grammar in writing while discipline-specific faculty focus their feedback on the acquisition and application of content knowledge (Zhu, 2004). Discipline-specific faculty also stress the importance of linking students' writing assignments and content with workforce needs and industry skills (Zhu, 2004) and tend to

be more exacting in their expectations of L2 writing (Matsuda et al., 2013; Roberts & Cimasko, 2008; Scarcella, 2003). The instructional strain of L2s has some faculty, irrespective of discipline, concerned about L2 writing and asking that L2s be moved out of mainstream classes, that EAP programs and faculty do more to prepare L2s for academic writing, and that institutions revise admissions policies to keep L2s still learning academic English out of degree-seeking programs and courses (Matsuda et al., 2013; Kanno & Varghese, 2010; Roberts & Cimasko, 2008; Scarcella, 2003). In studies on L2 writing, faculty reported that they had not had but needed professional preparation opportunities for teaching L2s and more institutional support from tutors, writing centers, and EAP faculty (Matsuda et al., 2013; Zhu, 2004). What is consistent among the literature regarding academic writing is that L2s, who are using new rhetorical, mechanical, and linguistic conventions, often do not produce linguistically accurate writing (Evans et al., 2011).

In a survey of L1s and L2s, students reported on professor feedback on their writing assignments (Karathanos & Mena, 2014). When asked how often they received positive or encouraging feedback on their writing, 44% of L1s and 26% of L2s reported that they did (Karathanos & Mena, 2014). When asked if they needed to improve their academic writing, 66% of L1s and 79% of L2s reported that they did. When asked if their professors had told them that they needed to improve their writing, 29% of L1s and 45% of L1s reported that they did. These findings suggested that students were not receiving the feedback that they felt they needed (Karathanos & Mena, 2014). In Boesch (2014) and Karathanos and Mena (2014), L2s reported that they wanted more specific feedback

on what they did right or how they could improve their writing even if they had received a good grade.

There are many inconsistencies in academe regarding how feedback is both perceived and practiced among and by faculty (Evans et al., 2011; Roberts & Cimasko, 2008; Zhu, 2004). Some professors, such as discipline-specific faculty, may focus more on content and rhetorical, or *formative*, feedback, and some, such as cross-discipline faculty, may focus more on grammatical and structural, or *corrective*, written feedback (Zhu, 2004). Some professors may rewrite a word or sentence without giving an explanation for the corrective changes (Roberts & Cimasko, 2008), and some, including writing professors, may not provide any corrective feedback due to varying beliefs and assumptions, some of which include that formative assessment is more important than linguistic accuracy, L2s should correct grammar errors themselves, error correction is ineffective and overwhelming to L2s, and other institutional agents should help L2s with grammar correction (Evans et al., 2011). In one study of 74 first-year composition professors, many reported that they were aware of the presence and writing needs of L2s in their courses, yet they had not made any accommodations or provisions to address the unique needs of L2 writers (Matsuda et al., 2013). According to Boesch (2014) and Aminy & Karathanos (2011), positive and encouraging feedback inspired L2s to write more and improve their language skills. Research on L2s also indicates that clear and consistent formative and corrective feedback can lead L2s to becoming more independent writers who produce more linguistically accurate writing (Aminy & Karathanos, 2011; Evans et al., 2011; Hartshorn, Evans, Merrill, Sudweeks, Stong-Krause, & Anderson, 2010).

In one study on the development of L2s' academic writing, professors did not overwhelm students with a great deal of corrective feedback but focused on one or two high frequency errors per paper with explanations in conference and provided links to web resources (Aminy & Karathanos, 2011). L2s followed up with correction and revision per paper throughout the term (Aminy & Karathanos, 2011). As L2s mastered isolated structural errors in subsequent assignments, professors added one or two more structural problems in subsequent writing assignments, eventually meeting with L2s less and less over the term as they became for confident and independent in their writing (Aminy & Karathanos, 2011). When professors provide resource materials, direct students to learning resources such as tutors on campus, and give opportunities for students to revise their work, L2s are more successful at learning and mastering academic writing skills (Karathanos & Mena, 2014; Ousey et al., 2014). These practices align with an academic validating model wherein faculty acquaint students with academic and institutional agents and resources and provide students with the opportunities to revise assignments until they master them (Rendón, 1994; Rendón & Jalomo, 1995).

 In an academic invalidating, or traditional, model, faculty present and withhold information and learning assessments are fearful and impersonal (Rendón, 1994). In Boesch (2014), L2s reported that professors who covered content too quickly and did not synthesize course content and assessments during a lecture had a negative effect on their learning. When faculty expected students to comprehend and synthesize course material and correct answers to study questions on their own by consulting an accompanying answer book, L2s reported negative classroom experiences and perceptions of their professors (Boesch, 2014). Furthermore, if there was a disjunction between content

taught in class and assignments or tests, L2s complained that in-class chapter reviews were too general, but tests were overly specific (Boesch, 2014). Lack of clarity in assessments and instruction can not only influence negative perceptions of the professor but also influence an L2's perception of his/her ability to learn and succeed in higher education (Almon, 2014; Boesch, 2014; Diaz et al., 2016).

Faculty Perceptions of L2s

The majority of studies within this review use qualitative methodology with L2 participants seen through a paradigmatic lens of social constructivism. Qualitative methodology consists of collected data that reveals the thoughts, reflections, and experiences of the participants' point of view (Creswell, 2007). Social constructivism relies on the participants' subjective meanings of experiences formed through interactions with others and through historical, social, and cultural norms that operate within individual lives (Creswell, 2007). In most of the research on L2s, faculty are perceived as powerful gatekeepers when they are unaccommodating and transformational change agents when they are accommodating. In the few studies that include faculty experiences teaching L2s, their perceptions reflect frustration and dissonance within the institution and the classroom. In Matsuda et al., (2013), writing professors expressed that their institutions needed segregation of L2s in classes with faculty who knew how to teach them, writing centers that focused on the needs of L2s, and revision and improvement in admissions and placement practices. In order to teach L2s, faculty expressed their needs for professional preparation opportunities and multilingual curricula with supportive materials (Matsuda et al., 2013). In other studies, discipline-specific faculty reported that L2s lacked foundational communicative and writing skills that could be bridged

institutionally via English professors and other linguistic support services (Donnelly et al., 2009; Zhu, 2004). In this period of declining enrollments and shrinking budgets (Valle, 2016), small, not-for profit institutions may not receive financial subsidies from the state (Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida [ICUF], 2017) nor have the resources to expand academic resources and/or provide professional development opportunities (Matsuda et al., 2013). In addition, L2s often do not have the time or economic resources to use institutional support services and further develop their academic English skills (Almon, 2014; Kanno & Cromley, 2013). As a result, faculty may find themselves in the precarious position of having very little institutional support while having to learn how to teach L2s on their own as more multicultural and multilingual students fill their classrooms (Starkey, 2015).

L2s' experiences in higher education as well as their positive and mostly negative perceptions of faculty dominate L2 literature. While L2s' experiences and perceptions are significant and salient factors in L2s' learning and academic success, the research gap in faculty's experiences of teaching L2s is evident. According to Freire (2005), educators choose to teach because they love learning, they love their students despite low salaries and little respect, and they are prone to cynicism due to an environment of increasing bureaucratization. Professors see their own gradual suppression and marginalization in institutional and teaching practices as part of larger bureaucratic forces which put standardized assessment, quantitative data, and marketing solutions above both professors and students (Bakeman, 2017; Stein et al., 2013). Academics are doing less research and more teaching, and academic freedom is gradually being denied as predetermined curricula and quantifiable data from external assessments seeking

continuous improvement increasingly define quality teaching and learning (Stein et al.,

2013). Furthermore, shared governance that includes faculty input is decreasing while

pressure on faculty to produce graduates is increasing (Bakeman, 2017; Stein et al.,

2013). Faculty teaching L2s in high-demand fields such as nursing are particularly

feeling the pressure to produce graduates without the aid of institutional services or

professional development that helps them teach immigrant students (Starkey, 2015).

Assumptions, beliefs, and biases toward immigrants and immigration are deeply

rooted in U.S. history, society, politics, economics, and culture (McDermott et al., 2012).

In the last 20 years, Americans' views toward immigrants as burden or benefit have

become increasingly divided among generations and partisan lines (Jones, 2016). Under

these social conditions, it is reasonable to assume that some faculty have biases toward

immigrant students and may stigmatize them with a deficit label (McDermott et al.,

2012). However, it is unreasonable to assume that all or most faculty have biases toward

immigrant students, especially if they are not being engaged institutionally or in

academic research.

Summary of Chapter 2

A Freirean framework posits that faculty want to and should be engaged in safe

dialogue to create new knowledge and enhance the curriculum and teaching practices in

order to solve educational problems (Freire, 2001, 2005). Dialogue is a democratic and

existential necessity to liberate the mind and transform socially oppressive structures

Bureaucratic and corporatizing forces in higher education, however, silence educators

and students. When faculty are excluded from the evaluation of practice and curricular

change, substantive changes in teaching and learning cannot occur (Freire, 2005).

Throughout American history, immigration has been used to fuel the nation's international stature as "a beacon of liberty" and the economy as "the land of opportunity" (West, 2010, p. 30). As unskilled, non-English speaking immigrants increased, so did policies and practices aimed at restricting these undesirable immigrants and Americanizing, or assimilating, those who could prove their legal status (Dorsey, 2007; Ullman, 2010; West, 2010). Immigration laws enacted in the 20th century allowed for a more globally, culturally, and linguistically diverse immigrant population (Lopez et al., 2015; West, 2010). The current U.S. population of legal immigrants totals just over 45 million and includes mostly racial/ethnic minorities who are unskilled with limited English proficiency (Lopez et al., 2015; Zong & Batalova, 2017). The ability to understand and use English has always been a marker for U.S. loyalty and an indicator for workforce access and mobility (Farkas et al., 2003). Federally funded ESL programs provide English instruction for immediate workforce needs (Burt & Mathews-Aydinli, 2007; Pandya, 2012). EAP programs provide academic English instruction for college study (Hernandez et al., 2012). The length of these programs does not allow for adult acquisition of academic English (Burt & Mathews-Aydinli, 2007; Ousey et al., 2014). As a result of this and an economy that needs college graduates, L2s are still learning English when in college (Almon, 2014; Kanno & Cromley, 2013; Kanno & Varghese, 2010; Oropeza et al., 2010; Ousey et al., 2014; Scarcella, 2003).

American higher education has been linked to local, national, and global economies since the 19th century (Altbach, 2016). College graduation rates are not meeting today's labor market demands and have resulted in increased pressure to produce college graduates, especially among nontraditional/minority students, who are at higher

risk of not graduating (Smith, 2015; Williams, 2013). Curriculum reform that includes faculty input is needed for individual institutions to respond to the needs of nontraditional/minority students and demands of external stakeholders, but faculty are often deemed obstacles to change and excluded from planning by state and public policy makers, who apply external assessments to evaluate teaching and learning (Bastedo, 2016; Witham et al., 2015). To address gaps in nontraditional/minority students' graduation rates, institutions must engage faculty in change, perform their own assessments, and disaggregate its particular student populations (Bastedo, 2016; Gardner, 2015; Smith, 2015; Williams, 2013). How immigrants fare in society and higher education will shape the future of nations (Douglass and Thomson, 2010).

L2s are mostly nontraditional students who have not become part of the national dialogue on college retention despite an approximate enrollment of 10% and higher attrition (Almon, 2014; Kanno & Cromley, 2013). Rendón's (1994) validation theory posits that validating interactions help nontraditional/minority students including L2s learn and succeed in college (Rendón & Jalomo, 1995). Validating interactions and teaching methods include curricular inclusion and accommodation and emotional and academic support in and out of class (Rendón, 1994; Rendón & Jalomo, 1995). The interactions with and teaching of faculty are salient in the learning and academic success of L2s, who often need more emotional and academic support in and out of class(Boesch, 2016; Diaz et al., 2016; Karathanos & Mena, 2014). When L2s do not perceive faculty as validating, heightened marginalization and lacks in learning are indicated (Almon, 2014; Aminy & Karathanos, 2011; Becket, et al., 2007; Boesch, 2014; Diaz et al., 2016; Sanner & Wilson, 2008).

Most L2 literature includes qualitative methods from the experiences of L2s. In L2 literature that includes faculty perceptions, faculty express frustration due to lacks in institutional support (Donnelly et al., 2009; Matsuda et al., 2013; Starkey, 2015; Zhu, 2004). Due to declining enrollments and shrinking budgets (Valle, 2016) and bureaucratic forces which exclude faculty participation in curricular enhancements (Stein et al., 2013), non-ESL faculty may teach L2s without institutional support while under pressure to meet demands to graduate students (Donnelly et al., 2009; Starkey, 2015). L2s' learning perceptions and experiences of their professors are as equally important as their professors' teaching perceptions and experiences, and contradictions cannot be resolved unless both are engaged in institutions and research.

Gaps and Limitations

This study intended to fill a number of gaps in the available literature. L2s are the fastest growing but one of the least studied subgroups of nontraditional students presenting teaching and retention challenges to colleges and universities (Almon, 2014; Boesch, 2014; Kanno & Cromley, 2013). L2s are four times less likely to graduate with a bachelor degree than nontraditional L1s, but research on their needs and academic success are not included in most universities' retention agendas and research (Almon, 2014; Kanno & Cromley, 2013). The majority of qualitative research on L2s in U.S. bachelor degree programs includes L2 perceptions of faculty; one qualitative study of nursing faculty's perceptions of teaching L2s in the U.S. was identified (Starkey, 2015). This dissertation study expanded on Starkey's (2015) research, which posits that faculty perceptions of L2s need to be explored since faculty organize and implement the

curriculum. This study differs from Starkey's (2015) because it included faculty from more than one academic discipline and implemented a praxis.

Research Questions

One central research question was at the core of this study: How do L2s succeed in bachelor degree courses? Three issue and procedural questions guided this qualitative research.

Issue questions:

1. What does bachelor degree completion mean for L2 students?

2. What perceived characteristics do successful L2s in bachelor degree courses have?

3. What elements of teaching influence L2s' success in bachelor degree courses?

Procedural Questions:

1. What themes emerged from these experiences?

2. What were the contexts of and thoughts about the experiences?

3. What was the overall essence of the experience?

Chapter 3: Methodology

Aim of the Study

The purpose of this study was to understand and describe the lived experiences of faculty teaching L2s in bachelor degree courses and to identify potential approaches and teaching methods that influence L2s' learning and success. Given the importance of faculty's role in the academic success and retention of L2s, the significance of the study stems from the minimal amount of existing literature on faculty's perceptions and experiences teaching L2s in bachelor degree programs. This information is needed as the L2 population increases and the body of literature on L2s' experiences of professors grows. This chapter includes the research approach, design, rationale, and participants. It includes the data collection tools, procedures, and data analysis that were used as well as the ethical considerations, trustworthiness, potential research bias, and limitations.

Qualitative Research Approach

As assessment of teaching and learning becomes increasingly contingent on quantitative performance measures implemented by external authorities (BHEF, 2013; FLBOG, 2016; Stein et al., 2013), qualitative research provides an alternative approach to research problems because it recognizes the views of participants from where they live and work and can advocate for "change and bettering the lives of individuals" (Creswell, 2008, p. 51). Qualitative research is also used when a detailed understanding of a central phenomenon and the individual experiences of those living the phenomenon are understudied (Creswell, 2007, 2008). Because faculty voices are underexplored and need to be heard accurately and specifically in relation to the phenomenon of L2s in bachelor degree courses, quantitative measures and statistical analyses are inappropriate as the

unique experience of each participant would be weakened. A qualitative study was an ideal approach for the principal researcher to understand and interpret meanings of the experiences of faculty teaching L2s in a Freirean dialogue of education.

According to Freire (2001), dialogue by its very nature implements a praxis. A dialogic investigation affords "the opportunity both to discover generative themes and to stimulate people's awareness in regard to these themes" (Freire, 2001, p. 96-97). The method and objective of a dialogue of education is to investigate the "thought-language" people use to refer to, perceive, and evaluate their world to discover generative themes (Freire, 2001, p. 97). For dialogue to serve as a democratic basis for developing education in a qualitative study, participants are invited to explore and take possession of their initial themes and adapt them as active participants in analysis to deepen conscientization (Freire, 2001). In order to enhance generative themes, research participants must participate in their own praxis or else risk being interpreted as static entities (Freire, 2001). When individuals are first presented with an existential situation or object, their initial view of the situation is exteriorized and divorced from reality (Freire, 2001). Perceptions of the proposed situation change once they are reflected upon and taken possession of in the mind and body (Freire, 2001). The subject begins to recognize him/herself in the situation and in relation to the object (Freire, 2001). This internalization of the situation is praxis, from which conscientization and generative themes occur (Freire, 2001). For Freire (2001), inviting participants to be active in research not only liberates consciousness but also enables people to act within the world to change the world (Freire, 2001).

As a strategy of inquiry, phenomenology involves returning to an experience to gather descriptions that offer the basis for reflective analysis that reveals the essence of the experience (Moustakas, 1994). Phenomenology is not concerned with experiences as they are empirically perceived and treated as facts; rather, phenomenology is concerned with "judgement-experiences" and corresponding ideas (Husserl, 2002a, p. 67). In phenomenological research, participants are asked to focus their attention on something, the noema, which then gives rise to the act of perceiving, the noesis, via reflecting, remembering, feeling, and judging (Moustakas, 1994). According to Husserl (2002b), while the judgements made via noesis are concrete, they are to be interpreted as perceived experiences; in other words, "what is judged must not be confused with what is judged about" (p. 144). The phenomenological researcher looks for how the noema is perceived by participants in order to extract the pure meaning and/or essence of a phenomenon (Husserl, 2002b). Certain verbal expressions and their correlating meanings then provide evidence to form a phenomenological unity (Husserl, 2002a).

According to Chenail (2011), qualitative researchers wanting to discover a particular phenomenon from insiders' perspectives structure their interviews with open-ended questions that usually begin with question words. In this research study, open-ended questions with question words were used and followed up by probing questions in one-on-one interviews.

Participants

A purposeful sampling of five participants at the research site included faculty teaching courses with L2 presence at the three- and four-thousand level to ensure that courses are at the bachelor degree level. Demographic data included participants' full-

or part-time status, first language, degree program or field, and identification of courses to be discussed as degree-specific or cross-curriculum to ensure that multiple sources of individuals were used in the study. According to Creswell (2008), multiple sources allow for triangulation of the data to enhance the accuracy of the study, and purposeful sampling enables researchers to select people who can best describe the experience of the phenomenon in order to develop a detailed understanding of it. Gentles, Charles, Ploeg and McKibbon's (2015) overview of sampling methods in qualitative literature indicates that participants in phenomenology are chosen for what they know, but strategizing the number of participants for a study is contradicted among researchers and seen as an attempt to achieve statistical generalizability. The qualitative study is a search for "meanings and essences of experience rather than measurements and explanations" (Moustakas, 1994, p. 21). Five participants were chosen because five is half the maximum average for phenomenological studies in Creswell (2007), who asserts that transcribing audio is a lengthy process for inexperienced researchers. Furthermore, the intent of qualitative research is to provide an in-depth picture, which diminishes in complexity with large numbers (Creswell, 2008).

Data Collection Tools

Interview data for the proposed study was collected via audio-recording, interview instrument, transcription, and email. The interview instrument with research questions and demographic data was pilot tested with a faculty member not participating in the study at the university. The interview instrument included welcoming statements to relax the interviewee, the research questions, space for notes

and additional comments, and a closing statement thanking the interviewee (Creswell, 2007). Pilot testing ensured rigor, eliminated possible biases, and assisted in establishing time needed for interviewing (Chenail, 2011). Because it is important to maximize eye-contact and minimize notetaking as much as possible to keep participants talking during an interview, interview questions were memorized and recording equipment was checked prior to the start of each interview (Creswell, 2007). Keeping participants on the topic of the question can be challenging for novice researchers, so follow-up questions may be needed if data for research questions are not captured at the time of the interview (Creswell, 2007; Turner, 2010). All participants agreed to answer follow-up questions if needed; however, probing questions during the interview allowed for all questions to be answered in rich detail.

The following questions served as the three main interview topics and were designed to address the central research question of the proposed study: How do L2s succeed in bachelor degree courses?

1. What does bachelor degree completion mean for L2 students?

2. What perceived characteristics do successful L2s in bachelor degree courses have?

3. What elements of teaching influence L2s' success in bachelor degree courses?

Procedures

Upon IRB approval, faculty at the proposed research site were recruited by email with an invitation letter to participate in the study. The invitation letter explained the purpose of the study, participants' involvement, benefits and risks, inclusion criteria, the time needed for the interview, and a deadline to respond. Prior to scheduling interviews,

the researcher emailed an approved informed consent to participants with invitation to respond with questions and/or concerns. Interview times and locations were arranged, and the informed consent was signed prior to starting the interview.

Interviews began with a protocol outlined by Creswell (2007) and included a review of the purpose of the study, the time needed for the interview, an explanation of how results would be used, and a confirmation that the participants were willing to validate and possibly extend the transcript. Once interviews were completed and transcribed, participants were sent the transcription. All five participants validated the transcripts. Two chose to edit and extend the original transcript.

Data Analysis

To analyze and interpret data, Smith, Flowers, and Larkin's (2009) six step IPA protocol was used:

1. Reading and rereading by immersing in the original data.

2. Initial noting by examining descriptive, linguistic, and conceptual language;

3. Developing emergent themes by mapping themes among interview notes, transcript, and exploratory notes from step two.

4. Searching for connections across emergent themes by identifying, ordering, and grouping emergent themes.

5. Moving to the next case while bracketing previous participants and ensuring that new themes emerge to maintain objectivity.

6. Looking for patterns across cases by tabling higher order and shared higher order qualities.

Ethical Considerations

According to Freire (2001), dialogue should not include discourse that is outside the others' preoccupation or that increases their doubts, hopes, and fears as this may "increase the fears of an oppressed consciousness" (Freire, 2001). Faculty are afraid to lose their jobs at state universities (Bakeman, 2017) and small private universities, which are predicted to close at an average of at least five per year over a ten-year period (Woodhouse, 2015). Because the researcher has a dual faculty and administrative position at the university, she assured participants at the start of the interview that the study used a faculty-student participatory/advocacy framework by discussing Florida state's current performance funding model, the exclusion of faculty participation and input in retention movements and agendas, and the relative gaps of faculty perceptions in research on L2s. To ensure participants felt safe, the researcher also explained that participants would receive the transcript for member checking and could change or extend their interview data. Per the researcher's obligation to protect the anonymity of participants and store their data and documents accordingly (Creswell, 2007), participants were asked to provide their own aliases, reminded of their right to withdraw from the study at any time, and told that all data would be stored on a password-protected home computer, including audio files, and backed up on a USB stored with interview notes and transcriptions in a locked cabinet in the researcher's home office.

Trustworthiness

To ensure trustworthiness in the findings, IPA processes for analysis per Smith et al. (2009) were adhered to. The researcher read and reread each interview to find emergent themes by delineating descriptive, linguistic, and conceptual comments. From

the emergent themes, higher order concepts were identified as superordinate themes and

tabled for each participant. Upon analyses of individual interviews, the superordinate

themes among the participants were read and reread to find patterns across cases and

identify shared higher order qualities, which were tabled in a master list of themes for the

group. The same method was used to identify the essence of each emergent theme.

Validity and reliability of data collected were ensured by having participants

review, check, and modify the interview transcript if they desired. Triangulation of the

data was established by participants' representing multiple sources of individuals. Of the

five participants, four of them spoke English as a first language, two were bilingual in a

second language, and one was a non-native speaker of English. Three were full-time and

two were part-time faculty representing four different schools at the university: Business,

Technology, Liberal Studies, and Professional Studies. Four taught degree-specific

courses and one taught cross-curriculum courses.

Potential Research Bias

As the director of ESL and professor in the EAP program at the research site, the

researcher is well-acquainted with the needs and challenges of L2 students. In addition,

the researcher is well-acquainted with faculty at the site and uses many of the validating

teaching methods herein described. In order to release preconceptions and prejudgments

about participants and their responses to open-ended questions, the researcher used the

epoché process. The epoché process includes focusing on a specific person or issue in

reflective meditation and writing down associated thoughts and feelings (Moustakas,

1994). Moustakas (1994) states that reviewing the notes until the hold of preconceptions

is released from consciousness enables one to meet people and data unbiasedly. The

researcher discovered that using aliases created separate domains of relating to campus personalities and research participants during interviews and data analyses, and this experience also enhanced the releasing of preconceptions from consciousness.

Limitations

Due to the researcher's position as director and faculty member of the ESL and EAP programs, potential participants might have been disinclined to participate in the study because of her position and potential research bias. Indeed, there have been controversies regarding the large ESL program's negatively impacting the mission of the university and cultural and linguistic misunderstandings between native and non-native speakers of English among the campus community. The researcher initially proposed a small sample size of five participants due to her understanding of these controversies as well as considering that dialoguing about a marginalized group might feel threatening as it can expose beliefs and reveal biases. The recruitment consisted of 18 faculty members, excluding deans, teaching 3000 and 4000 level courses at the time of the study. Six faculty members agreed to participate, and one was deemed unable to purposefully inform an understanding of the research problem as it was her first term teaching at the university and she had no prior experience teaching L2s. Despite the small sample size, the researcher also considered that coding rich data from in-depth interviews might be challenging for a novice researcher, so she established follow-up clarifications as a possibility should they have been necessary per Creswell (2007) and Turner's (2010) recommendations.

Chapter 4: Findings

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to understand and describe the lived experiences of faculty teaching L2s in bachelor degree courses and to identify potential approaches and teaching methods that influence L2s' learning and success. This chapter presents the findings that resulted from a phenomenological study of faculty perceptions of L2s in bachelor degree programs. The phenomenological design allowed for rich, descriptive data to be collected and analyzed. Emergent themes for the group were identified and tabled from individual participant's super-ordinate themes in order to describe the meaning of the issue questions, explore the overall essence of participants' lived experiences, and answer the central research question of the study: How do L2s succeed in bachelor degree programs? This chapter includes the answer to the central research question, a description of the participants' demographic data, and narrative summaries of the findings for the three issue questions with the essence of each finding.

The Central Research Question

How do L2s succeed in bachelor degree courses? The experiential themes and essences of participants' shared descriptions answered the central research question at the core of this study. L2s succeed in bachelor degree courses by

- seeing graduation as an achievement bearing life-changing opportunity, or the American dream;

- having the will to work hard in order to meet and overcome personal and linguistic challenges, or grit; and

- having faculty who provide accommodation for their social and academic needs, or student-faculty partnership.

Participant Demographics and Descriptions

Five faculty members teaching L2s in 3000 and 4000 level courses at the university participated in this study. For this study, this will be called Emmy, Kevin, Guillermo, Mixie, and Bob. In order to protect anonymity, the participants are not identified in these findings by specific characteristics, such as first language, areas of expertise, courses taught, or degree programs within the schools. One participant reported an average L2 population of 40%, three participants reported an average L2 population of 50%, and one participant reported an average L2 population of 75% in the 3000 and 4000 level courses that they described.

Narrative Summary of Findings for Issue Question 1

What does bachelor degree completion mean for L2 students? The responses to this question served as foundation for understanding how faculty experienced L2s as a unique demographic group within their courses. In order to generate themes, this question was supported by subquestions exploring the divergence of meaning of bachelor degree completion for faculty and L2s and the convergence of influence within the faculty-student relationship toward degree completion. The superordinate theme that emerged across participants was that bachelor degree completion is an overcoming and an achievement of new possibilities.

Self-actualization: Emmy. For Emmy, L2s are overcoming personal and societal limitations that have compromised their freedom and ability to self-actualize, work, and provide. Degree completion is the realization of a dream from which L2s can overcome

economic and financial restraints stemming from one's background. She described the

meaning of bachelor degree completion for L2s as, "the fulfillment of their dream . . . It

means that they get to give the gift to their family. For many of them, this is the first

degree within their family." When asked what the dream was, she explained:

The dream is freedom, freedom to work, freedom to provide for the family. I

would say for many of my L2 students, family is number one. They speak of their

family. They talk about how they want their children to be proud of them. They

talk about what their parents have done prior, and they want to work.

Emmy also equated bachelor degree completion with aspects of confidence and self-

development that enable one to realize dreams of a successful life in America and extend

new financial opportunities and sustainability to their families:

For some of them, it is self-efficacy, that they're able to do something. Many of

them don't see how brilliant they are. . . . They come into this class, and they want

to succeed. And the reason they want to succeed is for their family and so that

they can work and that they can stay in America and realize their dreams. . . . The

self-efficacy is I can do this. . . . So, it kind of merges with the family and

providing, economic sustainability and that intrapersonal strength.

American dream: Kevin. For Kevin, bachelor degree completion, "represents an

enormous success" to L2s. It is a goal embodying access to the American dream of

accomplishment and economic sustainability. According to Kevin:

It's a goal that represents the American dream. It opens all the doors. Most of

them are climbing barriers: Language, cultural, all sorts of barriers all of their

lives in the United States. And to get that bachelor's degree is a pass through

many, many of those other doors. It's a pass to financial security. It's a pass to

accomplishment. It's a pass to saying, "Yes, I'm here. I belong here. I'm part of

this society.

In Kevin's experience, L2s are more desirous of graduating than L1s because the

bachelor degree is validation, or proof, that one has the right to be in this country and

access its opportunities. In contrast to L1s, "the L2s say, 'I want to graduate.' . . . it's

proof that I belong in this country. It's proof that I belong here. That I've succeeded."

Expounding on the topic of the significance of the degree as proof of on one's right to be

here, Kevin explained:

It means they've made it. They are here. They're a part of. They're successful.

And if anybody criticizes them, they can say, "No, wait a minute. I went, and I-

look. I have this and I have this, and it got my job, it got me my promotion."

This symbolic power of the degree, "gives the L2s a lot of drive, a lot of drive, a lot of

desire to complete even though they do face, obviously, cultural and often language and

preparatory educational barriers." Despite experiencing, "sexism" within their own

family structures or family members who, "don't understand why they want to waste

their time and their money and their energy doing this," L2s are driven to overcome

barriers and become the, "first college graduate in the family."

Overcoming: Guillermo. For Guillermo, bachelor degree completion for L2s

means a, "tremendous overcoming" of challenging linguistic and life situations.

According to Guillermo, "many of them are not only overcoming language issues, but

many of them work. . . . [are] married, [and] a lot of them [are] single moms with these

kinds of responsibilities." Like Kevin and Emmy, Guillermo described L2s as, "very

desirous of education and succeeding" and graduating as an overcoming of one's circumstances and limitations. He expressed admiration and respect for their educational journey and completion:

> The fact someone would come here, and they struggle a lot of times. I see them struggle. I see them sometimes apologizing for it, and I tell them, "Look. I couldn't do what you're doing. If you dropped me off in your country, I would be lost. This is an amazing thing that you're doing." And I find, you know, I see them at graduation, and they're just ecstatic and happy that they've accomplished that.

Opportunity: Mixie. For Mixie, bachelor degree completion for L2s, "means an opportunity to get a job quickly and a well-paid job" whether they do this in the U.S. or go back to their home country. Because these students are bilingual, it creates, "even greater opportunity." Graduating "sets up economic opportunity" and the chance to create "a better financial situation." It is also an opportunity to overcome socioeconomic constraints as some are "the first individual in their family that graduates." Mixie equates L2 bachelor degree completion with the realization of a dream and the meeting of a challenging goal, providing not only financial opportunity but also financial reward that can be extended to the family. According to Mixie:

> It's a dream come true. It's a goal that is not easy to achieve. It's all the dreams together. And, but of course, all that translates to [having] a better life. . . . Here in America, having a better life has to do a lot with money. . . . So, they're better financially. . . . Their families are well.

Family: Bob. For Bob, graduation completion means something different to different L2s. The university enrolls a significant number of low-income immigrant L2s; however, there are also L2s who are high-income. These L2s are often international students with student visas and not immigrants. Describing what bachelor degree completion means for L2s, Bob said:

> A couple different things for different students. I have quite a few students that seem to be already self-sufficient, and they're coming back to learn something new or they'd always wanted to go to school. I guess they don't really need to. And so, for them, it seems like a sense of pride that they're doing that or just always wanted to do it as a representative for their kids, present something for their kids that they can do it. . . . I guess they'd be more upper class, quite a few upper class as far as financially speaking, but that's why they're there. Most of the people at the lower end of the spectrum are just trying to achieve the American dream, I guess, and move up in their jobs and become professionals, and . . . they're just trying to get a good job like everybody else I guess, just like anybody, any other student.

When asked what he meant by the American dream, Bob said, "Education. Good professional job. Go to school and get a good higher paying job and do better for your family. Achieve for your family." Like the other participants, Bob expressed that L2s' graduating is an overcoming of current circumstances and an achievement of new possibilities that can be shared with their families.

For all the participants, overcoming emerged as a theme with various descriptors that included their previous identity, their current socioeconomic status, and life and

linguistic struggles and challenges. The corresponding theme that emerged was the achievement of new possibilities, which mostly included financial opportunity and well-being that almost always extended to the well-being of family.

The essence for issue question 1. What does bachelor degree completion mean for L2 students? The essence of participants' shared descriptions was the *American dream*. Merriam-Webster defines the *American dream* (n.d) as "an American social ideal that stresses egalitarianism and especially material prosperity" and "the prosperity or life that is the realization of this ideal." A Pew Research Center survey reported that the top two essential qualities that Americans viewed as representing the American dream were the freedom to choose how to live and having a good family life (Smith, 2017). A bipartisan research study of 2000 respondents reported that the top three elements that were absolutely essential to achieving the American dream were (1) a strong work ethic, (2) values such as honesty, responsibility and persistence, and (3) a good education (Public Agenda, 2012). In describing the meaning of bachelor degree completion as an overcoming and an achievement of new possibilities, the participants drew upon the essence of the American dream as both concept and experience.

Narrative Summary of Findings for Issue Question 2

What perceived characteristics do successful L2s in bachelor degree courses have? The responses to this question served as foundation for understanding how faculty experienced L2s' success in bachelor degree courses. In order to generate themes, this question was supported by subquestions seeking detailed descriptions of what L2s do to successfully complete academic work and manage linguistic challenges. The

superordinate theme that emerged across participants was that L2s are intent on succeeding in education and persistent in overcoming challenges.

Persistence: Emmy. Attitudinally speaking, Emmy described successful L2s as having higher than average motivation to succeed and learn. She said, "They want to pass the class, get it done, get the A. And many times, my L2s don't just want to pass the class; they want to understand the material." She described this intention as, "fervor." When asked why she thought this particular population displayed these characteristics, she said, "They had to fight to get here. They have to fight to stay here. And for many of them, a college degree helps ensure their future. They are fighting for their future." Emmy went on to explain that she did not see this type of passion with her L1 population nor the same academic habits: "The difference between my L2s and L1s . . . if I were to track that quantitatively, my L2s attend." She gave four examples of L2s intent on getting to class and overcoming extraordinary challenges to learn and succeed, such as one, "that . . . was on the bus three hours a day when they came to class," one, "whose mother passed away [and was in class] the very next week," one, "with a severe emergency . . . [who] never missed class," and another, "that failed the same class twice and was trying for the third time . . . and . . . persisted."

In terms of completing coursework, Emmy added:

> A lot of L1s will do their paper towards, closer to the due date and the L2s will work on it from . . . the beginning of the course, and then they'll ask questions . . . "Is this correct? Is this correct?" They often will ask me to look at a draft of their paper. And so, the fact that they are already drafting the paper so early in the term shows a commitment.

When asked directly what perceived characteristics successful L2s in her bachelor degree courses had, Emmy said:

If you go into our library or Student Success Center, they're the ones that are in there. . . . if we were to go into our library and look around, see who's there: Our L2s. They're there. They're accessing the librarian, the student success center. They reach out to their faculty. They communicate with their faculty.

Summing up, Emmy added, "The characteristic of an L2 student that helps them succeed is that they're persistent, they're motivated, they show up, they attend the classes, they access the resources."

Willingness: Kevin. Like Emmy, Kevin's describes successful L2s as having both the mindset and behaviors needed to complete coursework and overcome linguistic challenges. He said,

"They're taking it seriously, they're doing the work, they're making the sacrifices, they're finding babysitters, they're leaving work early. They're telling their boss, 'I can't work tonight because I have class.'" Kevin stated that L2s' major challenge is writing, one in which they will have to find time and devote effort to overcoming academic gaps and balancing work-life responsibilities. He said:

The ones that do overcome [challenges] are going to make use of the resources available at the university, and, one and two, are willing to put that work in . . . But even with the resources there, those L2s have to be willing to take advantage, to find the time, again, we're talking about people who have jobs and families and lives, to find the time, [and to] get here.

Kevin makes himself available for extra help and allows students to rewrite their papers as many times as they choose in order to improve both their writing and their grade. He explained that, "the ones who are successful are the ones who are willing to seek out that help and the ones who are willing to rewrite their papers." Kevin experienced L2s' willingness as a major aspect of L2 academic success, concluding his response this way: "The ones who are willing to do it, we get them through."

Appreciation: Guillermo. For Guillermo, L2s' intention and persistence in succeeding in education stemmed from a desire for education and an appreciation for the freedom and opportunity that education makes available in this country. Referring to L2s, he said, "They do bring with them this appreciation. These habits. They don't want to fail. . . . They seem to be very desirous of education and succeeding." In Guillermo's experience, the values that L2s bring from their countries of origin and the values they have for this country, specifically the freedom to pursue educational opportunity, were associated with L2s' success in his bachelor degree courses. Citing some of his L2s and the troubles in their home countries, he stated:

> Many of them have overcome difficult situations from their home countries . . .
> but I think they're appreciative of the opportunities here. . . . They realize the
> opportunities here, and our students take advantage of those . . . I think they're
> more appreciative of the opportunities than the average.

Commitment: Mixie. In Mixie's experience, "[L2s] are very committed. . . . If [they] get to the 3000 level, 4000 level courses, it's because they're very committed." In order to pass her courses, students commit their time and energy to managing linguistic and other challenges in order to meet course requirements and expectations. She said:

They spend more time studying, especially trying to translate. . . . They spend a

lot of time reading. . . . I see them reading so many times. However, I see other

L2s that . . . don't have that, that commitment to try to get things done. Then, of

course, they're not successful.

L2s also have to take risks to be successful in Mixie's courses and field, in general:

They feel shy having a conversation or discussing terminologies or situations in

the classroom while there's other L1 students. . . . They tend not to not to do well

because . . . there's no other way. In this specific area, . . . you have to participate.

You have to be able to analyze . . . there has to be an argument because there are

discussions, and you are going to respond to certain things in that discussion. So,

if you feel shy or you . . . feel scared that you will not understand . . . then they

have the tendency to say, "You know, I'd rather not embarrass myself" or "I'm

out."

Dedication: Bob. Bob described a major component to L2s' success in his

courses as the desire to learn and dedication to doing the work. He said, "They really

want the degree, they're willing to do the work . . . They're dedicated. They want to learn

. . ." In describing specific actions that a successful L2 student facing challenges might

take, he explained:

An example is I have a student who . . . doesn't speak very good English, and so

if we dismiss early, almost everybody leaves right away . . . but I usually stay if

anybody wants help with homework or the projects, and she always stays till the

last minute. . . . So, put in the extra time, more communication, ask me questions.

For all the participants, intention and persistence were exemplified through L2s' thoughts and deeds toward education and their learning. These emerged and merged as a superordinate theme with various descriptors that included concepts of desire, value, willingness, and taking action such as attending class, devoting time to classwork, and overcoming of linguistic and life challenges via active participation in their own learning and intentional pursuit of support and support opportunities.

The essence for issue question 2. What perceived characteristics do successful L2s in bachelor degree courses have? The essence of participants' shared descriptions was *grit*. In their seminal study, Duckworth, Peterson, Matthews and Kelly (2007) defined grit as "perseverance and passion for long-term goals" (p. 1087). Expounding on this definition, they added:

> Grit entails working strenuously toward challenges, maintaining effort and interest over years despite failure, adversity, and plateaus in progress. The gritty individual approaches achievement as a marathon; his or her advantage is stamina. Whereas disappointment or boredom signals to others that it is time to change trajectory and cut losses, the gritty individual stays the course. (pp. 1087-1088)

When describing perceived characteristics of successful L2s in bachelor degree courses, participants drew upon the overall essence of grit as a strong desire to succeed in education and the persistence to complete a goal despite failures, gaps, and challenges. Participants drew upon the essence of the grit as both concept and experience.

Narrative Summary of Findings for Issue Question 3

What elements of teaching influence L2s' success in bachelor degree courses? The responses to this question served as a foundation for understanding how faculty participated in L2s' learning and influenced the meeting of course requirements. In order to generate themes, this question was supported by subquestions seeking detailed descriptions of what instructional and interpersonal methods participants used to influence L2s' success and manage linguistic gaps and challenges. The superordinate theme that emerged across participants was that they accommodated both the course and L2s to bridge cultural and linguistic gaps.

Supplementing, recognizing, and checking: Emmy. Emmy reported that she accommodated course content and requirements through modes of delivery aimed at helping L2s participate in their own success. In terms of providing course content support, Emmy said:

> I noticed that I had half L2s, so I embedded the PowerPoint in every single week through the Blackboard. I embedded the videos that we were going to watch in the classroom, the supplemental material so that they could watch it in advance, so they have access to it, and they did.

Because, "initiative" is included in Emmy's grading criteria, she invites L2s into discussion and affirms their contributions and efforts rather than evaluating the type, depth, or breadth of the input. She also gives options as to how initiative credit can be earned; for example, "They can ask a question, [and] they can give feedback on what they learned that week." Emmy said:

I notice that a lot of my L2s will not ask questions. And sometimes L1s can

dominate the classroom. So, there's a balance there. . . . If I don't hear [an L2]

student's voice after like a couple of weeks, I'll say, "I'd like to hear your voice."

. . . They will say a sentence or two and be proud of themselves, and then I'll

affirm them, but they do remain quiet as a group overall. . . . For an L2, I think

it's powerful. Many of them come from countries where their voices are not

heard.

When teaching, Emmy accommodates L2s' needs and comfort by continually checking

in, identifying her own knowledge gaps, and displaying patience and respect for linguistic

challenges and differences. She said:

I use checking to say, "Are we tracking with one another? Do you understand?"

and then offer them the opportunity to ask me questions. And then I also

acknowledge that I don't know everything about every topic. . . . Because I don't.

. . . Sometimes [L2s] may not speak as much, so linguistically they may struggle

to find a certain word, so I respect that and allow them to take their time forming

what they want whether we're doing role play and it takes them longer and

they're nervous because they don't know. They might say something wrong.

Empowering, engaging, and allowing: Kevin. Like Emmy, Kevin described his

course delivery as an important method in influencing L2s success. In Kevin's

experience, establishing a respectful classroom environment and a comfortable faculty-

student relationship creates self-empowerment and engagement with the course content.

He said:

I run a very non-hierarchical classroom so that's empowerment of the students.

Students feel that they're engaged, that their voice matters, their experience

matters. We talk. We talk a lot about respect. We sit in a circle. . . . We learn

everybody's names. We're going to talk to each other. You're not here to talk to

me. You're here to talk to everybody else. Your opinion matters. We want to

know what you have to say. So, I think that they feel more equal in my

classrooms. I think everybody feels more equal in my classrooms. I put a good

deal of effort to make that happen.

Kevin democratizes the classroom by defining the faculty-student relationship to clarify

how students should interact to be successful in his courses. He explained:

You don't have to pander to me. You don't have to jump through hoops. You

don't have to necessarily agree with me or pretend to agree with me; in fact, I'd

prefer it if you don't agree with me. Please tell me tell me why. Give me your

reasoning. Make your argument. That's what we're here about.

Being bilingual, Kevin may use the native language of some L2s and reported that it,

"helps create a rapport as well as sort of a level of comfort." For L2s to succeed in his

courses, Kevin stressed the importance of allowing his L2s to, "write their papers over

and over and over again until it's right or till it's better," adding:

I usually, almost always, see progress, and if there's some problem, I will sit

down and say, "OK, let's talk about it." And a semester doesn't go by that I don't

spend half an hour on common grammar, punctuation mistakes, for everybody.

Adjusting and Supporting: Guillermo. In Guillermo's interview, he described

the challenges that nontraditional students faced and referenced professors he had known

who used harsh grading criteria from which students could not recover. For Guillermo, accommodating course expectations for L2s is not only how he influences their success but also what he feels is the, "ethical" thing to do. He said:

> I don't expect any of our students to write like Shakespeare, and I certainly don't expect non-native speakers to write like Shakespeare. I read my papers carefully. . . . . Maybe I'll make corrections, of course . . . but I don't grade that. I'll tell them, "Here's how you'd change the sentence." . . . I think it's only right. . . . I adjust my expectations and want to help them succeed. Otherwise, why are we bringing them in here first of all? I think there is an ethical obligation here on my part.

> Recognizing that some L2s, "are very nervous about grammar" and to preempt

the possibility of plagiarism, which he believes occurs, "because they're just so worried," Guillermo said:

> I try to relax them on the first day or before an assignment is due. . . . I say, "Look, I'd rather you just tell me how you felt in your own words even if the grammar is not quite right."

He also gives them the freedom to choose their assignment topics. He explained:

> I'm not looking for structure. Each discussion is based on a reading or a lecture or an audio lecture, and I really give them options to talk about whatever idea . . . or whatever theory or issue we're studying that week that they found most interesting, explain why, and then talk about a theory that we've studied in the first section that you would use to defend your position on that. It's real simple, so there's not one way you can go. And most of them do fine with that . . . and a lot of them do better than our L1s.

Guillermo also tries, "to be supportive . . . with positive comments." Recounting an L2 who had approached him at graduation a number of years ago, he described the following interaction and how it informed his teaching practice:

> "Dr. [name], if it wasn't for you and what you said on my exam, I was going to quit school." So, I said, "Well, what did I say on the exam?" And he said, "Well, you said, 'Good exam.'" That's it! . . . And I thought those two little words somehow inspired this person.

When asked why he thought so, Guillermo said:

> Well, it reminds me just how important it is, just the least bit of positive affirmation goes a long way. I'll never forget it. I've told that story before but *good exam*. . . . And I think there was an explanation point. (Laughs) . . . So, we as teachers need to be aware of it, and then the reverse is true. I don't engage in the reverse, but negative comments and criticisms can be as powerful . . . on the negative side as well, so I'm careful not to do that.

Optimizing and allowing: Mixie. In similar ways to the other participants, Mixie described accommodating her courses to influence L2 success by providing support and options for learning and by creating an inclusive climate. Referring to L2s, Mixie said:

> They do like video clips. . . . I offer the option . . . I'm reactive of what they want. . . . All of my classes are recorded . . . and when I check the statistics, the majority of the students that check the recordings are the L2 students. . . . Now, if you wanted to ask . . . within the L2s [if] the ones that are more successful are the ones who watch them, I'd probably have to say yes.

Mixie also makes herself available for extra help and explained, "I could be more successful in a one-on-one within half an hour than I could do four hours in a classroom doing a lecture." Being bilingual, Mixie is flexible and accommodating inside and outside of the classroom, providing various support options to L2s. In the classroom, if a student asks a question in his/her native language that Mixie also speaks, she said, "I respectfully hear what they have to say in their language, and I refer back to the class in English." She also allows students, "to have a conversation about the topics that were discussed in the classroom in their native language," describing it as, "helpful." Outside of the classroom, she said, "If there's a student that needs additional help and is meeting with me and they want to speak in their native language, then it's OK." In Mixie's opinion, "having the opportunity to explain in their native language . . . helps," so she provides video clips via YouTube, where L2s who speak that language can, "become a subscriber . . . and learn the topic: The same topic, the same PowerPoint, the same lecture." While it does not occur frequently, Mixie also allows students, "to get the international version of their textbook. . . . if that's what they want . . . in their own language." When asked if she felt that allowance influenced L2 success in her courses, Mixie replied, "Absolutely."

Providing, adjusting, and partnering: Bob. Like Mixie and Emmy, Bob provides video tutorials through the learning management system (LMS), noting that L2s watch them. He explained:

Almost everything I teach I . . . usually have tutorials for. I record tutorials. . . . If there's a barrier there, which for some there is as far as language is concerned . . . [and] they can't keep up with certain things where most L1s would keep up, then I have everything on tutorial. Even if it's an on-campus class, I always have

tutorials from every week so they can watch it over and over, which a lot of them

do.

Like Guillermo, Bob described making adjustments to coursework expectations and

grading in order to encourage students. He said:

You have to be able to adjust . . . Like when I grade research papers . . . or any

writing, . . . I would never like take away a lot of points for grammar and

consistency, especially if I know this is how they would talk, with an incomplete .

. . English vocabulary. I would not detract from them. I guess I could correct

some of the wording and some of the phrasing, but I would not try to take away

their points as a way to discourage them.

Bob also makes himself available for extra help after class. Referring to a particular L2

who stays after class, "till the last minute" and asks the same questions, "over and over."

Bob said, "It can be annoying a little bit from time to time, but they keep asking the

questions and it's their education. I don't mind."

Similar to Emmy, who uses invitation and affirmation, and Kevin, who

establishes democratic ground rules to generate participation, Bob partners up students

for the first project in the beginning of the term. He explained:

If you don't do that, quite often they'll go through the whole semester, some

people, especially some of the language people, will never talk to anyone. Like

they won't get to know anybody. . . I think that's vital. That's a way I guess to

increase retention if you feel like you're . . . part of a group, if there's people there

that you consider friends.

To create groups, Bob gets to know students and where they are from while assessing L2s' English fluency. He then sits, "them by somebody who can speak both [their native language and English] a little better." As a result, "they usually end up making friends and helping each other out." According to Bob, the initial group project creates opportunities for socializing and learning. He said, "Usually one can speak really good English, and maybe the other one can't. That works great. . . . they always end up staying there the whole semester, and then they get to know each other, talk to each other." Bob summed up by saying that making class, "fun," having, "patience," and treating an L2, "like a regular person" were important methods that he employed for influencing L2 success and retention in his courses.

For all the participants, accommodating the course and L2s' learning needs to influence L2 success were exemplified by support practices that were deliberately applied to bridge cultural and linguistic gaps. These emerged and merged as a superordinate theme with various descriptors that comprised inclusive engagement, social and academic affirmation, options for meeting coursework criteria, adjustments in grading criteria, and the availability, delivery, and allowance of learning support, such as professorial help, in- and out-of-class translation, and complementary learning modalities.

The essence for issue question 3. What elements of teaching influence L2s' success in bachelor degree courses? The essence of participants' shared descriptions was *student-faculty partnership*. Cook-Sather, Bovill, and Felten (2014) define student-faculty partnership as a collaborative process by which all participants contribute differently but equally to curricular content and/or pedagogical concepts. When describing elements of teaching that influence L2s' success in bachelor degree courses,

participants drew upon the overall essence of student-faculty partnership as practice that was amenable, mindful, inclusive, and flexible.

Chapter 5: Discussion

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to understand and describe the lived experiences of

faculty teaching L2s in bachelor degree courses and to identify potential approaches and

teaching methods that influence L2s' learning and success. This chapter presents the

conclusions that resulted from the findings of a phenomenological study of faculty

perceptions of L2s in bachelor degree programs. The discussion includes findings for

potential approaches and teaching methods, recommendations for local practice and

future research, implications of the research findings, and a conclusion.

Potential Approaches and Teaching Methods

The purpose of this study was not only to understand and describe the lived

experiences of faculty teaching L2s in bachelor degree courses but also to identify

potential approaches and teaching methods that influence L2s' learning and success.

Emerging from the participants' descriptions, three approaches and teaching methods to

influence L2s' learning and success were identified as both reflecting the theoretical

framework and literature review. In no order of importance, the first was that the

participants mediated L2 uncertainty and self-doubt by responding empathetically to L2s'

emotional needs through communicative interactions that (a) acknowledged L2s'

identities, (b) valued their academic and linguistic achievements, and (c) encouraged their

persistence to succeed in a changing and challenging new world. The second was that the

participants practiced knowing, noticing, and responding both theoretically and

experientially. They learned about their L2s, noticed what their L2s needed and wanted,

and responded to their L2s' needs in an ongoing practice of acquiring and applying (a)

knowledge, (b) experience, and (c) method. The third approach and teaching method to influence L2s' learning and success was that participants engaged in partnering for success. Participants described democratizing practices that subverted traditional teaching and relational paradigms in order to foster safe, comfortable teaching environments and supportive relationships wherein student learning and success both in and beyond the classroom were integrated into practice.

Mediating L2 uncertainty. One approach and teaching method that participants described was that they mediated L2 uncertainty. Effective interactions and teaching methods defined by validation theory include providing emotional support that recognizes, values, and encourages nontraditional students, who are often plagued by fear of failure, social isolation, and self-doubt (Rendón & Jalomo, 1995). L2s, having lowered self-competency due to their sociolinguistic status, experience increased self-efficacy and motivation to persist as a result of interactions with professors who validate them (Aminy & Karathanos, 2011; Boesch, 2014; Diaz et al., 2016; Sanner & Wilson, 2008). Participants described engaging in validating interactions which mediated the precarious and often unsettling world of the L2 in academe.

Emmy. Emmy said that she affirmed L2s' sense of belonging by telling them, "This is where you are. Look how far you've come. Look what you are doing. Look what you have done." Perceiving L2 feelings of social and linguistic alienation that Boesch (2014), Diaz et al., (2016), and Starkey (2015) describe, Emmy said that she taps into, "the imposter syndrome" in order to, "remove" it and replace it with mindsets that say, "You deserve to be here. You're not an imposter. This is where you belong." Using interpersonal interactions to do this, she explained:

I ask them about their life, not just where they come from but, "Tell me about

your life, not just your family," because they always talk about their family.

"What have you overcome? . . . How do you want to use your bachelor's degree?

How do you see this? What do you want to do?"

She also takes time to explain the differences between bachelor, master, and doctoral

degrees in her field and how each one, "plays out as well as credentialing that is

important in the United States." She tells her L2s, "Who you are, who you have already

been, all of those traits that you have are going to play out in your future, but you have to

have this degree." Emmy said that many of her L2s have already had professional careers

in their home country but find themselves in the position of starting, "at the bottom rung

of the ladder again." She said, "I affirm them by allowing them to talk about their past

experiences but fuel their interest in how their life here in the United States is going to be

different because of their degree." Academic validation, such as Emmy described here,

not only acknowledges students' experiences and backgrounds but also positions students

as valuable knowers and future creators of knowledge (Rendón, 2002).

  Guillermo. Seeing his L2s "struggle [and] . . . sometimes apologizing for" their

language gaps, Guillermo validates by telling them, "I couldn't do what you're doing. If

you dropped me off in your country, I would be lost. This is an amazing thing that you're

doing." In addition, he described his own understanding of the powerful effect of

affirmation from the L2 graduate who credited Guillermo with his not quitting school

because he wrote, "good exam" on the student's test paper. This experience heightened

Guillermo's awareness that, "the least bit of positive affirmation goes a long way" in

terms of L2 success and retention. This experience also informed his teaching practice, which includes being, "supportive . . . with positive comments."

Bob. Bob described L2 retention this way: "They'll stick around if you get to know them, encourage them, and talk to them," adding that when faculty do not communicate with L2s or adjust their coursework, "they can be chased away or scared away or give up or maybe even feel like they can't do it or . . . blame themselves instead of . . . any lacking in the instruction."

Empathetic and responsive to the emotional needs of their L2s, these participants described mediating L2 uncertainty and self-doubt through communicative interactions that recognize and value L2s' present and past identities, their academic and linguistic performances and gains, and interpersonal connections that encourage L2 persistence in academe despite the challenges of navigating an unfamiliar world.

Knowing, noticing, and responding. A second approach and teaching method that participants described was that they applied what they knew theoretically and experientially about L2s, they noticed what their L2s needed and wanted in order to learn, and they responded to what they learned and noticed in their teaching practices. In other words, they practiced knowing, noticing, and responding.

Research indicates that validating L2s as knowers is important as many have perceived experiences of intellectual weakness and the resulting pressure of having to prove their worth due to their linguistic minority status (Almon, 2014; Boesch, 2014; Diaz et al., 2016). It is similarly important for faculty to become and be knowers of their L2s by engaging and observing them in class (Bednarz et al., 2010). All of the

participants expressed knowledge of the specific cultural backgrounds of their L2s as well as an academic appreciation and responsibility for them.

   Guillermo. Guillermo knows and notices from his classroom experiences with L2s that some of them, "are very nervous about grammar." He responds in this way: "I try to relax them on the first day or before an assignment's due." When describing the various cultural backgrounds among his Hispanic L2 population, he said, "Students educated me about that, but I think they they've made me aware . . . that life is far richer." Guillermo expressed the willingness and appreciation for ongoing and interpersonal cultural competence by positing himself as a learner of his L2s, a necessary vulnerability for faculty to succeed in teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students according to Bednarz et al. (2010). Knowing and noticing that L2s, as, "representatives of other countries [and] other cultures," enhanced his and his L1 students' learning, he said, "They teach us stuff. . . . They educate our . . . L1 students . . . about what's going on in the world and where they're coming from . . . and [not to] make these assumptions."

   For Emmy, knowing that "L2s tend to be quieter" and noticing that many L2s, "don't ask questions," she pays attention to affect and responds either by asking them, "Would you like me to repeat this? Is this clear?" or stating, "If anything isn't clear ever, please ask me to clarify it further." Knowing and noticing that L2s may be experiencing, "fear" or not wanting, "to appear stupid," Emmy responds by acknowledging L2 presence, inviting them into class discussion, and, "affirming students in the classroom during the lecture." Furthermore, knowing that, "every culture is different in their

communication" and that some of her L2s, "come from different countries where eye contact . . . is invasive or . . . dominating," Emmy said:

> I try to find out their country of origin so that I can respect that. Whereas in the United States of America you're not listening if you don't give me eye contact, I don't assume that my L2 is not listening because they're not looking at me.

Emmy aims to know her L2s' countries of origin so that she can respond in order to, "respect" through her teaching practice.

Mixie. Mixie knows that many L2s do not understand how the industry of her field hires, so she integrates that information into her courses. She also notices how L2s prefer to learn and responds to their preferences. Mixie stated that L2s, "prefer video-recording clips of the terms or the topics" discussed in class, so she responds by recording her lectures and offering video clips through the university's LMS. In addition, she said that L2s, "want to do handwriting homework rather than system homework." Laughing, she said, "And I don't know the answer why," but she responds to their preferences by making this option available despite the extra work it is for her.

Bob. Bob knows that many L2s cannot keep up with the lecture, "because of the language barrier and they don't want to become an impediment to the whole class." He notices that, "they'll pay attention as much as they can, and then they'll watch" the video tutorials he provides through the LMS, "over and over" until they can understand everything in the unit. They validate Bob with appreciation and praise, saying, "Hey. Thank you. These tutorials are so good." Bob's response is to, "record a lot of things. . . . and have everything available online so they can access it through there." Bob also

expressed academic and personal appreciation for his L2s' backgrounds and experiences. He said:

> I can't imagine going into a country and just in a couple of years learning the language and going to college and in a few years . . . they're already learning the language and about to graduate. It's like wow. I don't know if I could do that. I don't know other countries, so it's impressive.

Kevin. Kevin knows that many L2s face, "cultural . . . language . . . [and] preparatory educational barriers." He also notices that his students work and, "almost all . . . still have young children at home." He concluded by saying, "So, they're working *hard.*" Kevin responds to the challenges of all of his adult learners by being, "flexible," having, "empathy," and not having, "particularly rigid rules about a lot of things," such as tardiness or grading deadlines. While all of his students are presented with the opportunity "to rewrite their papers as many times as they want to improve their grade," Kevin noted that, "the L2s have appreciated that very much."

Partnering for success. A third approach and teaching method that participants described was that they partnered for L2 success by democratizing and supporting. According to Freire (2001, 2005), democratic intervention and participation of the educator is needed if students are to be truly educated and become critical thinkers who can act upon their world. Democratic educators understand that marginalized populations live in a world that separates them from academe and stifles their participation and self-actualization, so they include methods in their practice to liberate the mind and stimulate critical thinking in order to generate self-empowerment in their students (Freire, 2001). For Freire (2001), these methods include implementing safe dialogue wherein the teacher

and students' domains of power and powerlessness are renegotiated in partnering, which

result in a teacher-student and students-teachers paradigm of mutual reflection that

dismantles bureaucracy, generates democracy, and supports humanity. According to

Rendón's (2002) theory of validation, democratic acts that partner faculty and students

within a safe learning environment affirm students as valued knowers and creators of

knowledge. Faculty practice democratic partnering when they accommodate the

curriculum, teach inclusively, and interact relationally (Rendón's, 2002). Partnering with

students does not mean that faculty and students have equal roles, duties, expertise, and

status in teaching and learning (Cook-Sather et al., 2014). It means that partners'

viewpoints and input are respected and that all members have an equal opportunity to

participate and contribute (Cook-Sather et al., 2014). Participants' experiences that

describe partnering for success also elucidate the Freirean concept of love in the vocation

of teaching, which presupposes that educators teach for the love of learning, for the love

of teaching, and for the love of students (Freire, 2005). When infused by love, teaching is

the practice of democracy because it liberates the mind and, therefore, people (Freire,

2001).

  Emmy. Viewing her position of professor as, "similar to being a coach," Emmy

described how she partners relationally to students in democratic and participatory ways

that support the learner and subvert the traditional teaching-learning paradigm. She said:

    My L2 students have to work harder than any other level because not only do they

    have the language and what needs to be on the paper . . . they want to know

    what's required and then, their grammar, which I praise them on. So as a faculty

member, when I say I'm a coach, I'm an affirmer. When we come together and

we meet together, it's to affirm them that they can do it and that they will do it.

Repositioning herself as a coach, Emmy closes the distance between the world of faculty

and students. As a coach, she is not the sage on the stage and the transmitter of

knowledge; rather, she is the patron of champions and the harbinger of future possibility.

Describing how she experiences L2 learning and graduation, she said:

> They have grown so much interpersonally interacting with others and
>
> intrapersonally as they identify and deal with their own anxieties and stressors
>
> that come with being an L2 learner. And so that day . . . what that bachelor's
>
> degree means to me as a professor and a faculty member [is] that I was a part of
>
> their journey. I did my job, and I did it well enough that they got to cross that
>
> finish line.

At the end of the interview, when asked if she would like to add anything more about

L2s, Emmy said:

> Having been an educator for [double digit] years now, I have . . . heard and
>
> observed different types of faculty, belief systems . . . You'll hear people say
>
> things, and they may say, . . . "We're not here to teach English!" . . . and "I'm not
>
> a tutor!" And that really bothers me because we are! (Laughs) We are to tutor. We
>
> are their mentors. We, as faculty members, are on their journey with them. . . .
>
> We're there to guide them.

> ***Kevin.*** As cited previously, Kevin democratizes the classroom by establishing

ground rules for dialogue and creating a respectful classroom environment to stimulate

critical thinking and foster self-empowerment in his students. Noting that while there is,

"a power differential" between himself and students, Kevin encourages his students to disagree with him and clarifies that, "their voice matters, their experience matters, . . . [and their] opinion matters." When asked what bachelor degree completion means to him, Kevin said:

> I'm much more interested in their self-actualization in our classes. But I understand what the graduation represents, and I'm always happy to go to graduation and take pictures with everybody, and I feel very proud about that. . . . But not as proud as I feel when we're in a classroom, and they've written something or analyzed something or engaged in a conversation where they're actually the protagonist, and they're capable and willing and interested in saying, "No. This is what I think." And then, that sense of empowerment, I believe that they can take out into the rest of their lives.

For Kevin, the goal of education is not the, "award." It is the learning that creates the shift in locus of control and self-efficacy that yields profitable results in the lives of his students.

Guillermo. As cited previously, Guillermo supports by adjusting his grading and coursework criteria to the needs of his nontraditional/L2 student population and by focusing on, "what's important" in his courses: "critical thinking." He wants students to learn and wants "to help them succeed." He described his practice in opposition to traditional paradigms he had experienced in his career by referencing intimidating and punitive professors, course design, and grading criteria that engendered discomfort and thwarted student learning and academic success. Describing a former colleague's way of interacting with students, he said, "He was feared, and he liked it that way. But I don't. . .

. I wanted to develop a comfortable classroom, so it was more pleasant for me, too."
Describing a course in his field, he said:

> There's an old saying: *You could teach the course in such a way that almost nobody could pass*. But why would you do that? You, like me, maybe have experienced teachers who seem to be wanting to do that. (Laughs) So what is the point of this? We're teaching basic skills, critical thinking . . . I've learned maybe to focus on what's important.

Referring to a professor he had known who "gave students a zero on a hundred-point paper if there were APA problems," he said:

> A zero. Not a 59. If you're going to flunk them, start maybe with a 50. But a zero? How are you going to recover from a zero? . . . I saw things . . . for example, with no late assignments at all. I think that's just a bit strict. There are reasons why our students didn't get that work in on time. Why not let them learn? Yes, penalize it, but they're not going to be able to recover if you don't.

In traditional practice, teachers and students are separated by domains of knowing and not knowing and power and powerlessness (Freire, 2001). Fearful or punitive teaching practices create unsafe learning environments wherein students do not learn nor stay in school (Freire, 2005). The negative impacts and experiences of these classroom interactions are intensified and increased among nontraditional/marginalized populations (Rendón, 2002). Guillermo's reflection on fearful faculty interactions, no-win course designs, and punitive grading practices have informed Guillermo's teaching practices, which subvert the old paradigm of professorial power and distance, democratize course content and criteria, and support students in learning.

Mixie. As cited previously, Mixie democratizes the classroom by offering different learning supports and modalities that include multilingual sources, assignment options, and a classroom environment that is welcoming to multilingualism. In addition, Mixie partners for her students' ultimate success by infusing her courses with true-to-life scenarios that simulate the industry of her field so that learning and success are not localized to the classroom but extend to life-changing and life-affirming career opportunities. She said:

> When I see them succeed it's like I'm succeeding, so . . . I'm winning through them . . . it's an incredible satisfaction when I see them doing well. . . . This weekend, I saw one . . . and she was thanking me . . . It absolutely changed her life for good. That's . . . in her words. For me, that makes my day. That makes my day.

Perhaps Mixie's account here best sums up Freire's (2001) archetype of the educator, who teaches as an act of love for humanity because knowledge ultimately liberates human beings in the world in which they live.

Bob. As cited previously, Bob democratizes the classroom by offering different learning supports and modalities and partners students to build a community in his class. With L2s, he partners weaker and stronger students, fostering not only partners in teaching but also friendships among students. Bob also uses humor to partner relationally with students and break down the social barriers that can distance faculty from students and patronize L2 learners. When describing his video tutorials, he said:

> They can pause it and listen to my beautiful voice . . . as they drift off into sleep. I always tell them, "Go home. Watch the exact tutorials I did here in class. And if

you're really lonely and sad . . . or if you really can't get to sleep, play it and

you'll fall asleep."

When asked whether he used humor as a teaching practice with L2s, he said:

I guess I do. That would soften it, and I guess not treat him like they're some

fragile child, you know, you're not some fragile creature. You can joke around

and have fun and do the extra things they need without it being some punitive

thing or . . . like you're looking down . . . on them. You can be funny about it, and

make jokes about it. . . . You know what? I . . . have yet to meet one that wanted

pity.

Bob, a quick and witty individual, stated that he presented his courses and coursework in,

"easy to comprehend" but also, "entertaining and interesting ways." Like Guillermo, he

distanced himself from traditional labels and avoided what he called, "punitive" and,

"teacherly" approaches to grading and course criteria. Like Bob, Guillermo described

using humor to create a comfortable classroom environment, adding that, "it doesn't

always work" with L2s. According to Poirier and Wilhelm (2014) humor as a tool for

teaching can be precarious; however, if it is positive, politically correct, and considerate

of its audience, humor can create a relaxed learning environment, which is conducive to

learning, creativity, and critical thinking." In addition, if the professor is perceived as

caring, appropriate uses of humor can foster community, respect, and effective learning

(Poirier & Wilhelm, 2014).

Recommendations for Local Practice

To influence L2s' learning and success and, therefore, graduation rates, the

university is advised to consider the three approaches and teaching methods emerging

from the participants' experiences: (a) mediating L2 uncertainty, (b) knowing, noticing, and responding, and (c) partnering for success. As these methods are supported by the theoretical framework and literature review, they might be used for faculty development purposes or extended and modified for both academic and student services departments in group discussion. Because L2s represent a subjugated minority group in the context of the U.S.' controversial relationship with immigrants, the office of diversity and inclusion could use these and other findings for awareness initiatives and training to improve intercultural relationships on campus.

In Chapter 1, the researcher reported an L2 population of 39% enrolled in bachelor degree programs at the university (HUa, 2017). When describing average L2 presence within the courses described, one participant identified 40%, three participants identified 50%, and one participant identified 75%. Because students' native language is collected on a voluntary basis, it is important to note that faculty reported experiencing higher numbers of L2s in their bachelor degree courses. To better understand the size and demographics of L2 enrollment in associate, bachelor, and master degree programs and what this may mean to organizational operations and dynamics, the university might consider surveying faculty on their experiences of L2 enrollment in their respective disciplines. To better understand the characteristics of students and leverage retention efforts, the university might consider including faculty feedback to evaluate whether discrepancies in data interpretation exist and assess whether reporting tools need enhancing or changing. In addition, one participant reported an average class enrollment of 75% in degree-specific courses. A deeper exploration of this experience might reveal important information about how and why particular programs are experiencing L2

enrollment differently and inform how institutional support resources could or should be leveraged. In summary, a faculty-inclusive view of size, relative increases, and countries and languages of an L2 population could provide information that helps the university community to understand immigration trends from both an institutional and regional perspective and, therefore, determine and design institutionally specific approaches to retention that can better meet the degree completion demands of the region's economy.

In contrast to Starkey's (2015) research findings, the faculty participants in this study did not report feeling constrained due to linguistic diversity, a lack of training, and institutional support. Bob described answering the same question over and over as, "annoying . . . from time to time," and Kevin described teaching basic writing skills in a 4000-level course as, "frustrating . . . sometimes," but all of the participants reported either directly or indirectly that they understood L2s were still learning English and, thus, made accommodations and offered support to bridge L2s' language gaps via the presentation and delivery of coursework and in the requirements and assessments for assignments. Two participants did, however, describe examples of L2s who were linguistically unprepared for coursework. Guillermo said:

> I had maybe five or six . . . some had really good skills, but there were others who . . . just were not anywhere ready. But they were being helped, and I held their hands, metaphorically speaking, and eventually they got there.

Kevin said:

> There have been students that I have let people know this student never should have been admitted. . . . she or he in this case is not willing or able to put in not only the work . . . but to double the work . . . to get to where they can start . . .

I've had to make that recommendation twice. This student is struggling, and he or

she should go back to [local community college] or some place and take some

summer classes and build up their confidence in their abilities and then come

back.

Considering L2 retention in light of these comments, the university may want to

evaluate the institution's admissions and advisement practices in conjunction with

existing academic support services, recruitment agendas, and institutional goals and

consider whether operations are being driven by enrollment and workforce demands at

the expense of student success and retention goals. Furthermore, because both policy

procedures and literature regarding postsecondary attainment and the institution-level

delivery of education generally exclude faculty presence and input, assumptions and

responsibility for low retention can often be ascribed to what faculty do and/or do not do

in the classroom (Witham et al., 2015). Faculty feedback such as that described herein

can provide policy makers with rich descriptive and anecdotal evidence as to who

students are beyond demographic identifiers and statistics, what personal and academic

gaps and challenges specific student populations encounter in class and on campus, and

why these students tend to fail or self-eliminate. For example, Mixie's degree program is

one of the most rigorous and competitive in the university. In her experience, L2s who

are too, "shy" to participate in required, "situations in the classroom while . . . other L1

students" are present tend to self-eliminate, "pretty quickly." Then, she added, "And . . . I

don't see them coming back." When asked why she thought so, Mixie responded, "They

feel embarrassed." While she reported that persistent commitment to doing the

coursework was essential for L2s to succeed in her classes, she also described the

inclination to be, "professionally . . . aggressive" as a successful L2 personality trait in her field. According to Kevin, while he allows students to rewrite papers throughout the term, makes himself available for extra help, and has empathy for the struggles L2s experience juggling school, jobs, and families, he said, "L2s have to be willing to take advantage, to find the time . . . [and to] get here" in order to pass his class because of, "the written language gap." In Bob's experience, L2s who do not socialize with classmates are "the ones in danger of dropping out or are failing because they don't want to ask questions." He added, "That will be a language thing as far as courage. But . . . [they're] socially handicapping themselves for that." For this reason, Bob intercedes with group projects to create peer interactions, which often result in new friendships and, he believes, better retention. The participants' experiences with L2 failure and self-elimination are significant to the university as they include specific success criteria as they relate to certain personality traits and demands in certain fields and courses as well as descriptions of stressful life conditions and intercultural interactions supported by the research findings of L2s in Almon (2014), Diaz et al., (2016) and Bliss and Sandiford (2015).

While research on L2s indicates that institutional culture and faculty can both covertly and overtly dishonor linguistic minorities and label them with deficits (Boesch, 2014; Kanno & Cromley, 2013), thereby heightening marginalization experiences and influencing self-elimination (Almon, 2014; Borden, 2015; Kanno & Varghese, 2010), it is imprudent to assume that faculty are the only cause of low retention without investigating their experiences. Indeed, faculty perceptions can be utilized to expand institutional dialogues and approaches to retention so that institutional narratives are not

dominated by statistical outcomes, which do not illuminate who students are nor how they experience their courses and coursework demands. For example, the participants' experiences of L2 failure and self-elimination described herein can engender institutional inquiry that asks how L2s are advised in career choices, what student development practices target L2s' challenges, and what academic support services meet L2s' needs in order for them to be successful. Moreover, intervention strategies for those at risk of failing or dropping could even be informed by the simple understanding that for L2s bachelor degree completion means the achievement of new possibilities, or the American dream.

Currently ranking twelfth in the world for degree completion, American higher education has been in a steady decline of college attainment since 1990, when the United States ranked first in the world (Payne, Hodges, & Hernandez, 2017). Today's college and university students are more diverse and underprepared than ever before, needing both developmental support and learning assistance in order to be academically successful (Payne et al., 2017). According to Payne et al. (2017), education is both a classroom intervention and an institutional one to be positioned in academic affairs, student development, and enrollment management so that institutions can better understand and address student success and retention.

Recommendations for Future Research

A critique of the research findings suggests that the approaches and teaching methods that participants described as influencing L2s' learning and success may be much less applicable to faculty with larger class sizes and/or smaller or broader populations of L2s. In contrast to the university, which averages 14 students per class,

many faculty throughout the United States are teaching and managing many more students per class. Being able to, "sense the room" like Bob, "observe . . . affect" like Emmy, or, "sit in a circle" and, "talk" like Kevin may not be practical or even possible depending on class size and classroom design. For example, because the university hosts a large population of L2s mostly from Latin America and the Caribbean, small class size and relative consistency in cultures and languages have enabled the participants to become practiced at knowing, noticing, and responding to L2s individually, culturally, and linguistically. In addition, having fewer students to teach and manage per class frees up faculty to evaluate and accommodate their course design and delivery and be available for more out-of-class interactions that support L2s in completing coursework. Perhaps Emmy described the relative ease of teaching and partnering with students at the university best when referring to faculty who were less inclined to do so:

> We're not at some huge state school. . . . I had 80 students in my first [field] class. And we average 12. How hard is it to engage and get to know your students and see them as people and not just go in, lecture, and leave?

Future inquiry on the subject of L2 success in bachelor degree programs might explore faculty's experiences with classes exceeding 20 students in a theoretical framework of validation or student-faculty partnership to identify new and comparative practices and methods that influence L2 learning.

This study expanded on Starkey's (2015) research by exploring faculty's experiences, including faculty from more than one discipline, and utilizing a Freirean design of critical consciousness, which revealed itself as a core category in Starkey's (2015) grounded theory study. While findings from a phenomenological study of faculty perceptions of

L2s in bachelor degree programs described the experiences of five participants who are consciously engaged in pursuing and practicing cultural competence, it would be imprudent not to acknowledge the bias of some faculty teaching L2s and the relative stress that faculty have reported in high demand fields such as nursing, which requires that service sector policies and practices are competently met (Starkey, 2015). Cross-cultural communication not only impedes teaching and learning but can also have adverse effects in fields like healthcare (Starkey, 2015). Fields or faculty that may be perceived as culturally biased might very well understand and appreciate the need to grow a linguistically diverse workforce but remain challenged by major impediments due to gaps in institutional support for professional development and student services to bridge L2 learning and industry standards (Starkey, 2015).

Of all the participants in the study, Mixie teaches in the most demanding and competitive field. From the first class, Mixie stresses the rigor, academic requirements, and personal commitment that pursuing a degree in her field will entail so that L2s who cannot make the commitment are, "gone pretty quickly." When faculty's fields are ruled by licensing, accrediting bodies, and industry standards and can be threatened if they are not producing highly qualified graduates, faculty are pressed to be clear and exacting with their students regarding the academic rigor and English language competence needed to be both academically and professionally successful. While L2 perceptions of professors as avoidant, abusive, and discriminatory because of linguistic challenges (Almon, 2014; Boesch, 2014; Diaz et al., 2016) might be valid, some perceptions might be invalid and indicative of faculty who are actually constrained by having to mediate student, institutional, field, and industry needs and demands in high pressure and low

support conditions. Without more research that includes faculty's experiences teaching L2s in fields that are both demanding and in high demand, perceived and real bias of L2s will persist as well as the bias that faculty are resistant to enhancing their teaching practice and indifferent to helping students or their institutions succeed. In a paradigm of silence, educators who are not asked to think cannot know, so they do not resolve problems in practice nor in education; in a paradigm of oppression, students who are not invited to think cannot know, so they do not learn nor persist in school (Freire, 2005). In other words, neither educator nor student can participate in the cycle of knowledge, a contemporaneous coming to know and creating of knowledge that occurs through inquiry and self-reflection without institutional engagement and support.

According to Rendón's (1994) validation theory, the traditional academic model assumes that students who self-initiate and devote substantial time to studying succeed in college, and this assumption sustains a culture of individuality and self-determination that negates the social reality of marginalized students. Participants' feedback on how L2s succeed in bachelor degree courses included success characteristics that included self-initiation and devotion of time to studying. Examining why these success characteristics, which also imply grit, persist in higher education could be explored in new research that challenges Duckworth et al.'s (2007) positive correlation between grit and college retention and the growing body of replicated research on grit by using a Bourdieusian theoretical framework that explores how the social and cultural capital of grit is reproduced in American higher education via faculty or institutional constructs (Bourdieu, 1977). On the other hand, for L2s, compromised by the need to learn language and course content simultaneously, self-initiation and devotion to studying in the research

findings could have emerged more profoundly due to language acquisition in adults, which requires contact with the language and practice over time as cited in the literature review. English language acquisition for adults is also an area in need of further exploration, especially now as findings can be used to inform the development and design of existing and emerging EAP and WIOA programs under the latest federal guidelines.

Finally, while the focus of this study was on immigrant L2s, the majority of whom lack educational credentials, have low-income backgrounds, and belong to racial/ethnic minority groups, Bob described the meaning of bachelor degree completion for non-native speakers of English who were, "upper class" differently from, "most of the people at the lower end of the spectrum [who were] just trying to achieve the American dream." A relatively smaller population than the L2 population defined herein, these non-native speakers of English at the university include either international students with student visas or high-income immigrants. In either case, Bob's distinction is significant as both international and high-income students who are also non-native speakers of English have unique social identities that Goodnight (2017) and Vandrick (2014) identified respectively as being understudied among linguistic minority students in higher education. Furthermore, 1,078,822 international students were enrolled in U.S. Higher Education in 2016-17, contributing more than $35 billion to the U.S. economy in 2016 (Institute of International Education [IIE], 2017). Universities that either have or want to increase their international student populations should consider specifically defining and disaggregating subpopulations within the L2 population in order to better understand this group of learners, validate data, and extend research in this area of study.

Research method. Utilizing a Freirean paradigm for safe dialogue contributed to the collection of rich data as well as pleasant and collegial interactions between the researcher and participants before, during, and after the interviews. In addition, Freire's (2001) concept of the archetype of the educator, who teaches as an act of love and liberation, was not only revealed in the participants' reflections but also supported retention literature that, contrary to the stigma that faculty are obstacles in retention movements, faculty care about students and student success (Witham et al., 2015), and they, like most university staff, are driven by prosocial values (Umbricht et al., 2017). Implementing a praxis, however, did not yield expected results. Only two of the five participants extended their transcripts, and their extensions were minimal and focused on clarifying statements already made. Perhaps the participants had established themselves as advocates for L2s prior to the interview, so conscientization did not generate substantially new ideas, or perhaps the two-week return time was not long enough for participants to reflect on their practice and engender new thoughts. In addition, although Freire (2001) advocates for praxis in research and safe but dialogical interactions to foster conscientization and change in practice, participation and exposure in dialogue on institutional performance, marginalized populations, and one's teaching methods might feel too threatening for some faculty in today's higher education environments. As a participatory/advocacy method of research, a praxis might be implemented more effectively in faculty training and/or self-reflective contexts so that feelings of risk are minimized. While it is important to champion those faculty who are succeeding with diverse student populations, it is also important to engage faculty who are less likely to

consider students' cultural identities and less willing to reflect on their teaching practices in order to improve institutional performance and increase retention (Williams, 2013).

Implications of Findings

After ten years of deliberation, new government guidelines for reporting completion expanded in 2017 to include part-time and non-first-time, or transfer, students in degree-seeking cohorts of eight years at two- and four-year degree granting institutions (Lederman, 2017). This is a major step forward in reporting the retention of nontraditional students, who now outnumber the traditional population of 18- to 22-year olds in higher education today (Lederman, 2017). L2s, on the other hand, remain unidentified as a unique minority group in the IPEDS data and in most retention studies and agendas, often falling under aggregates of nontraditional, low-income, and racial/ethnic minority student populations. Addressing the changing demographics within higher education without addressing the changing demographics in the nation caused by immigration leaves a gap in how student characteristics, degree completion, and institutional performance can be more fully understood and, therefore, approached. If the government is not looking at L2 enrollment and completion, it is reasonable to assume that most institutions are following suit.

Lastly, the participants' descriptions included what bachelor degree completion means for L2s and how L2s succeed in coursework. The essence of the American dream emerged as an overcoming of a socioeconomic past and present and the achievement of new opportunities. It appears that the social ideal of the American dream is being expressed and experienced within higher education via the pursuit and obtainment of a degree. Moreover, the essence of grit ascribed to how L2s succeed in bachelor degree

courses denotes aspects of the American dream, the attainment of which is garnered through a strong work ethic, persistence, and a good education (Public Agenda, 2012). As a center of knowledge creation and distribution in a knowledge-based economy, American higher education is more than ever in the position of serving and responding to both the economy and the public good in a time of declining support from business and government leaders and increasing criticism for low retention and unequal student outcomes. According to Smith (2015), higher education can serve both the democratic tenets of American society and demands of the American economy by building institutional capacity for diversity. This requires an institution's looking at how decisions are made, how power is distributed, and how institutional culture is defined, whereupon structures can be created to serve and link the institution's needs and core purpose with the needs of society. An organizational design that excludes key constituents, such as faculty, and key constructs, such as the teaching and learning of students, from its plans and proposals to improve performance is undemocratic and implies the monetization and bureaucratization of education, from which the dehumanizing of key constituents, such as students, occurs (Freire, 2001, 2005). Freire's (2001, 2005) theories can provide a humanizing framework that subverts the undemocratic and dehumanizing trend of monetization and bureaucratization in education.

In this study, participants' responses reflected faculty as valuable resources of information via their descriptions of who L2s are and how they succeed in bachelor degree courses. Furthermore, their teaching methods, which included (a) mediating L2 doubt, (b) knowing, noticing, and responding to L2s, and (c) partnering for success by democratizing and supporting, are not only teaching methods to be shared among faculty

but also approaches and practices that could be understood, adapted, and applied in various departments that interact with and serve L2s.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to understand and describe the lived experiences of faculty teaching L2s in bachelor degree courses and to identify potential approaches and teaching methods that influence L2s' learning and success. The researcher focused on three issue questions that asked five faculty participants what bachelor degree completion means to L2s, how L2s succeed in bachelor degree courses, and what teaching methods influenced L2 success. Through dialogue, the researcher captured rich, descriptive data, from which emerged the essences of these shared descriptions and an answer to the central research question: How do L2s succeed in bachelor degree courses? According to the participants, L2s succeed in bachelor degree courses by (a) seeing graduation as an achievement bearing life-changing opportunity, or the American dream, (b) having the will to work hard in order to meet and overcome personal and linguistic challenges, or grit; and (c) having faculty who provide accommodation for their social and academic needs, or student-faculty partnership. From the participants' shared experiences, the researcher identified three approaches and teaching methods that influenced L2s' learning and success. These were (a) mediating L2 doubt, (b) knowing, noticing, and responding to L2s, and (c) partnering for success by democratizing and supporting. The problem of the graduation rate of 25% at the university (IPEDS, 2018) and an underexplored L2 population of 39% in undergraduate programs (HUa, 2017) was addressed by meeting two of the university's strategic goals: Programmatic Excellence to increase the likelihood of student enrollment, retention, graduation, and employment and Operational

Effectiveness to implement process improvements that improve the quality of service to students and other stakeholders (Summary of Strategic Planning, 2017). The findings of this study support the university in a better understanding of the unique constraints of its L2 population and informed strategies to better support L2s toward graduation.

References

Almon, C. (2014). College persistence and engagement in light of a mature English language learner (ELL) student's voice. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 39*(5), 461-472. doi: 10.1080/10668926.2013.850757

Altbach, P. G. (2016). Patterns of higher education development. In M. N. Bastedo, P. G. Altbach, & P. J. Gumport (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (pp. 191-211). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

American dream. (n.d.) In *Merriam-Webster's online dictionary*. Retrieved from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/American dream

Aminy, M. & Karathanos, K. (2011). Benefiting the educator and student alike: Effective strategies for supporting the academic language development of English learner (EL) teacher candidates. *Issues in Teacher Education, 20*(2), 95-109.

Anonymous. (2012-2013). ESL speaks the language of business. *Community College Journal, 83*(3), 11-14.

Arbeit, C. A., Staklis, S., & Horn, L. (2017). U.S. Department of Education. *New American undergraduates: Enrollment trends and age at arrival of immigrant and second-generation students* (NCES 2017-414). Retrieved from National Center for Education Statistics website: https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2017/2017414.pdf

Bakeman, J. (2017). Faculty union grows as professors fear conservative policies: Union affiliated with FEA now represents faculty at all 12 state universities. *POLITICO*. Retrieved from https://www.politico.com/states/florida/story/2017/01/faculty-union-grows-as-professors-fear-conservative-policies-108547

Barnett, E. A. (2011). Validation experiences and persistence among community college students. *The Review of Higher Education 34*(2), 193-230.

Bastedo, M. N. (2016). Curriculum in higher education: The organizational dynamics of academic reform. In M. N. Bastedo, P. G. Altbach, & P. J. Gumport (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (pp. 60-83). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Becker, L. A. (2011). Noncredit to credit transitioning matters for adult ESL learners ina California community college. *New Directions for Community College, 155*, 15-26. doi: 10.1002/cc.454

Becket, D., Benander, R., & Kumar, R. (2007). ESL students in the disciplines: Negoitiating the professional program track. *Teaching English in the Two Year College, 35*(1), 63-72.

Bednarz, H., Schim, S., & Doorenbos, A. (2010). Cultural diversity in nursing education: Perils, pitfalls, and pearls. *Journal of Nursing Education, 49*(5), 253-260. doi: 10.3928/0148434-20100115-02

Bensimon, E. M. (2007). The underestimated significance of practitioner knowledge in the scholarship on student success. *The Review of Higher Education, 30*(4), 441-449.

Bensimon, E. M. & Dowd, A. (2009). Dimensions of the transfer choice gap: Experiences of Latina and Latino students who navigated transfer pathways. *Harvard Educational Review, 79*(4), 632-658.

BHEF. (2013). *Report of the National Higher Education and Workforce Initiative: Forging strategic partnerships for undergraduate innovation and workforce development*. Retrieved from the Business Higher Education Forum website: http://www.bhef.com/publications/national-higher-education-and-workforce-initiative-forging-strategic-partnerships

Bialystock E. & Hakuta, K. (1999). Confounded age: Linguistic and cognitive factors in age differences for second language acquisition. In D. Birdsong (Ed.) *Second language acquisition and the critical period hypothesis* (pp. 161-181). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Bilsky, J., Neuhard, I., & Locke, M. G. (2012). The evolution of workforce baccalaureate degrees in Florida. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 158*, 35-46. doi: 10.1002/cc.20015

Bliss, L. B. & Sandiford, J. R. (2015). Linking study behaviors and student culture to academic success among Hispanic students. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 28*(3), 281-295. doi:10.1080/10668920490256462

Boesch, B. (2014). The importance of the Professor in college classroom climate for immigrant students. *College Quarterly, 17*(4), 1-20.

Borden, R. S. (2014). The English only movement: Revisiting cultural hegemony. *Multicultural Perspectives, 16*(4), 229-233. doi:10.1080/15210960.2014.956607

Bourdieu, P. (1997). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge, United Kingom: Cambridge University Press.

Burt, M. & Mathews-Aydinli, J. (2007). *Workplace instruction and workforce preparation for adult immigrants* (CAELA Brief). Retrieved from the Center for

Applied Linguistics website: http://www.cal.org/adultesl/pdfs/workplace-instruction-and-workforce-preparation-for-adult-immigrants.pdf

Chase, M. M., Dowd, A. C., Pazich, L. B., & Bensimon, E. M. (2014). Transfer equity for "minoritized" students: A critical policy analysis of seven states. *Educational Policy, 28*(5), 669-717. doi: 10.1177/0895904812468227

Chenail, R. J. (2011). Interviewing the investigator: Strategies for addressing instrumentation and researcher bias concerns in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report, 16*(1), 255-262.

Colby, S. L. & Ortman, J. M. (2017). *Projections of the size and composition of the U.S. population: 2014 to 2060* (Report No. P25-1143). Retrieved from U.S. Census Bureau website:

https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/publications/2015/demo/p25-1143.pdf

Cook-Sather, A., Bovill, C., & Felten, P. (2014). *Engaging students as partners in learning and teaching: A guide for faculty*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Crisp, G. & Nora, A. (2010). Hispanic student success: Factors influencing the persistence and transfer decisions of Latino community college students enrolled

in developmental education. *Research in Higher Education, 51*, 175-194. doi: 10.1007/s11162-009-9151-x

Cuyjet, M. J. & Meriwether, J. L. (2016). Environmental influences on college culture. In M. J. Cuyjet, D. L. Cooper, M.F. Howard-Hamilton, & C. Linder (Eds.), *Multiculturalism on campus: Theory, models and practices for understanding diversity and creating inclusion* (2nd ed.). Retrieved from https://books.google.com

Diaz, A., Cochran, K., & Karlin, N. (2016). The influence of teacher power on English language learners' self-perceptions of learner empowerment. *College Teaching, 64*(4), 158-167. doi: 10.1080/87567555.2015.1126801

Donnelly, T. T., McKiel, E., & Hwang, J. (2009). Factors influencing the performance of English as an additional language nursing students: Instructors' perspectives. *Nursing Inquiry, 16*(3), 201-211.

Dorsey, L. G. (2007). *We are all Americans, pure and simple: Theodore Roosevelt and the myth of Americanism*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Douglass, J. A. & Thomson, G. (2010). The immigrant's university: A study of academic performance and the experiences of recent immigrant groups at the University of California. *Higher Education Policy, 23*, 451-474.

Dubose, C. O. (2017). But I don't understand you: One faculty's observations of the challenges facing international healthcare students. *Journal of International Students, 7*(1), 154-159

Duckworth, A. L., Peterson, C., Matthews, M. D., & Kelly, D. R. (2007). Grit:

   Perseverance and passion for long-term goals. *Journal of Personality and Social*

   Psychology, 92(6), 1087-1101. doi: 10:1037/0022-3514.92.6.1087

Dyer, T. G. (1992). *Theodore Roosevelt and the idea of race*. LA: Louisiana State

   University Press.

Eaton, S. E. (2011). *How long does it take to learn a second language? Applying the*

   "10,000-hour rule" as a model for fluency. ERIC (ERIC No. ED516761).

   Retrieved from ERIC website: http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED516761

Enrollment Numbers: ESL/IEP Facts. (2016). Office of Registrar, Hodges University,

   Naples, Florida.

Erisman, W. & Looney, S. (2007). *Opening the door to the American dream: Increasing*

   higher education access and success for immigrants. A Report by Institute for

   Higher Education Policy. Retrieved from Institute for Higher Education Policy

   website: http://www.ihep.org/research/publications/opening-door-american-

   dream-increasing-higher-education-access-and-success-0

Escobar, M., Fernández, A. L., & Guevara-Niebla, G. (1994). *Paulo Freire on higher*

   education: A dialogue at the National University of Mexico. Albany, NY: State

   University of New York Press, Albany.

Evans, N. W., Hartshorn, K. J., & Strong-Krause, D. (2011). The efficacy of dynamic

   written corrective feedback for university-matriculated ESL learners. *System, 39*,

   229-239. doi:10.1016.1016/j.system.2011.04.012

Farkas, S., Duffett, A., Johnson, J., Moye, L., & Vine, J. (2003). *Now that I'm here: What immigrants say about life in the United States*. Report of Public Agenda Foundation, New York. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED473894

FLBOG. (2011). State University System of Florida, Board of Governors. *Strategic plan 2012-2025: Approved on November 10, 2011*. Retrieved from State University System of Florida, Board of Governors website: http://www.flbog.edu/pressroom/_doc/2011-11-28_Strategic_Plan_2012-2025_FINAL.PDF

FLBOG. (2016). State University System of Florida, Board of Governors. *2025 System strategic plan: Amended March 2016*. Retrieved from State University System of Florida, Board of Governors website: http://www.flbog.edu/board/strategicplan.php

Freire, P. (2001). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: The Continuum International Publish Group, Inc.

Freire, P. (2005). *Teachers as cultural workers: Letters to those who dare teach*. US: Westview Press.

Gambino, C. P., Acosta, Y. D., & Grieco, E. M. (2014). *English-speaking ability of the foreign-born population in the United States: 2012*. American Community Survey Reports (ACS-26). Retrieved from the United States Census Bureau website: http://www.census.gov/library/publications/2014/acs/acs-26.html

Gardner, L. (2015, June). Making diversity not the work of one office, but a campuswide priority. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from https://www.chronicle.com

Gentles, S. J., Charles, C., Ploeg, J., & McKibbon, K. A. (2015). Sampling in qualitative

    research: Insights from an overview of the methods literature. *The Qualitative*

    Report, 20(11), 1772-1789.

Goodnight, M. R. (2017). The language-related academic self-confidence of noncitizen

    students in U.S. higher education. *Journal of College Student Development, 58*(6),

    947-954. doi: 10.1353/csd.2017.0074

Hartshorn, K. J., Evans, N. W., Egbert, J., & Johnson, A. (2017). Discipline-specific

    reading expectation and challenges for ESL learners in U.S. universities. *Reading*

    in a Foreign Language, 29(1), 36-60.

Hernandez, K., Thomas, M., & Schuemann, C. (2012). Navigating uncharted waters: An

    accelerated content-based English for academic purposes program. *Teaching*

    English in the Two-Year College, 40(1), 44-56.

Hernández, S. & Ortiz, A. M. (2016). Latinx college students. In M. J. Cuyjet, D. L.

    Cooper, M.F. Howard-Hamilton, & C. Linder (Eds.), *Multiculturalism on*

    campus: Theory, models and practices for understanding diversity and creating

    inclusion (2nd ed.). Retrieved from https://books.google.com

Higher Education Opportunity Act of 1980, Pub. L. No. 110-315, § 2, 315 Stat. 122

    (1980).

Howard-Hamilton, M. F. & Hinton K. G. (2016). Oppression and its effect on college

    student identity development. In M. J. Cuyjet, D. L. Cooper, M.F. Howard-

    Hamilton, & C. Linder (Eds.), *Multiculturalism on campus: Theory, models and*

    practices for understanding diversity and creating inclusion (2nd ed.). Retrieved

    from https://books.google.com

HUa. (2017). *Native Language.* [Datatel]. Naples, Florida: Office of Enrollment

    Management.

HUb. (2017). *Academics at Hodges*. Retrieved from Hodges University's website:

    https://www.hodges.edu/academics/

Husserl, E. (2002a). Introduction to the logical investigations. In D. Moran and T.

    Mooney (Eds.), *The phenomenology reader* (pp. 65-77). New York, NY:

    Routledge.

Husserl, E. (2002b). Noesis and Noema. In D. Moran and T. Mooney (Eds.), *The*

    phenomenology reader (pp. 134-150). New York, NY: Routledge.

ICUF. (2017). *An independent education*. Retrieved from Independent Colleges and

    Universities of Florida website: http://www.icuf.org/about-us/an-independent-

    education/

IIE. (2017). *Open doors 2017: Executive Summary*. Retrieved from

    https://www.iie.org/Why-IIE/Announcements/2017-11-13-Open-Doors-2017-

    Executive-Summary

IPEDS. (2017-2018). *The statutory requirements for reporting IPEDS data*. Retrieved

    from the National Center for Education Statistics website:

    https://surveys.nces.ed.gov/ipeds/ViewContent.aspx?contentId=18

IPEDS. (2018). *Look up an institution*. Retrieved from the National Center for Education

    Statistics website:

    https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/datacenter/InstitutionProfile.aspx?unitId=aeb1b2b3b3af

Jones, B. (2016, April). *Americans' views of immigrants marked by widening partisan,*

    generational divides. Retrieved from the Pew Research Center website:

http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/04/15/americans-views-of-immigrants-marked-by-widening-partisan-generational-divides/

Junious, D. L., Malecha, A., Tart, K., & Young, A. (2010). Stress and perceived faculty support among foreign-born baccalaureate nursing students. *Journal of Nursing Education, 49*(5), 261-270. doi: 10.3928/01484834-20100217-02

Kanno, Y. & Cromley, J. G. (2013). English language learners' access to and attainment in postsecondary education. *TESOL Quarterly, 47*(1), 89-121.

Kanno, Y. & Varghese, M. M. (2010). Immigrant and refugee ESL students' challenges to accessing four-year college education: From language policy to educational policy. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 9*, 310-328. doi: 10.1080/15348458.2010.517693

Karathanos, K. A. & Mena, D. D. (2014). Exploring the experiences of linguistically diverse college of education student writers. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice, 11*(3), n.p.

Krogstad, J. M. & Fry, R. (2014, April). *More Hispanics, blacks enrolling in college, but lag in bachelor's degrees.* Retrieved from Pew Research Center website: http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/04/24/more-hispanics-blacks-enrolling-in-college-but-lag-in-bachelors-degrees/

Krogstad, J. M. & Keegan (2014, May). *15 states with the highest share of immigrants in their population*. Retrieved from Pew Research Center website: http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/05/14/15-states-with-the-highest-share-of-immigrants-in-their-population/

Labi, A. (2015). *Placing student success at the center of state higher education finance policy*. Lumina Issue Papers. Retrieved from Lumina Foundation website: https://www.luminafoundation.org/files/resources/labi-student-success-at-the-center.pdf

Leatherman, C. (1998). 'Shared governance' under siege: Is it time to revive it or get rid of it? *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 44*(21), A8-A9.

Lederman, D. (2017, October). *New federal higher ed outcome measures count part-time, adult students: The new, improved IPEDS*. Retrieved from the Inside Higher Ed website: https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/10/12/new-federal-higher-ed-outcome-measures-count-part-time-adult-students

Lopez, M. H., Passel, J., & Rohal, M. (2015). Modern immigration wave brings 59 million to U.S., driving population growth and change through 2065: Views of immigrations impact on U.S. society mixed. *Report of the Pew Research Center*. Retrieved from http://www.pewhispanic.org/files/2015/09/2015-09-28_modern-immigration-wave_REPORT.pdf

Lundberg, C. A. & Schreiner, L. A. (2004). Quality and frequency of faculty-student interaction as predictors of learning: An analysis by student race/ethnicity. *Journal of College Student Development, 45*(5), 549-565.

Mathews-Aydinli, J. (2006). *Supporting adult English language learners' transitions to postsecondary education* (CAELA Brief). Retrieved from the Center for Applied Linguistics website: http://www.cal.org/caela/esl_resources/briefs/transition.html

Matsuda, P. K., Saenkhum, T., & Accardi, S. (2013). Writing teachers' perceptions of the presence and needs of second language writers: An institutional case study. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 22*, 68-86. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2012.10.0001

McDermott, M., Shelton, N. R., & Mogge, S. G. (2012). Preservice teachers' perceptions of immigrants and possibilities of transformative pedagogy: Recommendations for a praxis of "critical aesthetics." *International Journal of Multicultural Education, 14*(2), 1-22.

Miller, N. B. (2014). Nontraditional student graduation rate benchmarks. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education, 62*, 141-151. doi: 10.1080/07377363.2014.953437

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd.

MPI. (2017). *Adult education and language learning*. Retrieved from the Migration Policy Institute website: https://www.migrationpolicy.org/topics/adult-education-language-learning

Oropeza, M. V., Varghese, M. M., & Kanno, Y. (2010). Linguistic minority students in higher education: Using, resisting, and negotiating multiple labels. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 43*(2), 216-231. doi: 10.1080/10665681003666304

Ousey, D. L., Brown, C. F., Goldschmidt, M. M. (2014). Developmental Immigrant Students: What cross-disciplinary faculty should know. *Research & Teaching in Developmental Education, 30*(2), 65-79.

Pandya, C. (2012). *Limited English proficient workers and the Workforce Investment Act: Challenges and opportunities*. Retrieved from the Migration Policy Institute

website: http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/limited-english-proficient-workers-and-workforce-investment-act-challenges-and-opportunities

Payne, E. M., Hodges, R., & Hernandez, E. P. (2017). Changing demographics and needs assessment for learning centers in the 21st century. *Learning Assistance Review, 22*(1), 21-36.

Poirier, T. I. & Wilhelm, M. (2014). Use of humor to enhance learning: Bull's eye or off the mark. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 78*(2). doi: 10.5688/ajpe78227

Public Agenda. (2012). *Hard work is essential for achieving the American dream, but is it enough? Americans are divided according to a new survey*. Retrieved from https://www.publicagenda.org/press-releases/hard-work-is-essential-for-achieving-the-american-dream-but-is-it-enough-americans-are-divided-according-to-a-new-survey

Rendón, L. I. (1994). Validating culturally diverse students: Toward a new model of learning and student development. *Innovative Higher Education, 19*, 33-51.

Rendón, L. I. (2002). Community College Puente: A validating model of education. *Educational Policy, 16*(4), 642-667.

Rendón, L. I., Jalomo, R. E (1995). *Using assessment to identify effective teaching practices*. Paper presented to the NCTLA Assessment Institute, Los Angeles.

Rendón, L. I., Jalomo, R. E., & Nora, A. (2000). Theoretical considerations in the study of student retention in higher education. In J. M. Braxton (Ed.) *Reworking the student departure puzzle* (pp.127-156). Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Roberts, F. & Cimasko, T. (2008). Evaluating ESL: Making sense of university

professors' responses to second language writing. *Journal of Second Language*

Writing, 17, 125-143. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2007.10.0002

Sanner, S. & Wilson, A. (2008). The experiences of students with English as a second

language in a baccalaureate nursing program. *Nurse Education Today, 28*, 807-

813. doi: 10.1016/j.nedt.2008.03.0004

Scarcella, R. (2003). *Academic English: A conceptual framework* (Technical Report

2003-1). University of California, Irvine: The University of California Linguistic

Minority Research.

Smith, D. G. (2015). *Diversity's promise for higher education: Making it work.*

Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Smith, S. (2017, October). *Most think the 'American dream' is within reach for them*.

Retrieved from Pew Research Center website: http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-

tank/2017/10/31/most-think-the-american-dream-is-within-reach-for-them/

Smith, J. A., Flowers, P., & Larkin, M. (2009). *Interpretative phenomenological*

analysis: Theory, method, and research. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications

Ltd.

Starkey, T. J. (2015). The critical factors that influence faculty attitudes and perceptions

of teaching English as second language nursing students: A grounded theory

research study. *Nurse Education Today, 35*, 718-725. doi:

10.1016/j.nedt.2015.01.017

Stein, M., Scribner, C., & Brown, D. (2013). Market forces and the college classroom:

Losing sovereignty. *Journal of Academic Freedom, 4*, n.p. Retrieved from

American Association of University Professors website:

https://www.aaup.org/JAF4/market-forces-and-college-classroom-losing-

sovereignty#.WiINV0yZOCc

Sue, D. W., Torino, G. C., Capodilupo, C. M., Rivera, D. P., & Lin, A. I. (2009). How

white faculty perceived and react to difficulty dialogues on race: Implications for

education and training. *The Counseling Psychologist, 37*(8), 1090-1115. doi:

10.1177/0011000009340443

Sugarmen, J. & Lee, K. (2017). *Facts about English learners and the NCLB/ESSA

transition in select states*. Retrieved from the Migration Policy Institute website:

https://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/facts-about-english-learners-and-nclb-

essa-transition-select-states

Summary of Strategic Planning Components. (2017, October). Office of Institutional

Effectiveness, Hodges University, Naples, Florida.

Summary of Survey on Diversity and Inclusion at Hodges University. (2013). Office of

Diversity and Inclusion, Hodges University, Naples, Florida.

Tovar, E. (2015). The role of faculty, counselors, and support programs on Latino/a

community college students' success to intent to persist. *Community College

Review, 43*(1), 46-71.

Travis, S. (2017, September 17). Florida schools gain ground in U.S. News college

rankings. *Sun Sentinel*. Retrieved from http://www.sun-

sentinel.com/news/education/fl-us-news-fiu-nova-20170914-story.html

Turner, D. W., III. (2010). Qualitative interview design: A practical guide for novice

researchers. *The Qualitative Report, 15*(3), 754-760.

Ullman, C. (2010). The connections among immigration, national building, and adult education English as a second language instruction in the United States. *Adult Learning, 21*, 4-8.

Umbricht, M. R., Fernandez, F., & Ortagus, J. C. (2017). An examination of the (un)intended consequences of performance funding in higher education. *Educational Policy, 31*(5), 643-673. doi: 10.1177/0895904815614398

USCB. (2013). *International migration is projected to become primary driver of U.S. population growth for first time in nearly two centuries* (Release No. CB13-89). Retrieved from the United States Census Bureau website: http://www.census.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2013/cb13-89.html

USCB. (2017). *Quick Facts: Florida* [Foreign born persons, 2012-2016]. Retrieved from https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/FL/POP645216#viewtop

USCIS. (2017). *Citizenship resource center*. Retrieved from the Department of Homeland Security website: https://www.uscis.gov/citizenship/learners/study-test

USDL. (2017, May). *Foreign-born Workers: Labor Force Characteristics Summary*. (USDL-17-0618). Retrieved from the Bureau of Labor Statistics website: http://www.bls.gov/news.release/forbrn.nr0.htm

Valle, M. (2016). Understanding legitimacy and impact within differentiated academic markets. *Journal of Academic Administration in Higher Education, 12*(2), 11-18.

Vandrick, S. (2014). The role of social class in English language education. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 13*(2), 85-91. doi: 10.1080/15348458.2014.90819

Walsh, J. (2008). The critical role of discourse in education for democracy. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 6*(2), 54-76.

West, D. M. (2010). *Brain gain: Rethinking U.S. immigration policy*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

WIOA. (2016). Final rules: A detailed look. Retrieved from the United States Department of Education website: https://www.doleta.gov/WIOA/Docs/Final-Rules-A-Detailed-Look-Fact-Sheet.pdf

Williams, D. A. (2013). *Strategic diversity leadership: Activating change and transformation in higher education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Witham, K., Chase, M., Bensimon, E. M., Hanson, D., & Longanecker, D. (2015). Moving the attainment agenda from policy to action. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 47*(4), 6-15.

Woodhouse, K. (2015). Closures to triple: The inability of small colleges to increase their revenue will result in triple the number of closures in the coming years, Moody's report projects. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/09/28/moodys-predicts-college-closures-triple-2017

Wooten, M. E. (2018, February 23). *Establishing expected levels of performance negotiated levels of performance for program years (PY) 2018-19 and 2019-20* [Memorandum]. Washington DC: United States Department of Education, Office of Career, Technical, and Vocational Education. Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ovae/pi/AdultEd/octae-program-memo-18-2.pdf

Zhu, W. (2004). Faculty views on the importance of writing, the nature of academic writing, and teaching and responding to writing in the disciplines. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*, 29-48. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.004

Zong, J. & Batalova, J. (2016) *Frequently requested statistics on immigrants and immigration in the United States*. Retrieved from the Migration Policy Institute website: https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/frequently-requested-statistics-immigrants-and-immigration-united-states-5

Zong, J. & Batalova, J. (2017) *Frequently requested statistics on immigrants and immigration in the United States*. Retrieved from the Migration Policy Institute website: https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/frequently-requested-statistics-immigrants-and-immigration-united-states

Appendix

Faculty Interview Instrument

Time of Interview Start:

Date:

Place:

Introduction: Thank you for participating in this study. You will have the opportunity to share your personal experiences as a faculty member teaching students whose first language is not English (L2s) in bachelor degree courses at the 3000 and 4000 level. The purpose of this study is to understand and describe how this population succeeds in bachelor degree courses according to your experiences. Let me remind you at this time that your identity will remain confidential, so please feel free to speak openly. Would you like to provide me with a pseudonym at this time?

Pseudonym: _____

Is it okay for me to record the interview? _____ Once the interview is completely transcribed, I would like you to review it for accuracy and invite you to be an active participant in the study by making any additions or deletions that you see pertinent to describing your experiences. Would you be willing to do that? _____

Before we begin, I want to give you the opportunity to ask me any questions pertaining to this study or information that you would like to learn about me.

Demographic Data:

1. Is your teaching status full- or part-time? _____

2. What is your first language? _____

3. What degree program or field do you teach in? _____

4. Please identify the course we are going to discuss as degree-specific or cross-curriculum: _____

5. Finally, could you give me an average percent of L2s in this course and the first

languages your students speak? _____

_____

Thank you. At this time, I will start the recorder.

Questions:

1. What does bachelor degree completion mean for L2 students?

      a) What does bachelor degree completion mean for faculty?

      b) In your experience, how do faculty influence bachelor degree completion?

Key words/topics for follow up questions	*Reflective notes*

2. What perceived characteristics do successful L2s in bachelor degree courses have?

      a) What do successful L2s do?

b) How do they manage linguistic challenges?

Key words/topics for follow up questions	Reflective notes

3. What elements of teaching influence L2s' success in bachelor degree courses?

a) What teaching methods influence L2s' success?

b) What interpersonal methods between faculty and L2s influence L2s' success?

c) How do you manage linguistic challenges?

Key words/topics for follow up questions	Reflective notes

Closing:

Thank you for participating in this interview. I want to assure you of the confidentiality of your responses and remind you again that I will be sending you a transcription for your review and extension. If any potential questions arise during analysis of your final transcription, would it be all right if I contacted you? _____

Time of Interview End:

Notes on interview, interview protocol, setting, etc.