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Chapter 1

COVER ESSAY

To be a second language user is to be constantly afraid. Every sentence carries within it a chance of failure. When I entered the composition program, part of me was scared that I would fail as a teacher of composition, for what could a second language user possibly teach native speakers about writing in their own language? Filled with the naivety of a new graduate student, I hoped to learn how to mask my perceived English deficiencies. In the course of this program, however, I learned that goal was a faulty one. It was the goal which I would later discover in this research project to be oriented at performance-avoidance – a personal goal of a teacher to never appear incompetent in front of students – and thanks to this research project, I was able to identify this goal and change it to the one oriented at students’ growth. I can honestly say that although the research project presented here carries only a part of what I have learned from my time in the writing program, it is the part that helped me most in understanding my role as an instructor of composition.

I tutored writing at the local community college before I had anything to do with graduate school, and when I entered the writing program I expected a lot of theorizing about what I already did rather than any innovation. From the first day here, however, I learned that praxis is more than just a collection of seminal scholarly articles thrown into the curriculum. I learned that theory and practice are not cause and effect but that they go hand-in-hand. In my first document of this research project, my statement of teaching
philosophy, I reflect on how the theoretical works inform the way I approach tutoring and teaching situations. I begin with the works of Richard Straub and Brooke Horvath because their ideas are at the heart of the revision process I tutor daily to my students at the university and community college. Before I started the program, my feedback to tutees consisted often of grammar and punctuation help. Originally, such limits were expected of me. However, as the center worked towards improving the tutoring experience for students, I was expected to start involving myself in all stages of students’ writing, and I quickly found that I lacked the tools to do so. Fortunately for me, from the start of this program I was introduced to Straub’s advice of providing feedback as a peer and not as an instructor. Immediately, I noticed that my spoken feedback was received much better by the students. By acknowledging the good parts of the paper, I was often able to show drafts in a new light to my college tutees who were now willing to replicate their own techniques that made their writing successful. Moreover, I noticed a similar effect when providing written feedback. Instead of writing short notations on the side, I started writing longer comments to students on papers, balancing them so as to be helpful but not overbearing like Horvath suggests. At first, it was difficult for me to see the results of my written feedback. However, when recently I started leading online workshops, I was able to see how greatly my students’ writing improves, even in such low-stakes assignments as discussion boards.

Next, I show the influence of James Berlin and Paulo Freire on my running of the classroom, an influence that stems from my conviction that students are their own greatest teachers. I did not harbor that conviction in the beginning of the writing program.
Having been schooled for many years in a very traditional environment, I saw a lecture-style crowded room as the norm. Even when I tutored, I looked for ways to “simplify” the process such as the use of answer keys to reading tasks instead of discussions. And even when I noticed problems with what I was doing, I never questioned them, for I was just a tutor and not the teacher. During my stay in the program, however, I learned that students are quite capable of forming much of the class’s dynamics as well as identifying their own needs. Following Berlin’s advice on collaboration and critical analysis, I, together with my students, began questioning the writing and reading materials they worked on. Instead of focusing on individual vocabulary words, we inquired together why the author might have used those words instead of some others. I saw an immediate improvement in the student’s formulation of main and secondary ideas as well as their inferencing skills. And when I entered the Reading Across the Disciplines and Writing Across the Curriculum programs at American River College, students started bringing their own unique needs to me. Before the program, I would offer them cookie-cutter solutions such as handouts with little context. Now, however, I spend the beginning of the sessions trying to collaboratively figure out the best strategy for the student to use. Together, we identify our task, what we already know about it, and what we need to find out. This tactic has carried over into my in-class instruction, and my class or workshop time is often based on the class discussion in which students decide what they need to work on and how the class will approach it.

Finally, in my teaching philosophy I demonstrate how my personal bilingual experience is tied with the works of Paul K. Matsuda, Tony Silva, and Sukesh
Canagarajah. While I was sympathetic to the struggles of language learning even when I began the writing program, I felt that I lacked a lot of tools to help other learners due to my traditional schooling. Furthermore, I felt that I was largely unaware of how to work with people whose English dialect was different from the one I have been taught. During my time in the program, I have reevaluated my workplace as the place of “contact zones” where different cultures and languages meet. Matsuda’s works on cross-cultural composition helped me to better foster language-learning and culture awareness in the mixed groups of second language learners and native speakers that I work with every day. If before I would localize the reading and writing help to just one student, now I would ask them to share their strategies in, for example, preparation of American History papers or personal statements. When students bring to me their essays on social issues, I feel more confident in guiding them through the consideration of ethics tied with the discussion of different cultures. When I encounter personal narratives from the perspective of members of different discourse communities, under the influence of Canagarajah’s work I am able to use strategies such as “code-meshing” to help these students build their narratives in a way that would make their writing meet the expectations of their intended and, often, more conventional audience. In short, if before this writing program I would be hesitant to work with a cross-cultural classroom, now I welcome such chances.

It should be also noted that while I was new to the idea of praxis when I entered the program, I was not new to the process of research. Even before I decided to start on the composition track, I knew that any successful qualitative research would involve
diversity of sources. Moreover, the research method of a context-sensitive text analysis that I adopted from Thomas Huckin also called for an interdisciplinary approach to the analysis of findings. The choice of this method stemmed from the very subjective nature of personal teaching goals and the way they have been often considered in the discipline within other discussions such as the ones focused on assessment. The necessity for these goals to be considered separately might not have been so obvious to my audience if I had limited my research with just composition sources. I aimed to show both the benefit of and the precedent to my research choices, and reaching into other disciplines helped me accomplish this goal. My second document in this research project, the annotated bibliography, reflects my approach through its interdisciplinary collection of newer and more established research. The sources range from print venues like books by Bob Broad to digital collections such as Composition Forum and from official statements like the programmatic learning goals of our institution and the WPA Outcomes Statement to scholarly reflections and debates such as works by Edward White and Peter Elbow. Furthermore, inspired by the parallel conversations about goals that were taking place in the fields of composition, educational psychology, and educational research, I considered both the qualitative and quantitative results of these conversations when I approached my topic. It was my hope that my annotated bibliography may demonstrate the flexibility of my research and my willingness to consider all available scholarly viewpoints before making any conclusions of my own.

Even with the variety of sources available to me, I knew that it might not be enough to convince my reader that something as subjective as a personal teaching goal
merits a comparison with the programmatic criteria. The topic of this research called for a qualitative analysis that relied on depth of the analysis rather than large number of participants. Furthermore, asking personal information in a research study could make randomly selected participants uncomfortable and, therefore, unwilling to share. For this reason, I decided to work with volunteers and to triangulate my data gathering to obtain as many different representations of their goals as possible. As a result, my research design involved a preliminary questionnaire that helped me locate interested parties and gave me some idea of what I should focus on in our discussions, an interview during which the participants would ultimately share their goals, and the written artifacts in the form of syllabi and assignment samples. These artifacts not only served as practical examples of what participants stated during the interview but also gave an opportunity to see how individual instructors mix personal expectations with the programmatic language. Finally, all of the pieces were considered in light of the programmatic learning goals of our first-year writing program. This research design turned out to be very fruitful because participants rarely fully talked about their goals in the questionnaire or even the interview alone. For example, a couple of participants included new goals during the interview which they forgot to mention in the questionnaire. Others stated a lot more about their goals in the written artifacts than they did during the interview. If not for the triangulation of data gathering methods mentioned earlier, I might well have not been able to obtain any conclusive picture of the relationship between the goals.

I also have to admit that it was difficult to narrow down the topic of the final document of my research project, which is my research article. The choice for that topic
stemmed from the change I experienced in the program when I reframed my original goal of masking my perceived “inability,” to the question of how to be a better teacher, and then into the question of what I would like my students to learn in my class. Much like the participants in my study, I felt that question should go even further and ask what I want my students to remember from my class even after they leave college. In other words, I wanted to know the full future impact of the responsibility I would have to carry as an instructor of composition so I could create appropriate writing classroom pedagogies today. Those questions led me into the pilot study on personal teaching goals and later, with the help of my readers, into the study of the relationship these goals have with the programmatic learning goals. In the course of the creation of this research article, I believe I have learned two very important things as a future instructor and as a researcher.

As an instructor of writing, I was shocked by the variety of ways personal teaching goals affect the classroom. Granted that I suspected them to be important from the start, I didn’t realize just how directly each personal teaching goal influenced individual unit construction in any chosen curriculum in my study, how it led to the creation of small and large-stakes assignments, how it affected assessment especially in terms of the priorities given to specific grading criteria, or how it affected personal sense of efficacy of my study participants. Through this project, I learned that I must be acutely aware of what I want and need my students to learn before I introduce anything into the classroom. The interviews with my study participants were especially helpful in this regard as instructors shared their failures alongside their successes. By listening to their
accounts, I learned that those other instructors often embarked on a similar road of self-
doubt and that they tried to incorporate other instructors’ goals into their classroom only
to see them fail. It was not until they learned to accept their own personal teaching goals
and use them for the benefit of the students that they managed to succeed. Their stories of
struggles and acceptance did a lot to reassure me as an instructor. Whereas before I would
feel hesitant to mix my own goals of transferability or student self-sponsored tasks with
the programmatic expectations, now I feel more confident when I work these things in
because I have observed the successful precedents of my participants.

As a researcher, I was struck by the ethical conundrums that I faced throughout
this research process. Initially, I expected to have difficulties in finding study
participants. After all, how many people would be willing to share the ways they may
deviate from the program? On that account I was proven wrong as instructors were
willing not only to participate in the pilot but also a follow-up study, and the majority of
my current participants were returning to me for the second time. However, the deeper I
engaged in this study, the more I faced confidentiality issues. My research project asks
very personal questions and delves into aspirations and failures. Moreover, it then
compares this personal information with the programmatic language. In the course of the
study, I discovered that I needed to do more to protect the integrity of my confidentiality
promise than just change names or minimize the quotes from the instructors. Teaching
curricula turned out to be so individualized that they may as well carry an identity tag on
them. Worries about the implications of revealed information often overshadowed the
perceived benefit of participation. Participants trailed mid-sentence as if they
remembered that they were on tape, and some things were never fully said. In several cases, participants double-checked whether they were already off-tape before they added anything to their words. With the full understanding of the context in which these members of an academic discourse community voiced their concerns, I must apologize to my readers for the parts of my research that did not make it into this final version. However, I do not discount a future possibility of revisiting similar concerns, for in the process of this research I also understood the necessity of the future creation of more ethically-driven research methods for the investigation of personal teaching goals.

In the process of writing this project I have also come to understand the impact of my research on my professional interest in teaching composition at the community college level. The majority of my current tutees are planning to transfer to a four-year institution, and many of them will transfer to our university. By conducting a research project that asked instructors to share what they value and expect in terms of student learning outcomes, I was able to separate what I should focus on as an instructor of a transfer-level classroom. While I was writing this research, I also understood that the original question I asked about transferability of skills was actually a vital one for me to answer in light of my professional goal. Even as I gathered the sources for this work, I noticed that I was adjusting my emphasis on transferable skills with my community college students, which turned out to be exactly what they would need once they enter this four-year institution. Through the process of shaping this research I shaped myself as a tutor and as an instructor, and I changed from an insecure writing aid to a more confident composition guide whose personal teaching goal is now clear – to promote
students’ growth as writers and to support them in their transition to a different set of writing expectations.
Chapter 2

TEACHING PHILOSOPHY

Bob Broad asks composition instructors to acknowledge what they really value in their classroom. As an instructor of composition, I base my expectations both on my experience of continuous life learning as well as the current scholarship in my field. In addition, my experience as a bilingual student shapes my teaching philosophy through the theoretical frameworks of both composition and the field of teaching English as a second language. The essence of my instruction lies in revision, democratization, and diversity.

As someone who places a strong emphasis on revision and peer feedback, I encourage it both through in-class participation and online activities. I use compliments, mitigation of criticism, questions and suggestions when making extended comments in students’ papers, and I occasionally use myself as a self-deprecating example of writing where it may be appropriate. In this manner, I strive to assess students’ writing from the double perspective of instructor and student, following the peer revision techniques outlined by Richard Straub and Brooke Horvath by positioning myself as a more experienced writer rather than a composition gatekeeper. For this purpose, I create semester long discussion threads where students can brainstorm and free-write in preparation for the rough draft or share their drafts with peers, and I participate in those threads alongside my students. I build my comments in light of the feedback already given by students’ peers and add any other relevant information. Furthermore, I always welcome students’ feedback on the class activities, comments, and peer-review
workshops through multiple formal and informal class evaluations for the double purpose of improving class experience for my students and illustrating the effect peer-review has on the class.

As someone who found writing a liberatory experience, I attempt to foster a more democratic approach in my composition course by placing an emphasis on student involvement and instructor guidance. In order to accomplish this, I synthesize several theoretical frameworks in my practice and include my students in the daily running of the class as much as possible. Additionally, I constantly re-evaluate my personal involvement and influence in the classroom environment. Under the influence of my own research study, I have come to understand that James Berlin was right in that no teacher is truly objective in their classroom, and I try to make sure that my personal biases do not become a hindrance on the road to students’ success. Heeding Berlin’s advice, I collaborate with my students in “[shaping] the content of the liberatory classroom” so that both my students and I have the chance to learn from each other (Berlin). In the most recent example, my students and I decided on the number of online discussion topics and at least one essay assignment which my students crafted from the creation of the writing prompt to the final draft evaluations. In this way, I share Paulo Freire’s vision of the democratized classroom, and in order to move my classroom closer to that ideal, I encourage student involvement in the process of creating meaningful classroom activities, participation in self-sponsored writing, and self-administered peer feedback. Additionally, I follow the advice of Ann George in working with the students to negotiate the class curriculum. Presented with program expectations and course goals, they decide
the attendance and late policy, minimum word requirements for their online journals, draft submission deadlines, etc. and in my experience their choices are not only professional but also keep me accountable to them since their negotiations inevitably influence my level of involvement.

As someone with a multilingual background, I support and nurture the diversity of thoughts across discourses and disciplines. For example, I ask students to consider writing in various discourse communities through critical evaluation of different writing guides in hopes that they may transfer some of the skills they learn from other disciplines into their own writing as is suggested by Irene Clarke and Andrea Hernandez. Following the proposal of Tony Silva on the ethical treatment of ESL students, I always consider my own experience as a bilingual student in order to “understand ESL writers.” I attempt to pair multilingual students with native speakers to “provide suitable learning contexts” and to foster cross-cultural composition (Silva; Matsuda & Silva). For example, this semester when Education majors presented drafts about their school histories, I made sure that the U.S. schooled reviewers were grouped with the presenter who was schooled outside of the country and vice versa with the U.S. schooled presenter. I carefully prepared myself for those workshops by asking presenters in advance about their drafts’ topics, size, and requirements as well as their classmates’ interest and expertise in that topic. This tactic ensured that a variety of opinions was offered to the authors of the drafts, and it resulted in very prolific comments and insightful questions from the peer reviewers. Additionally, I strive to “provide appropriate instruction” through leading my students to different writing frameworks but letting them choose their own topics (Silva).
And when I do not give the choice of a free topic, I offer a variety of self-sponsored writing prompts in hopes that my multilingual students can choose those that might not put them at a disadvantage or danger of being unfairly evaluated (Silva). Furthermore, I encourage the combination of multiple discourses and ethnic diversity through Canagarajah’s method of “code-meshing,” often when my students and I work on different reading strategies. In the most recent example, an Australian student of mine had difficulties adjusting her skimming techniques to the expectations of her local Humanities class. For several weeks, she and I worked together on comparing and contrasting the differences that she encountered, and in the process we successfully adjusted her note-taking and annotation strategies to become a strategy meld between what she was used to and what I could offer her.

In virtually all my curricular decisions, I place the greatest emphasis on the usefulness of my writing course in the students’ further academic careers and personal inquiries. I have experienced first-hand the effect that an empathetic, process-oriented, and culturally sensitive instructor may do for the students. Under this influence, I decided to teach writing as a means of empowering students, and it is my hope that the emphases of my instruction may lead the students to the larger understanding of writing both as a cultural artifact and a means of social change.
Chapter 3

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

While the focus of my project is to analyze the relationship between programmatic learning goals and personal teaching goals in the field of composition, this research relies heavily on an interdisciplinary consideration of sources. The reason for such consideration can be traced to the interdisciplinary nature of the context-sensitive text analysis method that was applied to study artifacts. Because the field of composition, the field of education research, and the field of education psychology carried parallel scholarly discussions about goals, the sources from all these fields allow to compose a fuller picture of the different relationships between personal teaching and programmatic learning goals. Overall, the topic of my study touches on several interconnected scholarly conversations about assessment, personal and programmatic goals, and achievement and efficacy. The field of composition informs my study in its consideration of learning outcomes, programmatic learning goals, and personal teaching goals through the works of Bob Broad, Peter Elbow, Chris Gallagher, Joseph Eng, Kathleen Yancey, Edward White, Lori Salem and Peter Jones, Glade et al., and Asao Inoue. The fields of education psychology and education research also inform my study about personal teaching goals through the works of Ruth Butler, Caroline Mansfield and Susan Beltman, YoonJung Cho and Sungok Serena Shim, and Barnes et al. Additionally, education research connects the effects of personal teaching goals, beliefs, and attitudes with student
achievement through the works of Daniels et al, and Pintrich et al. A comprehensive collection of the sources used in this research is as follows.


For an audience of academic faculty members, Barnes et al. propose that “at least some of the between-discipline variability in grade elevations is attributable to measurable differences in beliefs faculty hold about the meaning grades should convey and how grades relate to learning” (456). The authors analyze the relationship between “teaching goals, academic discipline, and grading beliefs (457). They gather data from 442 faculty participants across the nation via mailed surveys (457-459). The authors group the results using Biglan classification of academic disciplines (460). The authors find that biggest “discipline-related differences in gatekeeping scores involved,” in particular, the pure nonlife disciplines, which included English (464). They conclude their study by suggesting that faculty members form their grading beliefs “because they were taught by others who held those beliefs,” and that faculty awareness “of their own grading philosophies and the contexts in which they were developed and are sustained” may help them with validation of their assessment choices (465).

This is the first non-composition article that I found to directly relate instructor beliefs and goals to assessment; more so, it did it by including some of the English faculty into the participants’ pool. As such, this study is useful for my research for
several reasons. Particularly, its cross-disciplinary focus on undergraduate faculty aligns well with my research topic that considers the role of personal teaching goals of first year composition faculty. Additionally, it provides support for the argument that my study results may help in professional training and development of composition faculty members. Also, the knowledge that the field of composition, as part of English instruction, is one of the most susceptible to teaching goals being used as a gatekeeping rationalization in the process of student assessment should also be considered by the readers of my study who may use it for crafting their own local assessments. Finally, this study is the only one that looks at the relationship of goals and personal beliefs with programmatic expectations, and I can use this focus to further support my own research question which also looks at a relationship between two sets of goals.


For an audience of composition instructors and writing program administrators, Bob Broad maps the personal criteria by which writing teachers evaluate student writing. Through the method of dynamic criteria mapping, Broad offers his own answer to the question of what teachers really value in students’ writing (3-4). He centers his research on 50 instructors of English 1 in a fictitiously named City University and their similar, first year composition portfolio courses (16-26). Broad observes, interviews, and collects documents from most of the participants, and then does a triple concurrent, comprehensive, and close analysis of the data with subsequent verification (26-31). He identifies 89 different personal criteria that instructors use when grading the portfolios of

For an audience of teachers, Ruth Butler examines how mastery goals predict teachers’ perceptions and frequency of seeking help from their colleagues. Butler summarizes various studies to show “that goals matter because they create distinct motivational systems that are associated with qualitative differences” in how individuals
“define and evaluate success, process information, and regulate behavior” (241). The
author administers surveys and questionnaires to 320 elementary, middle, and high
school teachers across 17 Israeli schools and conducts hierarchical regression analysis of
the collected data (243-248). Butler concludes that instructors’ achievement goals are
linked with “help-related perceptions, preferences, and behavior” and suggests that they
may be linked to other teachers’ behaviors (250).

This study establishes personal teaching goals as having a direct influence over
instructors’ teaching choices. Additionally, Butler concludes that goals have the power to
influence instructors’ expectations of their students’ achievement and to shape their
teaching philosophies. The author indicates one of the directions of future research as the
need to “identify how features of the school and general educational context influence
teachers’ achievement goals for teaching as a prelude to developing policies and
programs that might foster mastery strivings, reduce strivings to avoid the demonstration
of poor ability, and support adaptive coping strategies among students and teachers alike”
(251). This need to identify the relationship among goals may be partially realized
through my research, and the article can further help me shape the focus and the
subsequent implications of my own study. In other words, I may use this article to
establish the need for studying the relationship between personal teaching and
programmatic learning goals.

Cho, YoonJung, and Sungok Serena Shim. “Predicting Teachers’ Achievement Goals for
Teaching: The Role of Perceived School Goal Structure and Teachers’ Sense of

For an audience of teachers, YoonJung Cho and Sungok Serena Shim investigate “contextual and personal factors associated with teachers’ achievement goals for teaching” (12). The authors divide teachers’ achievement goals to four distinct categories and make a prediction of teachers’ goals based on “perceived school goals” (13-14). They survey 211 primary and secondary teachers from the American Midwest (19). Then, they use hierarchical multiple regression analysis to trace a relationship between school mastery and performance goals and instructors’ mastery and performance goals (12). The authors make a case for teachers’ self-efficacy as the strongest predictor of the use of teachers’ achievement goals inside a specific school structure (13-17). The authors suggest that teachers are more likely to follow the policy of their schools; however, the authors stated that teachers with a strong sense of self-efficacy are more likely to push their goals in spite of respective school goals, while those teachers who perceive themselves as low-efficacy are likely to succumb to school goals in spite of their personal ones (18-19).

This article may help with analyzing the relationship between programmatic learning goals and personal teaching goals in terms of which goal category is more likely to be adopted by individual composition instructors. In my research, I plan to survey instructors on the number of years of experience; this source may help me see if composition instructors are more likely to adopt a certain goal system as they continue working in the field. This article may also help in clarifying what group of instructors is
more likely to favor personal teaching goals or programmatic learning goals. Such information may be of especially high value for writing program administrators in the process of updating or creating their writing programs. Specifically, if there is a correlation between age, experience, and goal preference, the WPAs can use this knowledge to address the needs of both the newer and more experienced faculty members.


For an audience of elementary and secondary school teachers, the authors establish a link between personal goals and intended classroom goals. Based on Elliot’s definitions of types of goals, the authors distinguish between mastery, performance, and performance avoidance personal goals in teaching (397). In their study, the authors administer a questionnaire to 302 pre-service teachers of elementary, middle, or secondary school level at two universities in Western Canada and their respective classes (401). They use structural equation modelling as a method of examining the possible differences between intended and institutional goals (396). The authors find similarities between the goals of the students and the goals of the teachers, the goals of the teachers and job satisfaction, and the goals of the teachers and their level of self-efficacy (400). In the study’s conclusion, the authors propose that mastery goals are more likely to translate
to a successful classroom rather than other types of personal goals, and that when teachers are put under external pressure to follow performance oriented goals, they are less likely to motivate their students (406-407). The authors suggest improving teacher-training programs with more focus on mastery goals in order to increase teacher efficacy; additionally, they outline the limitations of their study, in particular that any personal goals mentioned by the teachers must be verified by action such as “observations of actual behavior” (408).

In terms of my research, this article helps to further classify different types of goals. By showing the relationship between teachers’ personal goals and intended classroom goals, the article establishes the need for personal teaching goals to be understood as a factor of influence on students’ learning outcomes. The call for action that the authors express in the limitations of their article ties well with the data gathering part of my research that involves collecting and analyzing curriculum artifacts of the interviewed composition instructors for the purpose of tracing the relationship between personal teaching goals and programmatic learning goals. Even though I will not be observing the instructors’ behavior in the classroom as the article authors suggest, I will evaluate the provided artifacts for the signs of such behavior by looking for evidence of incorporating both programmatic learning and personal teaching goals inside writing assignments.

Addressing instructors of composition and writing program administrators, Peter Elbow presents an against-the-grain reading of the WPA Outcomes Statement. Having participated in a series of reviews and interviews that followed the implementation of the WPA outcomes, Elbow supports the Statement and acknowledges its uniqueness and complexity in the task it has accomplished by creating a set of goals for the first-year-composition classroom (177). However, Elbow turns the reader’s attention to certain perceived outcome gaps within the statement by using his own personal teaching goals as an example (178). Some of the goals that he lists as missing include “invention,” “rhetorical savviness,” and time management of the writing process (178). Additionally, the author offers to include students into the process of further revision of the WPA outcomes to ensure students find them clear and accessible (187).

In addition to being a helpful source for predicting possible questions of my readers, Elbow’s article offers a great example of a composition instructor whose personal teaching goals interact on a complex level with the programmatic learning goals of the WPA outcomes. Judging by Elbow’s description, his personal teaching goals in many areas coincide with the programmatic learning goals, and yet they also allow for the chance of goal revision. I suspect that in my study, a sizeable number of participants will follow a similar pattern with respect toward how their personal teaching goals interact with programmatic learning goals, and I may be able to use Elbow’s suggestions when I address the possible existing concerns of the readers.

Writing for composition instructors, Joseph Eng describes his process of establishing adjunct composition instructors’ “accountability for the faculty’s teaching performance and the students’ writing abilities” through the Shawnee State University pilot portfolio project (59). In particular, Eng studies the grading pattern of adjunct and tenured composition faculty members in an effort to address “a common departmental concern […] that the assigned grades, although resulting from a variety of instructional measures, should significantly reflect major composition goals, such as acquiring desired writing skills in contexts of structure, content, mechanics, and research” (60). Through comparison of 112 students’ grades and writing-skills rubric scores for writing samples collected from faculty members who taught English 112, Eng concludes that there is “no statistically significant difference” between the writing-skills rubric scores of different instructors, but that the grades awarded by adjunct faculty members are higher “than may be warranted by the writing samples of their students” (67).

Even though personal teaching goals are not the main focus of this research, it is one of the examples that does raise the question of the possible motivation behind the grades awarded by the adjunct faculty. Since grading is always a highly subjective process, understanding the personal teaching goals of those whose assessment skills are put under question may complement the general discussion of this assessment. This source inspires certain questions that my research may be able to inform, such as
inquiring about the possible personal factors that influenced the higher grades awarded by the adjunct instructors. Furthermore, SSU’s effort to standardize the grading of one course affected the assessment choices of a specific group of composition instructors. The discussion of this change, therefore, helps support my argument that the relationship between personal teaching goals and programmatic learning goals significantly influences writing programs.


For an audience of composition instructors and writing program administrators, Chris Gallagher “describes an assessment quality heuristic that allows [WPAs] to develop validation arguments framed within the principles and terms that the field and individual programs value” (10). He begins by responding to instances of local assessments such as the one described by Bob Broad and compares their merits and possible shortcomings (10-12). Then, Gallagher defines the role of a heuristic in studying individual assessments and provides an example review with four major areas of evaluation and six categories of quality review (12-14). The author then outlines the possible uses of heuristic reviews in personal and collaborative evaluations of assessment (14-16). Finally, Gallagher discusses the relationship between local and disciplinary values and offers heuristic evaluation as an opportunity to strengthen the perceived validity and reliability of local writing programs (16-21).
Although this source does not focus on personal teaching or programmatic learning goals specifically, it does continue the scholarly conversation of local assessment that was started by Bob Broad. For my study, this source offers specific references to how personal teaching goals may be perceived within larger programmatic learning goals and what is the process of their validation in the eyes of a larger scientific community. Furthermore, Gallagher offers an against-the-grain reading of local writing assessment which helps my study anticipate possible questions from the reader. Finally, Gallagher raises the need to create “multiple ways to achieve high assessment quality” on the teachers’ terms which are compatible with “local and disciplinary values,” further strengthening the focus of my study exploring the relationship between personal teaching and programmatic learning goals (20).


For an audience of composition instructors and writing program administrators, Glade et al. trace changes in the beliefs of composition instructors about the role of student writing assessment conducted via portfolio. The authors find the discussion of faculty opinion important because the changes experienced in the Washington State University assessment were reportedly initiated by the faculty (161). In order to trace the shifting opinions of the faculty, the authors interview several writing-intensive instructors and administer two surveys over a period of two years in order to gather a sense of the
instructors’ perceptions of the writing portfolio’s role in their classrooms (161-163). The authors find that in the beginning of their study, instructors are in favor of the assessment tool that would act as a “gatekeeping device” (163-165). Towards the end of the study, Glade et al. find that at least some of the instructors’ perceptions about the role of the writing portfolio were changed as a result of involvement and WAC faculty seminars (165). The authors also discover that the general understanding of the portfolio’s role in the university writing assessment has not changed because of what they describe as “need-to-know” basis (167). Finally, the authors outline the effects of their study which influenced “the faculty development program” and established “a community of writing” (167).

Unlike the other sources, this study focuses on the change of teacher personal attitudes as a result of programmatic change. In other words, if most other sources help trace the relationship in the direction from the personal teaching goals to the programmatic learning goals, this study helps to visualize the effect in reverse. Furthermore, the noticeable shift in personal attitudes, which almost always influence personal teaching goals, occurs over the period of two years. Such relatively short time of change supports the findings of my preliminary research that writing instructors can and do change their goals. Finally, this article provides ideas for further research, for example tracing the goal-relationship change over time or focusing on particular programmatic changes and their effects on subsequent personal teaching goals.

Inoue, Asao B. “Self-Assessment as Programmatic Center: The First Year Writing Program and Its Assessment at California State University, Fresno.” Composition
For an audience of writing program administrators and composition instructors, Asao Inoue provides an overview of how directed self-placement influenced the first year writing program at CSU, Fresno. The author first outlines several issues that shaped the CSUF writing program and provides a description of the program’s mission statement. Then, the author describes the structure of the program and defines the program portfolio both as a pedagogy and a program assessment device. The author uses the data from eight different areas such as passing rates and course surveys which are gathered by the program from approximately a quarter of all students completing a writing course. Using personal research analysis and the study conducted by the Office of Institutional Research, Assessment, and Planning at CSU, Inoue finds that students’ scores and retention rates are better in the CSUF direct self-placement writing program, even in comparison with similar programs such as the one at Arizona State University. The author concludes that even though the “programmatic culture” was not the original focus of the program, and it is not uniformly accepted by all teachers, “it appears to be an effective and educative culture.”

This source serves my research well as an example of how to situate my argument with regard to programmatic structure. As I was surveying this article, I realized that I would likely have to frame my argument by first describing the writing program at CSUS before I venture into comparison of programmatic learning and personal teaching goals. The minute shifts that I may notice between the two sets of goals can only be validated in
the eyes of my audience if I can also guide them through what is programmatic and what is not. This article, which shows the changes that occurred in students’ learning outcomes as a result of programmatic changes of student placement, helps me situate my argument in a manner that best fits my intended audience. More so, because this source is from my intended publication venue, and it contains examples of data tables and charts, I can use it as a visual example of how to present my argument in a rhetorically successful manner that is specifically tailored for Composition Forum.


For an audience of international education researchers, graduating and early career teachers, Caroline Mansfield and Susan Beltman examine the motivation of graduating and recently graduated Australian teachers from the perspective of their personal teaching goals. The authors gather 495 surveys with open-ended questions and analyze the responses from “a collaborative, inductive-deductive process” (54). They outline, define, and provide examples for 18 different personal teaching goals (55-58). The authors find that some of the most expressed goals include gaining employment, “continuing professional learning,” and developing teaching identity (59). Mansfield and Beltman discover “belonging to the community” to be one of the least expressed goals (59). Additionally, they find that during the survey teachers indicate avoidance goals or, in other words, those events or situations in their future teaching that they wish to avoid (61). The authors conclude their findings by stating that most of the personal teaching
goals of the participants focused on professional development and self-improvement as a teacher (63). However, the authors also caution that graduating and recently hired teachers also expressed employment gain as their main goal, which they attributed to the hiring situation in Australia (63). Finally, the authors suggest that their findings can be used for preparing teachers-in-training through professional goal planning and considering personal teaching goals within the concurrent employment situation of the area (64).

This research article can be used for the consideration of personal teaching goals changing as a result of longer teaching practice. Specifically, the findings of this source tie well with the question that I pose for the article of Joseph Eng, which considered adjunct composition instructors’ assessment practices, where I argue that the personal teaching goals of the adjunct faculty have not been taken into account. Additionally, since one of my data-gathering questions inquires about the change of goals through years of practice and another about the number of years in the field, this article could inform me on the anticipated differences in responses between different age groups among participants.


For an audience of instructors and international education researchers, Pintrich et al. create a historical overview of research on achievement goal theory. Specifically, the authors outline the research on definition and meaning of achievement goals and
generalities of their dimensions, the roles and consequences of adopting multiple goals in the classroom, and the role of classroom contextual factors such as goals in collaborative learning groups (319-331). Additionally, the authors outline current issues in the measurements of goals such as “the difference between actual and perceived classroom goals” and the “way data are aggregated or reduced” (331-334). Finally, the authors raise the problem of researching how personal goals coupled with classroom context may influence learning outcomes across all levels of education (334).

This overview of achievement goal theory is helpful to my research question in that unlike most other sources it establishes the need for my investigation at the university level when it states that “it will become critical to investigate the effects associated with adopting multiple goals, how varying levels of these goals affect outcomes, and how goal endorsement varies at elementary, middle, high school, or university levels” (334). In other words, this article can help me tie together the research from the field of education and the field of composition by establishing a need to research the subject in the same context. Furthermore, the study urges researchers “to become more consistent in the meanings they adopt and in their operationalization of achievement goals” which will help me bring together the differing classifications of teaching goals in the literature review of my study (334).

For an audience of composition instructors and writing program administrators, Lori Salem and Peter Jones explore personal attitudes of the writing-intensive instructors at Temple University. The authors focus on commonality in beliefs and attitudes as well as possible correlations between faculty qualities and facts, such as the amount of experience in teaching writing, and their personal attitudes towards composition instruction (60-62). The authors investigate 25 faculty members in the recorded group discussions and 140 faculty members through e-mail surveys (62-65). Then, they perform cluster analysis of the findings to uncover the distribution of the five factors of influence on the teaching experience of the respondents (65-66). From these, Salem and Jones identify five typical profiles based on similar personal attitudes towards teaching writing, including “the undaunted crusaders,” “the self-critical/humble colleague,” “confident but resentful colleagues,” “on-time victims of pure communication,” and the “outliers” (66-75). The authors conclude that faculty attitudes should be “understood as multidimensional and interrelated collection of factors” and, as such, must be considered as systems of beliefs (75-76). The authors also challenge the beliefs that composition instructors’ attitudes can be understood better with certain shared demographic factors, faculty proximity, or frequent voicing in discussions (76-77). Finally, the authors describe the immediate and long-term implications of studying the personal attitudes of writing instructors, including adjusted advertisement techniques and the need for faculty recognition, and suggested further professional support for composition instructors.

This is one of the few articles I found that considers writing instructors, personal teaching, and programmatic aspects together in one study. The five categories of attitudes
defined and outlined in this article can help me establish an even better link between personal teaching and programmatic learning goals because they describe instructors’ grading philosophies and elucidate the focus that the writing intensive instructors adopt in order to evaluate their class and teaching efficacy. More importantly, this article articulates immediate changes that were implemented as a result of considering the personal teaching attitudes of the respondents. The suggested changes vary from advertisement adjustment to rethinking the focus of professional development workshops. Such examples would be very valuable for establishing the practical relevancy of my research in that it allows me to argue both for long-term and short-term changes depending on the results I may receive.


For an audience of composition instructors and writing program administrators, Edward White offers an introduction of how the WPA Outcomes Statement came to fruition. He recalls that its creation was heralded by the need to come up with a device for student first year writing placement (3). It was then that he discovered just how different each first year writing course was from all the others since instructors’ personal teaching choices often differed substantially across the different first year writing courses of the university (3-4). The author explains that this need to implement a structure in the first year writing program was what pushed the development of the Outcomes Statement (4-
Then, White outlines the difference between the outcomes and standards, and warns against excessive standardization of the field (6-7). Finally, the author presents the book itself as the place for exploration of the contemporary questions about the use of the WPA outcomes in the classroom (7).

This article directly relates to my research design in that the WPA outcomes were created as a result of inquiry about personal teaching goals. The same process of inquiry and systematizing can be used for understanding the relationship between the personal teaching goals today and the programmatic learning goals which were very likely influenced by the WPA Outcomes Statement. Furthermore, the article enables me to better craft my interview and questionnaire through its examples of the posed questions that have often been left unanswered.


For an audience of composition instructors and writing program administrators, Kathleen Yancey offers an interpretation of what outcomes are by contrasting them with objectives and standards. She begins by focusing on the process of creating learning objectives for writing classes in the 1970s, which she describes as the process of deciding on what criteria students should be tested (18). Then, she describes the implementation of standards in the 1990s, and she offers both their role as a democratizing venue for educational opportunities and a precursor of a standardized curriculum (19-21). Finally,
Yancey outlines the outcomes as focusing on “the what of education” (21). She also notes that outcomes offer a chance for very different curriculums since they outline the learning goals and not the means to reach them, and she concludes that outcomes push instructors to think “not of what’s barely doable, but of what’s visionary for our students – and for ourselves” (23).

Though this source does not directly discuss the topic of personal teaching goals, but instead focuses on the historical types of programmatic learning goals, it is useful for my study in that it provides a concise overview of how programmatic learning goals evolved in the last several decades. Also, this article supports the idea of a complex relationship between the different types of goals since if an institution could have more than one system of outcomes to follow, with local and national ones sometimes coming into opposition, so could the personal teaching goals of individual instructors within one program be “plotted against” the programmatic learning goals of that same institution (22). Finally, the article provides the idea that outcomes, whether personal or programmatic, do not exclude differences in personal teaching choices, and in my study those differences will likely serve as the main indicator of personal teaching goals manifesting themselves in each respective curriculum.
Chapter 4

RESEARCH ARTICLE

INTRODUCTION

In his discussion of “The Origin of the Outcomes Statement,” Edward White noted how teachers’ “differing goals and expectations” posed a difficulty in the placement of students into writing courses, and it is this difficulty that eventually led to the drafting of the 1996 WPA Outcomes (4). The creators of the WPA Outcomes Statement reconciled different learning goals through a list of expected outcomes of student overall course achievement, and in the process they separated the notion of “outcomes” from the notion of “standards,” stating that “agreement on outcomes does not require agreement on a single best way to achieve those outcomes” (5). To further the distinction between outcomes and standards, Kathleen Yancey stated that outcomes allow freedom of “curricular specifics” such as “different teaching styles, diverse pedagogies, multiple kinds of assignments, direct and indirect response strategies, and so on” (18). Over the years, the WPA Outcomes Statement created a large scholarly discussion that branched out across all composition from writing across the curriculum to digital literacies. The debate included those who voiced a sense of unease about the move to generalize personal teaching goals, but even these statement challengers noted that specifying teaching goals was ultimately the right decision that led to some consensus in the field (Elbow 177-178). Still, a feeling may linger that something is missing from this
discussion of personal teaching goals within outcomes, assessment, and writing program evaluation, and that something seems to be the consideration of teachers’ personal goals.

Chris Gallagher raised such concerns when he established the importance of creating a local assessment that writing teachers would value. Gallagher notes that in comparison with standardized tests, local assessment is often perceived as less objective in terms of validity and reliability, which in turn calls “into question faculty’s assessment capacity” (20). This issue, Gallagher believes, creates the need to find multiple ways of achieving “high assessment quality” that includes both the “local and disciplinary values” (20). Particularly, he establishes the need to “develop methods [of validation] that are rooted in local interpretations of disciplinary values and the local values of [writing] programs while being intelligible to audiences beyond [these] programs” (11). Gallagher argues that in order to do that, “participants first need to decide which criteria are most important to them, and then they need to decide what those criteria mean and how they would be realized and documented in assessment practice” (16). If the participating instructors do evaluate local criteria through the lens of personal importance, the suggested evaluation process implies that at least some of these criteria may correlate with the personal teaching goals of the instructors. Such correlation in turn suggests that personal teaching goals may inform not just the original WPA Outcomes but also current writing programs that tailor their assessment methods specifically to their institutions. Yet in the field of composition, the study of personal teaching goals has been largely treated with caution, and the discussion of the subject is often subsumed into the larger topics of learning outcomes and writing program evaluation. The lack of a separate
scholarly conversation on such an important inherent factor of high-stakes decision-making within writing programs calls for a better understanding of the programmatic role of personal teaching goals. For example, not much is known about how instructors perceive personal teaching goals within the programmatic learning goals provided by their respective institutions and how these personal teaching goals actually affect the classroom. Therefore, in order to inform the ongoing debate on the role and effect of personal teaching goals within composition praxis, this study asks composition instructors to identify what skills they value most as the positive learning outcomes of their students and then compares their personal teaching goals with the programmatic learning goals, explicitly noticing how they manifest in the course curriculum. By doing this, the study hopes to consider the perception of the participating writing instructors towards the relationship between their personal teaching and programmatic learning goals, and it aims to inform readers about the possible complications in the research on personal teaching goals.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Within the field of composition, the topic of personal teaching goals is most often present in the discussion of programmatic learning outcomes. Outside of the field of composition, there also exists a body of research that focuses on personal teaching goals. A detailed classification of personal teaching goals has been established in the fields of educational research and educational psychology, where the discussion of personal teaching goals has been ongoing for the last thirty years.
The need to understand the relationship between programmatic learning goals and personal teaching goals has been established from the inception of the WPA Outcomes Statement. When describing the difference between outcomes and standards, Kathleen Yancey mentioned a range in the cohesion of personal and programmatic goals’ interaction. Outcomes served as curricular frameworks, but any person or institution could understand the end goal of student learning differently within the same outcomes. According to Yancey, such freedom of outcomes’ interpretation meant that an institution could have more than one system of outcomes working at once, and several writing programs were mentioned as having their local outcomes “plotted against” the national ones (22). This opposition was actually seen as beneficial by Yancey because outcomes

---

**Figure 1. Study of Goals in the Fields of Composition and Education Psychology**

The need to understand the relationship between programmatic learning goals and personal teaching goals has been established from the inception of the WPA Outcomes Statement. When describing the difference between outcomes and standards, Kathleen Yancey mentioned a range in the cohesion of personal and programmatic goals’ interaction. Outcomes served as curricular frameworks, but any person or institution could understand the end goal of student learning differently within the same outcomes. According to Yancey, such freedom of outcomes’ interpretation meant that an institution could have more than one system of outcomes working at once, and several writing programs were mentioned as having their local outcomes “plotted against” the national ones (22). This opposition was actually seen as beneficial by Yancey because outcomes
allowed for variability without being invasive. Moreover, this variability transferred to individual instructors’ decisions as long as “the students’ final performance” was kept in sight (23). These “many legitimate ways to get to Rome” were meant to allow diversity and freedom in the faculty approach to student learning, but it seems that they did not address the potential for personal teaching goals flying under the radar of the programmatic language (23).

Peter Elbow presented some of these missing personal teaching goals in his against-the-grain reading of the WPA Outcomes Statement. Having participated in a series of reviews and interviews that followed the implementation of the WPA Outcomes, Elbow supported the Statement and acknowledged its uniqueness and complexity in the task it has accomplished by creating a set of goals for the first-year-composition classroom. However, Elbow turned the reader’s attention to certain perceived outcome gaps within the statement by using his own personal teaching goals as an example. Some of the goals that he listed as missing included “invention,” “rhetorical savviness,” and time management of the writing process (178). Additionally, Elbow suggested to include students in the process of further revision of the WPA Outcomes to ensure that students find them clear and accessible. This example almost certainly does not invalidate any programmatic learning goals, but instead it should point our attention to understanding the relationship between the two – the programmatic and the personal.

An attempt to trace personal teaching goals within programmatic assessment was made in 2003, when Bob Broad raised the same concerns of validating personal assessment in the book *What We Really Value: Beyond Rubrics in Teaching and*
Assessing Writing. While focusing on writing rubrics, Broad echoed some of the questions raised by Elbow in his commentary on the WPA Outcomes about what individual teacher’s beliefs, values, and expectations are overlooked in the process of setting the programmatic writing rubric (Broad 3; Elbow 179). Broad assumed that “a teacher of writing cannot provide an adequate account of his rhetorical values just by sitting down and reflecting on them; neither can a WPA provide an adequate account of the values of her writing program by thinking about them or even by talking about them in general terms with her writing instructors” (3). In order to give a fuller picture of the personal teaching goals of the instructors within his institution, Broad used the method of dynamic criteria mapping based on observations of norming sessions, personal interviews, and concurrent, comprehensive, and close evaluative analyses of the produced documents. Based on this analysis, he outlined three large sets of criteria that teacher-participants use when assessing students’ writing: textual criteria connected with “the qualities or features of the text being judged,” contextual criteria that are “not directly related to the text being judged,” and other factors that were additional circumstances which could not be added under the previous two categories (34). In total, Broad mapped 89 different criteria and values that teachers used in assessing student’s writing. Among the possible uses of the results, he offered the findings along with his dynamic criteria mapping method as suggestions for professional and writing program development and evaluation. However, as has been noted multiple times both by Broad and by the creators of the WPA Outcomes, personal teaching goals may affect much more than just local assessment, and it is that global scope of effects that this study is hoping to explore.
While the present study could not explore the possible relationship between the personal teaching goals of the participants and the full set of Broad’s criteria, its reflective nature coupled with the small number of participants did allow for some of the most global of the textual and contextual dynamic criteria to be considered in the process of the research. Still, the similarities between those few dynamic criteria and the personal teaching goals of my participants were so great that they made Broad’s dynamic criteria framework the most insightful for the analysis of my findings.

Since Broad’s study, interest in the field of composition has shifted from personal teaching goals to attitudes towards teaching writing. In a recent example, Lori Salem and Peter Jones explored personal attitudes of writing-intensive (WI) instructors at Temple University “as multidimensional and interrelated collection of factors” which, as they found, formed frameworks of instructors’ beliefs (75-77). These resulting frameworks varied widely because individual participants understood what teaching a WI course means differently; for example, a fairly common belief of Salem and Jones’ participants that students are poorly prepared for a WI course resulted with some teachers regarding their WI course as a waste of time and others framing WI as a “worthwhile and satisfying” work which demands recognition from the university (76). On the surface, any relationship between personal teaching goals and Salem and Jones’ frameworks of personal attitudes towards teaching writing seems tenuous because the former focus on the end goal of student learning while the latter reflect on the personal aspects of being in the profession. However, respondents in the study often found it difficult to explain and separate those various aspects of the personal, and that difficulty seemed to point to a
possible link between personal attitudes and personal teaching goals that is caused by misinterpretation. According to Salem and Jones, that misinterpretation in turn carries the danger of harmful representation of a participant as happened in their examples of misinterpreted instructors’ “‘resistance’ to aspects of the writing program” or the behaviors that remained unexplained since the underlying attitudes that formed them were missed (61). As a result, their study highlights the value of continuing research of the personal aspects of being a composition instructor since it may help prevent the misinterpretation of instructors’ beliefs, behaviors, and decisions (61). Since personal teaching goals are technically instructors’ personal attitudes, beliefs, and decisions about the end goal of students’ learning, it is not unreasonable to suggest that many aspects or conflicts researched in personal attitudes towards writing might be also applied to the study of personal teaching goals, and that much like personal attitudes, personal teaching goals may be in danger of being simply missed or misinterpreted in the context of the whole writing program. Continuing the discussion of personal teaching goals and their relationship to programmatic learning goals alongside the current conversation on personal attitudes may, therefore, prove vital for taking a more metacognitive look at what effect personal decisions may have on instructors and, by extension, their students.

Moreover, exploring how and in what ways these personal teaching goals interact with programmatic learning goals may be useful not just to individuals but to writing programs and, respectively, to their educational institution because, much like with Salem and Jones’ study, such research allows us to see where personal bias overshadows the researchers’ and WPA’s understanding of the individual instructor’s choices and where
instructors’ bias comes into play when incorporating the programmatic learning goals into the curriculum. Such consideration of personal teaching goals would not be unique, as a similar scholarly discussion already exists in the neighboring fields of educational research and educational psychology.

**Personal Teaching Goals and Educational Psychology**

In the field of educational research and educational psychology, most of the current research on personal teaching goals may be traced back to Carole Ames. In 1984, Ames laid the groundwork for the analysis of teachers’ systems of motivation, which she linked to personal teaching goals and values. She identified “three systems of teacher motivation [...] corresponding to an ability, task mastery, or moral responsibility orientation” (546). Under the first ability, “evaluative motivational system,” Ames identified the main concern of the teacher to be ego protection when the motivation of the teacher consisted of demonstrating high ability and avoiding demonstration of low ability (546). Both of these premises were shown to be connected with the idea of maintaining control in the classroom. In “moral responsibility” the teacher’s concern resided with preserving the student’s ego, which resulted in the attribution of any failure on the part of the student towards the teacher (546). Finally, in the “task mastery” goal orientation system, the teacher’s values were oriented away from ego and towards external tasks at hand, and so the teacher’s main concern became accomplishment of the set educational goals (547). The main conclusion of Ames’ work proposed not just linking the effects of motivational systems on learning but conducting “a microanalysis of both motivational and learning related cognitions and their interactions as they are related to different goals and/or value
orientations” (553). The purpose of such investigation, according to Ames, would be the creation of an instructional theory that “describes and explains the interactions of teacher and student cognitive activities in the context of different motivational systems” (553). What is important here to note for the field of composition is how strongly personal bias of the instructors in Ames’ study affected the perception of their role in the classroom. Even though that study was oriented at the field of educational psychology, the field of composition should still pay attention to the bias aspect of the discussion, specifically because composition is one of the fields most prone to personal bias, at least when it comes to student learning assessment. This bias claim stems from a 2001 study when Barnes et al. found that the field of English is among several disciplines that have the biggest “discipline-related differences in gatekeeping scores” related to personal bias (460-464). They suggested that faculty members form their grading beliefs “because they were taught by others who held those beliefs,” and that faculty awareness “of their own grading philosophies and the contexts in which they were developed and are sustained” may help them with the validation of their assessment choices (465). Again, much like with personal attitudes on teaching writing, the relationship between grading beliefs and personal teaching goals may seem tenuous on the surface, and yet these two aspects share a tight connection since a personal belief about what should be the end goal of student’s learning will almost certainly influence the way that student’s learning is assessed throughout the course. In other words, understanding one’s grading philosophy can help an instructor retrace their way to understanding what it is that they personally expect their students to learn.
One possible way to become more aware of one’s personal grading philosophy would be for an individual instructor to make their personal teaching goals explicit and compare them with the programmatic learning goals of the institution. This may not be an easy task though since personal goals are many and varied, but the field of education research presents an extensive system of personal goal categorization that an interested composition instructor may use. Paul Pintrich et al. created a notable overview of such system as part of their work on achievement goal theory where they outlined the definition and meaning of achievement goals, the roles and consequences of adopting multiple goals in the classroom, and the role of classroom contextual factors such as goals in collaborative learning groups. The team outlined two broad categories of achievement goals by applying student learning goal categories that were outlined in 1992 by Carole Ames. The first category included mastery goals that "reflect a focus on developing competence, learning, and understanding the task and the use of self-referenced standards of improvement" and are more commonly associated with the quality of learning (320). The second category was named performance goals that focus on "demonstrating competence" through standard scores, norms, and other quantifiable results of learning (320). It is very likely that most composition instructors have personal teaching goals belonging to both of these categories simultaneously, but it is just as likely that individual personal teaching goals could favor either mastery or performance. The self-identification of where exactly personal teaching goals fit within these categories could bring a composition instructor potential improvement since the body of education research seems to favor the mastery-oriented goals (Butler; Corkett, Hutt, and Benevides;
Stronge et al). In the more recent 2013 example of such conclusions, Daniels et al. established a link between personal goals and intended classroom goals, further distinguishing between mastery, performance, and the newer category of performance avoidance personal goals – the goal to never appear incompetent in front of students. Daniels et al. proposed that mastery goals are more likely to translate to a successful classroom rather than other types of personal goals, and that when teachers are put under external pressure to follow the performance oriented goals, they are less likely to motivate their students. Additionally, they suggested improving teacher-training programs with more focus on mastery goals in order to increase efficacy of the teachers and even cautioned that any personal goals mentioned by the teachers must be verified by action such as “observations of actual behavior” (408). Of course, having every instructor observed for signs of a certain goal category is unwieldy and complex. However, that does not mean that a proposal for behavior observation by Daniels et al. should be completely discounted because it may lead to a practice that composition instructors are well familiar with – self-reflection. If an instructor is unsure of where exactly his or her personal teaching goals fit into the classroom, self-identifying the place their personal teaching goals occupy on the sliding scale of mastery and performance could be a start to understanding their own curricular choices, and since personal teaching goals can be difficult to observe in action for the one who possesses them, this study attempts to aid that process through an example of a qualitative overview of the relationship between personal teaching and programmatic learning goals.

RESEARCH DESIGN
The study was conducted in an English department at a large, urban state university with multiple sections of a one-semester first-year composition (FYC) course and a stretch composition course. These courses are taught by approximately fifty lecturers as well as ten to fifteen TAs and several tenured composition faculty. The writing program provides six programmatic learning goals that are shared in all FYC courses (see Appendix A). In order to better understand the effects personal teaching goals may have in their concurrent implementation with these programmatic learning goals, this study focuses on the following questions:

1. To what extent do instructors’ personal learning goals connect with the FYC program goals?
2. To what extent are instructors’ personal goals different than the FYC program goals?
3. Are there patterns among the various personal teaching goals of first-year composition instructors?
4. How much emphasis do instructors put on each personal teaching goal?

To triangulate the highly subjective topic of personal teaching goals, three data-collection methods were used: questionnaires, interviews, and a qualitative comparison of the syllabi and/or writing assignments provided by the teachers. In the initial stage, printed questionnaires were distributed to the English department lecturers, teaching assistants, and tenured composition faculty members (see Appendix B). The questionnaire contained a description of the research, the definitions of personal teaching goals and programmatic learning goals, as well as two types of questions. The first type
of question established the instructors’ background by asking about the length and the type of their teaching experience. The second type of question focused on the teachers’ personal goals. Participants were asked to provide answers anonymously in order to minimize any possible risk of criticism that may be associated with this topic. They were also asked to indicate whether they would like to participate in a follow-up interview. These volunteers were contacted, and during the interview they were asked to provide artifacts from their class curriculum which included a copy of their favorite assignment prompt and a corresponding syllabus.

Five interviews were conducted with four female and one male instructor. For the sake of confidentiality these participants will be given the pseudonyms Lucy, Jenny, Joanna, Michelle, and James. At the time of this study, Jenny and James were full-time lecturers, while Lucy, Joanna, and Michelle held a Teaching Associate position while simultaneously attending the graduate program. All five participants taught a first-year composition course at the time of the interview, and each one of their classes was a portfolio-based course. The interview discussion points initially focused on establishing a comfortable line of communication with the interviewee through questions about their reasons for entering the field and educational background. Then, depending on the answers provided in the questionnaire, the interviews focused on the types of assignments that were given to students and the most important skills that interviewees believed students should gain in a composition classroom. Instructors were asked to describe their favorite assignment and, if possible, provide the interviewer with a copy of that assignment and a course syllabus.
The resulting data packets turned out to be highly context-sensitive, as no single assignment could be fully understood without the accompanying syllabus and no single interview was fully informative without some accompanying written artifact. Such heavy context reliance demanded a research method that was highly flexible, interdisciplinary, and not strictly bound by a single method. Therefore, a context-sensitive text analysis was used to locate the presence and implementation of personal teaching and programmatic learning goals, and then the findings were compared with the answers from the interview discussions and questionnaires. The reading of the artifacts and the review of the recordings was conducted under the assumption that reported information “is no longer simply an artifact of the writing process but is the primary and essential link between writer and reader;” in other words, a close discourse analysis was conducted with the data in search of the participants’ purposes, intentions, and goals (Huckin and Flower 347). The self-reported personal teaching goals of the study participants were compared with the programmatic learning goals for first-year composition established by the writing program of the same institution. In the words of Thomas Huckin, the data interpretation was not meant to “insist on any one interpretation of findings” but rather assemble enough evidence to make a strong case about the relationships of various goals (89).

FINDINGS

The overall findings of this study placed the personal teaching goals of the participants into two distinct categories. The first category presents five personal teaching goals that
overlap with the programmatic learning goals. The first three were mentioned by all participants while the last two were upheld by the majority. The second category moves beyond the language of the programmatic learning goals and presents the personal teaching goals not included in programmatic goals.

*Personal Teaching Goals within Programmatic Learning Goals*

Several FYC programmatic learning goals stress collaboration and community, and they were mentioned as a personal teaching goal by all of my study’s participants. James especially saw the two goals as interrelated and consistently named community engagement and collaboration as his two emphases in his questionnaire, artifacts, and interview. The writing assignment he provided as his favorite during the interview, for example, involves interviewing a professional in the student’s field about the writing that he or she does while another writing assignment he indicates in his questionnaire is called “Writing Partners” and asks students to spend a day in the local community center or elementary school. Jenny also placed a heavy emphasis on collaboration in all researched aspects of her goal orientation. Her curriculum led to the culminating collaborative project in which students were given sources and then had to work in groups to develop the prompt, draft, revise, and present to the class what they have learned. Likewise, Lucy, Jenny and Joanna saw collaboration between students as part of community engagement, which all three of them defined as safety for students to share ideas, to respectfully disagree, and to learn from one another. Additionally, they reported collaboration with students as another aspect of their personal teaching goals. Joanna, for example, stated in her syllabus with regard to her first assignment, “This is my favorite part of our semester,
and I look forward to collaborating with you on this assignment.” In short, community and collaboration was found to be one of the two most aligned personal and programmatic goals in this study.

The second most aligned personal teaching goal included two categories that were reported by participants hand-in-hand – critical thinking and rhetorical awareness. Similarly to collaboration and community, this goal infuses language from several programmatic learning goals as well. Surprisingly, not a single participant of my study indicated this goal as their personal priority in the preliminary questionnaire but rather it was revealed through their artifacts, and only a couple of the participants chose to mention them during the interview. While the reasons for that are difficult to determine, a statement from Joanna about rhetorical skills could shed some light about the possible explanation. In it, Joanna described her rhetorical analysis essay as her least favorite assignment which she regarded as a “pain” and assigned only because of the perceived benefit to students. “I sludge through it every semester, and I hate it,” she states, “I do it because I think it’s so critically important.” The overall impression from these two sets of personal teaching goals is that critical thinking and rhetorical skills were perceived by the study participants as a “must” rather than “want,” and therefore often regarded as self-understood in the composition classroom. This might explain why these goals are also mostly stressed in the syllabi where Jenny, for example, wrote in the course description “we need critical thinking and reading skills,” and where Joanna devotes half the first page paraphrasing and breaking down the FYC goals with emphasis on critical analysis and rhetorical awareness. Of course, this does not mean that participating teachers do not
count critical thinking and rhetorical skills as important goals; likely, it indicates that teachers do not consider them *personal*. Regardless of their attitude, three participants worked them into their curricula if not in the first then definitely by the second unit of the semester, and all of them planned to fulfill those goals by the end of their course. The level of practice and the level of personal conflict between what is perceived as beneficial and what is perceived as secondary could likely mean that programmatic learning goals have a way of influencing personal teaching goals to the extent that instructors may not really be able to draw the line that separates their values from those of an institution, rendering them effectively aligned.

The last personal teaching goal included study skills and work ethic and aligned with the first programmatic learning goal. All five respondents of this study reported instilling “study skills” in their students as one of their personal teaching goals. Only three respondents indicated those skills in their questionnaire, and only two out of three confirmed their goal of nurturing study skills during the interview. As Michelle indicated in her interview with regard to the larger role of first year composition classroom, “It’s almost like a boot camp.” Similarly, during the interview Jenny defined “study skills” as “training to be a student in an academic world” that included effective reading strategies such as skimming and understanding that writing begins before the prompt. Her syllabus similarly reflected such expectations by stating among other things that, “those students who complete all informal work, whether they are struggling or having difficulties rarely fail my course.” The other two respondents indicated study skills and work ethic in their syllabus as a must for the completion of the class. James, for example, stated in his
syllabus to this students, “Be ready to hit the ground running!” but neither of the two respondents stressed the importance of work ethic as their personal teaching goal during the interview.

Among the goals preferred by the majority, four out of five participants of my study indicated writing process as one of their personal teaching goals though only two, Lucy and James, immediately noted this goal in the questionnaire, and only James consistently indicated writing process as one of his personal teaching goals in the syllabus and in the interview. A good example of such an expectation is featured in James’s syllabus where in his course description he states “but more importantly, it will help you learn that writing is a process that you can work on, and that you can improve your writing if you follow certain practices.” During the interview, his rationale for that was that students will implicitly fulfill the goals by developing their writing process. Similarly, when speaking about the most important skills students could gain in a composition classroom, Joanna indicated that “writing process is probably more important than rhetorical skills.” The emphasis that these participants put on the writing process generally aligned with the key programmatic learning goal of helping students to develop a metacognitive understanding of writing as a communal process (Appendix A). It should be noted, however, that specifically James did not seem to perceive those goals as fully aligned, yet the full influence of that perception is difficult to judge since the participant cut the conversation short. When explaining the personal importance of the writing process, James stated that even though he pays attention to the six programmatic goals, he doesn’t ask his students to focus on the language of these goals and urges them
to think “how to be a better writer” without delving, for example, into a metacognitive aspect of understanding the writing process “because then [the class has] to spend ten minutes talking about what ‘metacognitive’ means.” When citing the programmatic goal of “metacognitive understanding of the writing process,” James stated that he didn’t completely eliminate it, but that he also didn’t think his students had to worry about “what the composition community… or composition language thinks about the process.” Explaining his choice further, James defined his goals as “holistic goals” which he then juxtaposed to some other set of goals – an inference that can be made by judging his next words “and not” which were followed by a significant pause. Unfortunately, James never completed that sentence and switched the subject, leaving the opposing set of goals unnamed.

Finally, three participants included metacognition as their personal teaching goal, which also aligns with the third programmatic learning goal. Participants implemented this goal in various ways. Lucy assigned her first self-reflective narrative essay to the students asking them why they write. Joanna asked students to be metacognitive about their discourse community through constructing a discourse community manual, and James asked his students to interview professionals in their majors about the kinds of writing that they do. His assignment was multi-step and urged students to use “four different ways of looking at the [subject]” they’re interested in, and James described this assignment as having a real effect on his students, with “some changing their majors.” Similarly, Jenny, who did not focus much on metacognition in any of the presented
written artifacts, did name the peer response letters where students reflected on writing as her favorite because they told her more about student’s progress than their actual writing.

*Personal Teaching Goals beyond Programmatic Learning Goals*

In general, the language of the programmatic learning goals seems to favor the development of collaborative skills among student writers (Appendix A). In contrast, all five participants mentioned writer’s confidence and independence as their personal teaching priority. Lucy, for example, wrote in her questionnaire, “I must say though that one of my ‘non-programmatic’ goals that isn’t necessarily explicitly mentioned in the FYC Goals is my desire to instill my students with confidence.” Jenny, in an even more vivid example, builds her whole class curriculum around developing students’ independence and confidence as writers. Students’ independence was the first among the personal teaching goals which she reported during the interview, and she defined it as leading her students towards “knowing something intuitively,” whether it would be where to search for information or what parts of the reading to pick and choose for the analysis.

Her course featured scaffolding towards that goal of independence where throughout the semester students were given a series of assignments that promoted proactive decision-making until they reached the culminating self-sponsored essay. Students were given six sources to read, and they were expected to present and discuss these readings to the class by a certain date. After that, they had to produce an essay based on the readings and class discussion. Jenny did not specify essay requirements such as topic, length, or format.

According to the prompt description, the purpose of this writing assignment was to show how students can apply everything they have learned during the semester. Furthermore,
students did not receive instructor feedback, the premise being that students should be able to incorporate the lessons taught on their own. Jenny aimed with this assignment to “let them sort of struggle through it” because in the process of fulfilling it she could “watch them apply what they’ve been doing” the entire semester.

Another thing that programmatic learning goals do not explicitly center attention on is the students’ achievement beyond first year composition. Surely, transferability lurks in the language of most of the programmatic goals such as those that talk about textual conventions or engaging with discourse communities. However, it turns out that for all three TA participants, transferability of skills learned in the class was perhaps the greatest priority, and the emphasis they placed on it as well as time they invested in explaining their vision of it hints that for these participants transferability was not an assumed part of the programmatic learning goals but a personal vision. In fact, they often saw their own previously mentioned personal teaching goals in light of transferability. When Joanna, for example, stressed the importance of being able to enter the academic conversation and her aspiration to prepare students for that conversation, her reasoning was, “that is a transferable skill that you can use in everything.” When Lucy assigned a research proposal and annotated bibliography to her students, she saw it as a requirement for the following classes and courses rather than first year composition, which was evidenced by her not requiring to follow through with research. It is not that she did not deem research important. According to the interview, focusing just on the annotated bibliography and the proposal taught her students the same transferable skills that they could later apply when they wrote “real” research. Similarly, even though Michelle did
not mention application in other courses in her syllabus or writing assignments, in response to what she would like her students to remember from her course five years down the line, she wrote, “That they worked hard and found the skills they learned to be applicable to other classes.”

Although it is not ever advisable to generalize on the basis of several participants’ responses, one similarity should be noted between the reasons for why the participants of my study chose certain personal goals over others. Virtually everyone, in written form or during the interview, stated that the reason for them choosing something was their own experience. A vivid example is Lucy, who based several of her goals, including transferability, independence, and building the community, by “drawing on [her] own weaknesses.” Her history of being “lectured at” was what prompted her to urge her students to work collaboratively and raise their writer’s confidence. Obviously, none of the programmatic learning goals urges students to learn from instructor’s experience, though it is not unreasonable to believe that any first-year composition instructor is likely the most experienced writing student in the class. There is also a possibility that my interview questions, which asked about personal experience prior to choosing the composition track, could have influenced such responses. However, any further connections or conclusions would require a much larger pool of study participants.

CONCLUSION

The original aim of this study was to consider the effects personal teaching goals may have during their concurrent implementation with programmatic learning goals. Composition instructors were asked to identify what skills they value most as the positive
learning outcomes of their students, and their personal teaching goals were compared with the programmatic learning goals and their course curriculum. The emphases that these individual participants placed on their goals were explored in hopes of finding the extent of connection, opposition, and the possible patterns between their goals. However, the resulting findings showed that a complex relationship between the programmatic and the personal exists not in the patterns of goals per se but in the instructors’ perception of their personal teaching goals and the resulting conversation about them, and the need to re-evaluate the methods with which personal teaching goals are inquired about became the most surprising result of this study.

Specifically, when during the interview any participant discussed what he or she may have perceived as opposition to programmatic learning goals or when he or she shared personal teaching goals that potentially might not find immediate support with their colleagues, all subjects expressed serious discomfort at continuing the conversation. Possible participants’ discomfort was an anticipated part of this project, and all required steps were taken to ensure the respondents’ privacy. Still, whenever participants approached an aspect of their personal teaching goals that seemed like it might not meet the approval of their colleagues, complications arose. Participants would begin to describe the perceived incongruences with the programmatic language, but as in James’s example on the importance on the writing process, they would reach a couple of words that seemed to hint at conflict or disagreement and trail off mid-sentence. Often, an uncomfortable pause would ensue after that. In one case, the participant stated that they “probably said too much already” on the issue while being recorded. In another, the
participant spent about ten to fifteen minutes after the interview to review the privacy policy with the researcher, making sure that the recording would be disposed of properly. This stretch of time may seem normal, but the actual length of the interview with the participant was slightly over fourteen minutes. This means that the participant spent just as much, if not more, attempting to preclude any possible ramifications as they did answering the questions. Such examples lead to the conclusion that any methods of data collection in the future studies where personal teaching goals are considered need careful selection and perhaps even modification in order to ensure not just the integrity of the researcher’s work but also the personal safety and comfort of the study participants.

While the small number of participants and the possible complications resulting from the chosen data collection method preclude any generalization, several impressions that could merit further inquiry with more participants were formed as a result of this research. The first impression generated by the findings was that the personal teaching goals mentioned in this study almost never directly conflicted with the programmatic learning goals. On the other hand, the personal guard that the participants exhibited with respect to their teaching goals seemed to affect the extent to which they were willing to explain the place their personal teaching goals have in praxis. One does wonder how much more genuine the provided data could have been if the writing instructors did not feel the need to safeguard their responses. The personal teaching goals that instructors did explain almost perfectly fell in line with the programmatic learning goals, judging by the common expectations of what students should be able to achieve in the writing course. However, the alignment of personal teaching goals with programmatic expectations
exhibited by these study participants should not be taken as a sign that further research on personal teaching goals carries no danger to the professional image of the prospective participants, and the personal fears that any future participants may voice in such discussions should invariably be treated with due respect. In order to ensure higher data accuracy and research safety, the participants’ perception of the potential danger that a conversation about personal teaching goals might bring should definitely be considered in the future studies.

The second impression that was formed concerned the difference between the way personal teaching goals were expressed in speech and in written artifacts. Often, personal teaching goals revealed themselves only in the process of combined text and audio analysis, and questionnaires alone were not sufficient for adequate interpretation of personal intentions since participants often provided very brief written responses. Also, all participants seemed to be willing to continue discussing their personal teaching goals well after the interview was over, which hinted at time constraints being an influential factor in how much respondents ultimately disclose to the researcher. The small number of participants of course makes it difficult to discern any clear pattern in the time it takes instructors to begin revealing their personal goals. However, almost all participants towards the end of the interview referred to the beginning of their discussion by indicating revisions and additions to their earlier responses and sometimes even reconsidering their previous statements entirely. It was as if consideration of their own personal teaching goals was new to them, and the interview was the first time they have tried to audibly reconcile their goals with the programmatic language. If such conjecture
is true, any future research on personal teaching goals would have to consider the possibility that the research itself is the first time composition instructors may explicitly consider the matter at question. Thus, the combination of multiple data sources and longer conversation periods may also provide higher data accuracy in the future studies on personal teaching goals.

The ultimate result of this research showed that the participating writing instructors do perceive their personal teaching goals as valuable and often pivoting aspects of their curriculum planning, and the proliferation of how their personal teaching goals affected the classroom hints at further consideration of these goals in the overall composition instruction. The conversation about personal teaching goals seems to have pushed the study participants to explicitly consider their existing teaching choices, thereby offering them a chance of self-reflection and, perhaps, improvement. The potential benefit of such chances should not be underestimated in the composition field, for they may lead to revision of the existing teaching practices and, therefore, may directly affect the students. Furthermore, the study of personal teaching goals seems to offer the data collection methods that have long been considered the staple of the field a chance for improvement as well. Through careful consideration of how to best approach the conversation about the personal aspects of teaching, the composition research methodology gains an exciting opportunity to invigorate itself through innovation of its data gathering methods.
APPENDIX A

First Year Composition Learning Goals

Goal #1: To help students understand the ways that readers read and writers write in and beyond the university

- Students will read and write a variety of texts for multiple purposes, audiences and genres.
- Students will demonstrate intellectual curiosity and risk-taking.
- Students will use reading and writing for discovery, to make sense of themselves and the world around them.
- Students will understand extra-textual contexts that shape reading and writing.
- Students will value academic integrity and take responsibility as an engaged person in their roles as student, learner, and global citizen.

Goal #2: To help students understand processes of reading, writing, and research

- Students will develop various and flexible strategies for generating, revising, editing and proofreading.
- Students will set purposes and goals for reading, writing, and research.
- Students will give and receive constructive criticism.
- Students will organize their essays to support their points of view in ways that are appropriate to their topic, audience, and purpose.
Goal #3: To help students develop a metacognitive understanding of processes of reading, writing and thinking

- Students will monitor and adjust their processes of reading and writing.
- Students will generate their own questions about texts.
- Students will engage in self-reflective activities assessing their reading and writing in relation to their learning goals and values.
- Students will internalize and apply a variety of effective reading, writing and study strategies.

Goal #4: To help students understand textual conventions

- Students will develop knowledge of genre conventions ranging from structure and paragraphing to tone and mechanics.
- Students will evaluate and cite sources appropriately.
- Students will develop syntactic maturity and sentence clarity.
- Students will edit their work for appropriate grammar and mechanics.

Goal #5: To help students understand and engage in reading and writing as communal processes

- Students will share their reading and writing with one another.
- Students will integrate their own ideas with those of others.
- Students will work in collaborative groups to generate, critique, and revise their ideas in reading and writing.
• Students will use their reading and writing to engage discourse communities within and beyond the university.

Goal #6: To help students think critically about academic discourse communities as contact zones where different cultures both connect and come into conflict

• Students will reflect on the ways that academic cultures and academic discourses connect and conflict with their home cultures and personal discourses.
• Students will explore the relationship between language and identity.
• Students will consider the politics of language use and standardization.
• Students will practice linguistic and cultural pluralism.
• Students will critically reflect on their literacy histories.
APPENDIX B

Questionnaire

Dear Writing Instructor,

My name is Lyudmila Moraru, and I am an English Department graduate student who is currently working on a culminating research project portfolio. For my research project, I am studying the personal teaching goals composition instructors may have for their students in addition to the programmatic learning goals for first year composition courses. If you could take five minutes to answer the questions below, I would be very grateful! Please leave the completed questionnaire in my mailbox labeled “Moraru.” If you are willing to talk with me briefly about your teaching goals, please include your contact information. Thank you!!

*********************************************************************************************

1. How long have you taught at this educational institution?

2. Which writing courses do you usually teach here?

3. What are some non-programmatic goals, goals that may or may not be included in learning outcomes, that you personally feel are important in your classroom?

4. Please share any examples of how you integrate these personal teaching goals with the programmatic learning goals in your classroom.

5. How have your personal teaching goals changed over time?

6. Imagining your students five years after they have graduated, what would you most like them to remember from your class?
APPENDIX C

Research Presentation Handout

Personal Teaching Goals of First Year Composition Instructors

Purpose

- To consider the perception of writing instructors towards the relationship between their personal teaching and programmatic learning goals.
- To inform readers about the possible complications in the research on personal teaching goals.

Research Questions:

- To what extent do instructors’ personal learning goals connect with the FYC program goals?
- To what extent are instructors’ personal goals different than the FYC program goals?
- Are there patterns among the various personal teaching goals of first-year composition instructors?
- How much emphasis do instructors put on each personal teaching goal?

Research Design

- Method: context-sensitive text analysis (see Thomas Huckin).
- Steps taken to ensure privacy: name coding, data destruction, contracts with duplicates, etc.
- Questions were formed with the help of the ENGL 220D pilot study.
Majority of the participants were interviewed both in the pilot study and main research study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Data</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>Easily distributed in any quantity (~70q total). Little prior acquaintance with the participants is required.</td>
<td>Not enough information for this particular topic. Required a follow-up and more explanation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat impersonal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Participants have the chance to talk at length and reflect on the data they provide. Non-verbal communication may be considered in the study.</td>
<td>Scheduling issues and recording/privacy issues. Limited control over the direction of the conversation. Interview may be the first time the topic is considered, and it may take a longer/shorter time than expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artifacts</td>
<td>May be analyzed endless amount of times for context clues. May be easily annotated and manipulated to simplify the research</td>
<td>Researcher is not the audience in mind, and therefore artifacts must be combed for relevant pieces of information. Like questionnaires, they may require a follow-up.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There may also be hesitation from some participants to share artifacts due to the possibility of plagiarism, etc.

### Findings

- Participants’ personal teaching goals practically never conflicted with the programmatic learning goals.
- Discomfort was observed when discussion touched personal teaching goals that were perceived to conflict with the programmatic language.

### Things to Consider in the Future Research*

- Pilot participants should likely not change in the main research if the researcher simply expands the initial questions.
- Studies on personal goals should have a personal touch; questionnaires seem to fit a pilot study better.
- Interviews should have at least several open-ended questions that allow for clarifications in case the conversation goes off-topic.
- Fears of improper disclosure and/or plagiarism must be addressed head on and with integrity.
• Artifacts turned out to be a great detailed source of data, and raised the least amount of questions from the participants. They should definitely be considered in the future research.

*Please note that the provided suggestions are made with the topic of personal teaching goals in mind; therefore, they might not accommodate a different research topic well.
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