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Introduction

This study took place in Sacramento, California where I was a master’s student in English composition. The course was a first-year college composition class, which is required for all undergraduate students to complete to meet graduation requirements. I functioned as the teacher and the researcher, and the students were both monolingual and multilingual. My research focus was to see how explicitly teaching a metacognitive understanding of genre could or would affect the development of genre metacognition for the students. My interest in genre metacognition was a direct result of my own gaps in this ability as I completed my bachelor’s degree program. However, naming this shortcoming would not occur until I encountered readings in my master’s degree program, thus setting in motion my desire to assist other students in developing genre metacognition so that they would not struggle nearly as much as I did during my bachelor’s degree program.

During my undergraduate work at Eastern Oregon University, I took three courses from Dr. Mark Shadle. His approach to teaching was called multiwriting, “which incorporates multiple genres, disciplines, cultures, and media to syncretically gather post/modern forms” (Davis and Shadle 417). As a student, I found Dr. Shadle’s teaching philosophy was beyond my prior course experience. During the first week, the class voted on one topic to be the focus of our portfolios. For the remainder of the course, we engaged in classroom discussions about the discoveries we were making in our individual investigations, and we gathered for workshops to get and give peer feedback on our texts. As far as individual assignments, we were not given a specific number or type of genre to
be produced. If asked what Dr. Shadle expected with regard to production, he would say that we should continue to write and explore until we were finished.

The means of assessment for the course was a portfolio presentation and a holistic grading of the same portfolio by Dr. Shadle. Needless to say, in the first course, Applied Discourse Theory, I struggled. I managed to produce a portfolio, but in retrospect, it lacked cohesion. I was surprised by how readily other students in the course were able to understand the portfolio goals, which were never clearly stated, and produce a portfolio and presentation that were very thorough and effective in presenting their own ideas. The second course I took with Dr. Shadle, Native American Literature, went more smoothly because I had already had exposure to this literature type in a Folklore course, but again, my multigenre portfolio lacked imagination and diversity that would have engaged any readers of the texts.

Between the second and third course, I had an accident that caused me to lose my language skills, higher cognitive understanding, and my memory. For example, to overcome the language communication problem, I was using circumlocution to be able to convey my meaning. For instance, if I could not remember the word *cooler*, I would say, “the thing that you use to keep food cold when traveling or going on a picnic.” In another situation, for the word *car*, I might say, “the thing that you sit in to get around town.” To say the least, I was very frustrated. However, Dr. Shadle was able to assist by allowing me to use my own experience of regaining my written and verbal communication skills as a basis for my multiwriting project in his Writing Theory course. Now I would not recommend that you damage your own brain in order to succeed at
multiwriting, but by expressing my own relearning process, I was able to produce a very engaging portfolio that included visual components, several memoir essays, and research essays on both brain functions and handwriting analysis. I was successful in grasping the multiwriting concept and applying it to my writing, but I still could not have identified how I was able to accomplish these tasks.

**Genre Awareness in Composition Research**

After leaving Eastern Oregon, I was still wondering what exactly it was that Dr. Shadle had taught me. I knew as a writer that I had progressed, but I could not understand what had changed. At California State University, Sacramento, I discovered my answer. In pursuit of my master’s degree in composition, I encountered a study by George Kamberelis entitled *Children Writing Stories, Science Reports, and Poems*. The study was done over four months with 54 children from kindergarten through second grade. The main question was what caught my attention, “What do children’s texts and metadiscourse about their texts reveal about how genre knowledge emerges during the early elementary years?” (409). This study discovered that children’s development of an understanding of genre was “complex [and] non-linear” (448). The research also discovered pertinent information about how children develop genre categories:

- Children’s category systems for genres may be more nascent and less differentiated than those of most adults. Yet, they also suggest that children develop increasingly complex and flexible knowledge repertoires of generic forms, functions, and relations between the two. (449)
Ultimately, this study showed that as “children seem both to progress and regress [through an understanding of genre], they learn to differentiate and eventually creatively integrate the forms, functions, and contexts of different genre” (449). I believe this concept of genres was what I had been struggling with in Dr. Shadle’s courses.

In addition, when initially given an opportunity to select my own genres and topics, I was unable to move between genre forms to adapt them to what I hoped to express. Based on the discoveries of Donald Graves and Nancie Atwell, moving between genres should not have been difficult for me. In “An Examination of the Writing Processes of Seven Year Old Children,” Donald Graves discovered that “information environments give greater choice to children. When children are given choice as to whether they write or not as [well as] what to write, they write more and in greater length than when specific writing assignments are given” (235). Graves also discovered that “large amounts of assigned writing inhibits the range, content, and amount of writing done by children” (235). According to Graves’ study, a classroom setting should have information available to the students, choices about writing assignments, and manageable amounts of writing to be produced. To test Graves’ findings, Nancie Atwell did her own research in a study called “Everyone Sits at a Big Desk: Discovering Topics for Writing.” Atwell discovered that “open topic choice allow[ed] young writers to tap their own, rich, personal and academic resources” (35). Her approach to teaching a class in which students had agency was “to offer individual guidance within the context of each writer’s intentions” (36).
Given these two studies, I wondered why I could not move easily between genres, especially when student agency was at the center of Dr. Shadle’s teaching techniques. I discovered this answer when I read about Paulo Freire in “Chapter 2” of Pedagogy of the Oppressed. Here Freire describes the banking concept as “an act of depositing, in which the students are the depositories and the teacher is the depositor. Instead of communicating, the teacher issues communiqués and makes deposits which the students patiently received, memorize[d], and report[ed]” (72). My prior education was a strict parochial school education in which the banking pedagogy had been employed.

In contrast to banking, Freire describes his alternative approach, problem-posing education, where “there is no longer merely the one who teaches, but one who is himself taught in dialogue with the students, who in turn while being taught also teach. They become jointly responsible for a process in which all grow” (78). Dr. Shadle’s classroom was centered around this approach to teaching. We were to function as both teachers and students. However, I did not become a fully functioning co-creator in the environment established by Dr. Shadle until after my head injury. Certainly, the two prior classes prepared me for this engagement with this teaching pedagogy, but perhaps my injury allowed me to let go of my banking concepts as the only means of being taught.

Ultimately, Dr. Shadle had taught me metacognition as it relates to genre usage. In Educational Psychology: A Practical Approach by Dr. Edward L. Vockell, he states, “metacognition refers to [a] learners’ automatic awareness of their own knowledge and their ability to understand, control, and manipulate their own cognitive processes.” At the time that I completed my bachelor’s degree, I was not consciously aware of my
metacognitive understanding of genre, but I was maneuvering through various genre choices based on topic and reader expectations within the academic community.

**My Research Questions**

As I began my search to understand the growth that occurred in Dr. Shadle’s courses, several questions arose that informed the structure of my research project. The first was what is a *genre*? The second was what is a *discourse community*? The purpose of defining these two terms was twofold. The first was to establish the parameters of my study, which was to take place in a first-year college English composition classroom in which I was both the teacher and the researcher. The second reason was to provide definitions for the students who were not only my students but also my study participants, so that we could utilize these definitions in our classroom discussions. In order to assist students in expanding their genre use, I also needed to determine how their current awareness of genre structures and conventions were developed. Based on the answers to the preceding questions, research on the best teaching techniques for encouraging a metacognitive understanding of genre needed to be developed. Finally, did the pedagogical approach developed and implemented during the study have a positive, neutral, or negative impact on the metacognitive understanding of genre by the student participants?

**Defining the Key Terms**

If my ultimate goal was to enable students to develop as writers through similar teaching methods used by Dr. Shadle, then understanding the term *genre* became important to not only my own growth as a writer but also as a teacher. If I was going to
help college students, some who may have had similar experiences in a banking environment, then I needed to explore the most effective pedagogy to attain an understanding of how we as writers move between genres to express our ideas. In order to attain this goal, I needed to understand what was meant by the term genre.

Genre has numerous definitions, which are influenced by the scholar’s area of expertise. Dr. Amy Devitt provides the one that seemed the closest to my own experiences. In “Writing Genres,” Devitt states that genre is an expression of a rhetorical situation between a writer and a reader that is recognized through repetition within a discourse community (31). It is also a contract between the writer and the reader that encompasses form, situation, and culture, and it can be classified based on form, relationships, and patterns as users identify different tasks as being similar (31). With this definition, I began to explore the term discourse community because the interaction with and the identification of a genre takes place within this setting.

Dr. John Swales’ definition of discourse community is the one that I would use in my research and within the composition classroom. Swales clarified the characteristics that need to be present for a group to be a discourse community. All six of the following attributes must be present for a discourse community to exist:

- have a broadly agreed [upon] set of common public goals
- have mechanisms of intercommunication among its members (meetings, telecommunications, correspondence, newsletters, conversations and so forth)
- use its participatory mechanisms primarily to provide information and feedback (without some kind of communication exchange there is no discourse community)
- utilize and hence possess one or more genres in the communicative furtherance of its aims
- have acquired some specific lexis (for example: terminology that at times can be very specialized)
- have a threshold level of members with a suitable degree of relevant content and discourse expertise. (21-32)

In order to fully understand the term *discourse community*, a few examples of what are and are not considered discourse communities would be helpful. Examples of discourse communities are as follows: a teacher and students who meet in a classroom regularly to discuss subjects that are mutually agreed upon (at least during the course of the term); coworkers who meet or correspond regularly about topics within their specialty area; or church groups whose members engage in social gatherings. However, two examples of groups that do not create discourse communities are people who ride the same bus to work every day and maybe even visit with one another as they travel, or an audience in a courtroom during a brief trial. These two illustrations do not possess all six attributes of a discourse community. For example, neither group has “a broadly agreed [upon] set of common public goals” (Swales). In both cases, the interchanges between members are limited to random social interactions. In other words, the members do not have a common objective or mission; they do not recognize an agreed upon purpose for their
interaction with each other. If the group members did not meet again, they would not believe that a target had not reached. Without this cohesive element in either of these associations, neither group is a discourse community.

**Steps to Metacognition**

The first step in assisting students in moving towards a metacognitive understanding of genre is to help them understanding the meaning of both genre and discourse community as well as grasp the interplay between these two elements. Genres are expressions of the culture and values of a discourse community, and discourse communities utilize genres as a means of effective communication among its members. As discourse communities change, so do the genres. They are reflections of each other.

The second element is to create an active learning environment in which the students make choices for themselves about various activities in the classroom or assignments in the coursework. When Donald Graves allowed his students to decide whether or not to write, the students generated more writing. In addition, Nancy Atwell found that when students could select their own topics, they were more engaged with their writing endeavors. And Mark Shadle allowed his students to select their own avenues of exploration and the genres they wanted to employ to express their discoveries which assisted students in developing a metacognitive understanding of genre. From these examples, it appears that an active learning environment not only helps promote student engagement but also helps develop metacognition, which are two aspects of writing that are worth developing in an English composition course.
Pedagogy, Teaching Methodology, and Course Structure

My goal as a teacher was to create an environment that developed a discourse community in which student agency could be seen with a goal of moving students towards a metacognitive understanding of genre. This approach was best employed through a constructivist pedagogy that was developed from a theory by Jerome Bruner. Within this approach:

Learning is an active process in which learners construct new ideas or concepts based upon their current/past knowledge. The learner selects and transforms information, constructs hypotheses, and makes decisions, relying on a cognitive structure to do so. Cognitive structure (i.e., schema, mental models) provides meaning and organization to experiences and allows the individual to ‘go beyond the information given.’ (qtd in K12 Inc.)

The three elements influencing my pedagogy were an awareness of genre, an understanding of how genres develop and are utilized within discourse communities, and a cognitive structure that allows students to discover these connections. This three-pronged approach was to be the structure of an explicit teaching of genre in the composition classroom. To test the effect of this approach on genre metacognition for my research, students would need to demonstrate the application of these connections outside the composition classroom onto future writing endeavors in other discourse communities.
The first element was to define the term *genre* and give examples of which genres we would be using within the classroom. In order to attain this understanding, selected readings were provided for the students based on the genres they wished to explore. A rhetorical analysis was required for each genre they were going to use (see Appendix A: Assignment Prompts). This requirement was based on prior research in which “explicit analysis of prototypical texts of a target genre contributed to raising students’ rhetorical consciousness and to developing their ability to better contextualize the genre of their writing” (Yasuda 113). In addition, the four elements of the rhetorical square would be used for this evaluation because the interplay of voice, audience, message, and purpose provide writers with a representation of the rhetorical situation. This approach applied Devitt’s belief that “the primary task for teaching genre awareness is to keep form and context intertwined” (198). The rhetorical analysis addressed the first step in understanding the form. The context was connected through classroom discussions of the use genres as integral expressions of various ideas within discourse communities.

To address the context in which writing develops, the assignments were scaffolded to move students from what they knew to what they did not know about the various genres and their application in discourse communities. For this reason, the first assignment was a memoir (see Appendix A: Assignment Prompts). This assignment required students to look within their own personal experiences and make a relevant connection to a broader social context within a discourse community of their own choosing. The concern with this assignment is that students may select topics that expose too much of their personal lives to peers. As we discussed their topics in workshops,
students were reminded to select examples that they would be willing to share in peer reviews. The focus was to take a familiar example from their own lives and connect it to a subject outside their individual experiences, thus connecting the topic to a broader discourse community. This assignment was to begin moving the students from what they already knew entering the classroom to placing the memoir within a broader context, thus expanding their understanding of genres within discourse communities.

The second assignment was a topic within any number of discourse communities of which they are members. The genre was a commentary in which the students had to take a point of conflict with which they were familiar or wanted to explore, then take a position that was not only supported by research, but also recognized the opposing position (see Appendix A: Assignment Prompts). They were not required to give both sides of the argument, but by expressing the points of the opposition, they would be placing their writing within the broader conversation of a discourse community.

The third assignment also was a topic selected by the student but additionally the student was allowed to select from four different academic genres: a review, a profile, a proposal, or a report (see Appendix A: Assignment Prompts; see Appendix B: Purpose/Genre Handout). While the limiting factor was that all four choices were from the academic community, they all could be applied in other discourse communities outside academia. Therefore, these selections were practical choices since one of the goals of learning a metacognitive understanding of genre is to recognize, evaluate, and apply your knowledge within one discourse community, then demonstrate the genre model within another community. The purpose of this assignment was to have the
students consider which genre would best suit the idea that they wanted to express, what sources would provide the most effective means of persuasion, how the writer would keep the reader engaged, and what was the message and purpose of their writings. These elements provided an overview of the rhetorical situation that the assignment represented. Within the classroom, we discussed placement of their writing within the academic discourse community as well. This assignment was the culminating expression by the students of their understanding of the interplay between discourse communities, genres, and student agency.

The final assignment was a letter to the professor (see Appendix A: Assignment Prompts). This assignment asked the students to reflect on the development of their writing process throughout the course. In addition, the students were given questions to help prompt ideas that might be included within their essay, such as the implications of genre on their writing process and/or how their understanding or use of genres might affect future writing endeavors. Since genre awareness was a goal of my study, but not a requirement of the college, if students did not address this part of the prompt, it did not impact their grade in the course. The letter was the only assignment that did not require a rhetorical analysis. Since the audience and purpose were already predetermined by the assignment parameters, a rhetorical analysis was not indicated.

**Test Group and Evidence Gathered**

The subjects of this study were from a first-year composition course at California State University, Sacramento during Spring 2011; I was the instructor and the researcher. The class had 24 registered students of which 18 qualified for the study. The qualified
students had completed all coursework, the before and after interview questionnaires, and the final essay. One student was originally included but was disqualified when she made a note that her interview answers were given to her by text from a person outside of the classroom. In addition, it became relevant to the findings to know if students were monolingual or multilingual, so all of the findings are delineated by this element. The study itself has a very small sample size. For this reason, the findings cannot be extrapolated and then applied to other composition classes or students in general.

For the purposes of the study, the Letter to the Professor, and the Before and After Interview Questionnaires were collected from all qualified students (see Appendix C: Interview Questionnaires). After the evaluation was completed on these materials, additional information was gathered through e-mail correspondence to determine if participants were monolingual or multilingual. While three essays were also produced during the semester, these writings were not used for evaluation purposes. The detailed explanation of these essays was to demonstrate the scaffolding of the metacognitive approach implemented in the classroom. Evaluation of these essays was not performed or included in this study.

In order to evaluate the research texts, a context-sensitive text analysis was utilized. This methodology relies upon “plausible interpretation rather than on any kind of proof” (Huckin 89). This method is not a scientific approach, but rather, the findings are meant to be interpretative (89). The questionnaires and interviews in conjunction with the writing samples were intended to provide a glimpse of the social context in which the writers, readers, and texts interacted. The final results do not attempt to take into account
all of the variables that can influence the outcome of the study, but instead, provide one possible set of findings based on a particular criteria (89). This type of evaluation is intended to expand the understanding of genre metacognition without claiming to be the final word on the topic.

In the evaluation of all three forms, I was looking for identification of genres in conjunction with the use of these genres in more than one discourse community. The underlying assumption was that by using one genre in more than one context transference of knowledge and usage had taken place, thus demonstrating a metacognitive understanding of genre.

The Study Results with Sample Responses

The test group initially included twenty-four students enrolled in the course. Of these students, eighteen completed all assignments and additional documents required for the study. Within this group, eleven were native speakers and seven were multilingual (see Appendix D: Language Diversity Chart). Note that all student responses are quoted verbatim.

Before/After Interview Questionnaire Results

The first step was to evaluate the results of the Before/After Interview Questionnaire. Question two asked students to list written genres with which they are familiar, then question three asked them to give examples of when and why they might use each of the genres that they provided. A metacognitive understanding of genre would be demonstrated if the student could provide an example of genres being used within discourse communities.
Here are two responses that demonstrated the application of genres within discourse communities:

JA*: When trying to convince someone to believe my argument or ideas.
To inform and enlighten my audience and to simply entertain the audience. (2 pts)

AC: If I wanted to write about a significant time in my life I would write a memoir. An essay about trends can be a commentary and if I wanted to persuade people to do something it would be a proposal. After maybe visiting a place you would write an review and writing about a person, place, or thing can be a profile. A report can basically be on anything like for example: AIDS. (2 pts)

At the end of each response, points were assessed. Each point indicated the participant’s identification of a discourse community. This numeric assignment was used as a means of coding the responses.

Here are two responses that did not demonstrate the application of genres within discourse communities:

CG: A Comparative – is for comparing two different objects in one paper and clearly explaining both sides. Report is to create a nonopinionated paper about a specific topic. Memoir is a story about one specific moment in life. (0 pts)

---

1 An asterisk indicates a multilingual student.
DD: Persuasive when your trying to gain support for something.

Rehtorical when you summarize & compare arguments throughout an essay, summary when you summarize a play, movie, musical, song, etc.

compare & contrast when you compare 2 things. (0 pts).

Neither of these two examples identifies discourse communities. The first response from CG gives definitions of genres, while the second response by DD gives either the purpose or definitions of genres. As indicated, no points were given to either of these responses.

The next step was to compare the number of times a student was able to place genres within discourse communities before taking and after completing the writing course. By mapping this information, I could determine what percentage of students improved over the course of the term, what percentage remained the same, and what percentage regressed.

Out of eighteen students, seven showed improvement (38%), ten remained the same (56%), and one regressed (6%). This result did indicate that the metacognitive approach may have had a positive impact on development of genre awareness in some of the students.

However, as I began to scan the results, I noticed a distinct difference between monolingual and multilingual students. I was able initially to determine this trend because I was aware of which students I believed spoke more than one language. After clarifying the language abilities of the students, I split the results into two different categories: monolingual and multilingual speakers.
Out of eleven native speakers, three showed improvement (27%), eight remained the same (73%), and none of them regressed. For the monolingual students, the average was less than the overall result of 38%. I did not consider this level of progress to be remarkable as this result might be attained under a pedagogy that did not focus on a metacognitive understanding of genre.

However, when I reevaluated the performance of the multilingual students, the results were much higher than the monolingual students. Out of seven students, four showed improvement (57%), two remained the same (29%), and one regressed (14%). More than half of the student pool showed improvement; it appeared that the teaching of a metacognitive approach to genre was a concept that was grasped more readily by multilingual students. I did not however consider these results sufficient without further evidence of this trend.

**Letter to the Professor Results**

To triangulate one type of data with another, I looked at the *Letter to the Professor*, which was the final writing assignment for the course. In addition to addressing their development of the revision process, students were given additional questions that they could include in their letters that addressed the effect of genre on their writing process and the use of genres in their future endeavors. If student did not include this information in their essays, their grade was not adversely impacted.

In order to demonstrate a metacognitive understanding of genre, students needed to identify a genre and place it within a discourse community that was outside the current course. This information transference regarding genre use in a social situation outside of
the current discourse community demonstrated a more complete understanding of metacognition.

Here are two examples of this transference:

CS*: I was unaware of the diverse types of writing that exists in writing people’s writing, such as memoir, review, commentary, report, proposal, and profile before I participated in English 1A. I will take these skills that I have gained and apply them to my future in order [to] gain even more skills in writing and utilize them in my future language endeavors. These skills could be applied to the workforce that I aspire to join: pharmaceutical. I can effectively utilize these abilities I have gained when writing up labs, drug write-ups, or detailed prescriptions.

LG*: Learning the skills of a rhetorical analysis has also affected my skills in writing. Instead of digging in deep into a piece of writing, it allowed me to just focus on the simplicity of it. This is really important because every time I read something that I have to write on, I’m always going to think about what the author’s message is, who he is writing to, what the purpose of their writing was and their voice. Without this knowledge, I wouldn’t be able to tell what genre of writing the author was using.

In both of these responses, the participants have indentified genres and alternative uses for them that were outside the current composition classroom. Initially, CS provides a list of the genres that we studied during the semester, but in the last comment, shows the application of a report or possibly reviews when writing up labs, drug write-ups, and
detailed prescriptions. In contrast, LG selected one genre, the rhetorical analysis, that we used throughout the term to become more aware of the elements of a genre (voice, audience, message, and purpose). She plans on doing an analysis whenever she is required to read so she can identify the genre that the author is using to express their ideas. This repetitious application on reading outside of the current classroom demonstrates transference of one genre (the rhetorical analysis) to reading and writing in other discourse communities.

Here are two examples of responses in which students mentioned genres either in general or specifically, but they did not show transference from within our classroom to writing endeavors in other discourse communities:

WD: Genre has affected my writing because it shapes how I am going to write a paper and how I am going to organize a paper. Without a genre my paper would be completely different. Genre is set up in a certain way.

CG: I came to the conclusion that the only instance I would need to write another paper in the future would be for something such as a thesis paper, a letter of recommendation, a report, a final examine, or anything else that I couldn’t explain without writing it down. After creating one of these pieces I could use the revision process that I learned this semester to make it even better. Therefore I realized that this semester was very helpful to a process that I will use for the rest of my life.

In the response from WD, genre is identified as a form to be used to organize a paper. This was a concept that WD learned in our classroom, but WD does not provide any
examples of how this understanding could or would be used in other discourse communities. In the response from CG, four genres have been identified (a thesis paper, a letter of recommendation, a report, a final exam), but how these genres might be used in interaction in other discourse communities was not provided.

When considering the entire sample group, out of eighteen responses, six students identified genres that would be used in other discourse communities (33%), while twelve students either did not identify genres or did not provide discourse communities outside of the current classroom in which genres would be used (67%).

This overall result was similar to the Before/After Interview Questionnaires. In the Letter to the Professor, 33% demonstrated transference, and in the Before/After Interview Questionnaires, 38% showed improvement. These results showed consistent patterns between two different evaluation sources that lent validity to the conclusion that the metacognitive pedagogical approach did seem to have some impact on the abilities of students to identify and apply genres within more than one discourse community.

Just as in the Before/After Interview Questionnaires, it was important to look at the Letter to the Professor results from a monolingual and multilingual perspective to see if the results were consistently indicated between both sources.

For the monolingual students, two out of eleven identified genres and applied these writing in other discourse communities (18%). Just as with the Before/After Interview Questionnaires which showed a 27% improvement for the monolingual students, the 18% result for the Letter to the Professor indicated consistent results. Since the results were compared based on each student’s individual progress from the start to
end of the course rather than any influence on genre awareness advantages between monolingual and multilingual students at the beginning of the course, the progress recorded was absolute, rather than relative, for each students develop or progress in a metacognitive understanding of genre. With this in mind, the results indicated that the monolingual students did not receive as much benefit as the multilingual students from a pedagogy that focused on a metacognitive approach to genre.

When looking at the multilingual students, a consistent pattern was also identified. For the Letter to the Professor, four out of seven students provided genres that could be used outside of the current classroom (57%). Just as in the Before/After Interview Questionnaires in which four out of seven students showed improvement, the metacognitive pedagogy appears to have assisted these students in developing a more proficient understanding of the use of genre in a variety of rhetorical situations. For both evaluation methods, the multilingual students demonstrated a much higher level of development in the metacognitive understanding of genre. The consistency between these two methods demonstrates validity within the research results.

**Findings**

The results from both study methods indicate that multilingual students demonstrated far more ability in developing a metacognitive understanding of genre than monolingual (native) speakers. In the Before/After Interview Questionnaires, the multilingual students showed a 57% improvement over the course of the term in comparison to the monolingual students who only showed 27% improvement. In addition, a similar result was obtained in the Letter to the Professor. For the multilingual
students, 57% identified genres within discourse communities outside of the current classroom, while monolingual students only demonstrated this ability 18% of the time. So what caused such a distinct variance?

One possibility might have been the constructivist pedagogy, which does not make any distinction between monolingual and multilingual students. In other words, regardless of the level of proficiency with the English language, the approach takes the students from what they know when beginning the course, through various ideas and concepts that are to be evaluated and tested, to a more advanced understanding of the subject matter. This same process may be what multilingual students do more frequently than their monolingual counterparts do. Since multilingual students must constantly switch between languages, and therefore cultures and the communication expectations of these discourse communities, they may be far more adept at using the very steps provided within constructivist pedagogy.

This idea may be further supported by Amy Devitt who states, “first-year composition courses can help students acquire genres that would serve as bridges to the new genres later learned by immersion” (207). Perhaps the reverse can also be true? Multilingual students have been immersed in at least two different discourse communities to the point of being fluent in the reading and writing of more than one set of genre expectations. These students have already experienced new genres that have provided bridges for them between more than one language. Their ability to use effectively a metacognitive understanding of genre to express their ideas in more than one culture may
already be developed beyond those of their peers. The first-year English composition classroom could be an extension of this ability.

In addition, on a daily basis, multilingual students must not only decide who their audience is, what voice should be used, what the most effective means of delivering a message are, and what they can and cannot propose as an action, but they must also consider the genre in which they deliver their communications. Since genre forms are different between languages, multilingual students, whether consciously or unconsciously, must do more advanced code switching than their monolingual counterparts. In Tardy’s review of L2 research, she notes, “fluency in at least two languages means that these writers may engage in more oral interaction with diverse groups of people, increasing the resources that they can draw on in genre learning” (96). For this reason, the constructivist approach used in the classroom may have been an advantage to multilingual students at the outset. In other words, since multilingual students must learn more genres for both oral and written communication than their monolingual counterparts do to coexist in more than one discourse community, their skills may be more suitable to a constructivist approach (Tardy, K12 Inc.).

Another influence in the comparative results between the monolingual and multilingual participants may rest with the influence of previous experiences and exposures to genres. In 2001, Sunny Hyon did a study with L2 learners in which he suggests, “genre-based teaching may have less of an impact for students who have greater genre knowledge prior to instruction” (qtd in Tardy 89). In this scenario, monolingual students have had far more exposure to genres that occur in English language
environments by the mere fact that they have functioned throughout their lives in an environment surrounded by English texts and have been educated with English language genres as examples. The monolingual students have been immersed in social paradigms where English language genres were consistently accessed or available, but have not had the experience of genres generated in other languages. In contrast, the multilingual students have had far less consistent exposure or interaction with English language genres. However, they have had far more experience with genres from other languages that may have given them more experience at the outset with genre metacognition out of necessity due to their needs to function in more than one language community, even if they were not consciously aware of developing and using this tool effectively to communicate. The results of this study would indicate that Hyon’s observation that genre-based teaching may be less effective for native speakers than multilingual students might prove to be accurate. Currently, this finding is inconclusive, but there may be some yet unexplored reasons with connection to prior genre experiences that influence a student’s engagement with genre-based teaching.

In addition, multilingual students may have found the explicit instructions more beneficial than the monolingual students did. In a comparative review of first and second language genre learning research, Christine Tardy states:

Explicit instruction may very well play a different role for L2 writers as well. While some L1 writers do express some need for or use of explicit instruction, L2 writers may have an even stronger desire for such instruction in order to demystify the “rules” of specialized writing. (96)
Because the pedagogical approach for the study was to teach explicitly a metacognitive understanding of genre, the explicitness may have had an impact on the results. Since multilingual students have a desire for this type of instruction, they may have been more engaged with the process, thus demonstrating marked improvement over their monolingual counterparts.

Overall, there may have been one or more factors that influenced the differences between improvement shown by the monolingual and multilingual students: the constructivist pedagogy, prior genre exposure or experience, co-existence in more than one discourse community, or the use of explicit instruction. It would be difficult to account for all of these possible elements in this study.

However, one aspect of these results that instructors may want to consider is how to create a learning environment that integrates genre metacognition in a classroom with both multilingual and monolingual students. Since multilingual students use metacognition in more than one language community, perhaps by incorporating additional discourse diversity in the classroom, multilingual students would be more engaged in the classroom discussions. They would be bringing a level of expertise into the classroom that monolingual students would need to develop to understand genres from other cultures. In exchange, the monolingual students could share what they already know about the nuances of the genres in the English language, thus improving the writing endeavors of both groups. This approach would assist both monolingual and multilingual students in testing various genres against what they already know, allowing them to create new genres from prior ones. Both monolingual and multilingual students
would be teaching each other. This scenario provides a very active collaborative environment in which all students and the teacher could learn from each other.

In another approach provided in “Teaching for Transfer in ELT,” Mark James discusses bridging strategies, which “involves teaching that gets students to make conscious abstractions and identify alternative applications of instructional material” (152). One application is generalizing concepts, which “draw on [student] experiences in the ELT classroom to derive general principles that are relevant elsewhere” (“Teaching for Transfer" 156). An application of this concept can be altered to bring to the forefront the multilingual experiences; instead of drawing on experiences from the ELT classroom, multilingual students could draw on experiences in their home discourse communities, while monolingual students could provide examples from English speaking discourse communities. As students provided examples of various genres from these unique environments, the class as a whole could evaluate the various elements that are present in each genre and complete rhetorical analyses based on VAMP on these examples. This approach would not only bring diversity into the classroom that would allow multilingual and monolingual students to be experts in their own right, but it would also broaden an understanding of the rhetorical environment of all genres.

**Future Research**

In “Researching First and Second Language Genre Learning: A Comparative Review and a Look Ahead,” Christine Tardy reviewed 60 empirical studies that explored how writers learn genres. One gap that she identified is “a need for research on L2 writers in the workplace and in undergraduate content courses” (97). While my study
was not intended to be research regarding multilingual students, the results do indicate
significant variances between monolingual and multilingual. In addition, the participants
were college undergraduates, so the findings may begin to fill the gap for this research
type as identified by Tardy.

Another gap identified by Tardy is the absence of “a comprehensive synthesis and
comparison of genre learning of L1 and L2 writers both in and out of the classroom
instructional settings” (80). While my current study is very limited in scope because it
was completed over only one semester at California State University, Sacramento, it does
provide at least preliminary evidence that the acquisition of a metacognitive
understanding of genre might vary significantly for monolingual and multilingual
students. For future studies, a longer study would be more beneficial; it could follow
students beyond one semester to see if genre metacognition is reflected in future writings
endeavors that were not captured with the limitations of this study. If a longitudinal
study were developed, the point at which students applied a metacognitive understanding
could be detected, thus identifying more clearly at what point students apply what they
have learned about the use of genres.

In addition, further study into the development of metacognition in multilingual
students compared to monolingual students might provide a key into how to approach
metacognition more effectively for both types of students. For example, two different L2
classroom settings showed improvement in metacognitive awareness of L2 students but
used two different pedagogical approaches to teaching. In addition, their evaluation
criteria were also different from each other, which makes a comparison of these two
studies difficult. However, it is interesting to consider these to studies to perhaps consider pedagogical approaches that could be tested with monolingual and multilingual students to see if their effectiveness is consistent with both groups.

The first is a study conducted by Mark James, which is described in “An Investigation of Learning Transfer in English-for General-Academic-Purposes [EGAP] Writing Instruction.” The study took place over the 2007-2008 academic year and had 11 participants who were enrolled in EGAP writing courses. The course focused on critical thinking, reading, and writing skills for students who had met the minimum English language requirement for ESL. The classroom activities included working collaboratively and individually through multiple writing process steps that included reading and invention, composing, revising, and proofreading. Of the ten learning outcomes, eight skills were evaluated for genre metacognition: organizing, using resources, developing topics, establishing coherence, using appropriate syntactic patterns and devices, using a process, writing efficiently, and using appropriate vocabulary (“An Investigation of Learning Transfer” 191-93). The findings indicated that these skills did transfer at various levels of frequency from the writing course to other academic disciplines which demonstrated that skill transfer occurred. While an entire genre was not identified as being utilized in more than one discourse community, elements of genre were being applied. This application demonstrated genre metacognition based on the parameters established by James.

In contrast, Sachiko Yasuda’s study, “Genre-Based Tasks in Foreign Language Writing: Developing Writers’ Genre Awareness, Linguistic Knowledge, and Writing
Competence,” also evaluates genre awareness. However, her approach is through systemic function linguistics (SFL) theory which:

- Claims that understanding the construction of genres requires the realization of three types of linguistic resources in text: **ideational** resources, that build the *field* or content of a text; **interpersonal** resources that construe *tenor*, or attitudes, social relations, and evaluations in a text; and **textual** resources that construct *mode* or flow of information and discourse in a text. (112)

The concepts were integrated into the classroom through a “task-based syllabus [which] aims to offer sequenced tasks in which learners are encouraged to use language to achieve a certain goal” (113). The syllabus shows the use of one genre, an e-mail, which is then developed for use in twelve different purposes, such as expressing gratitude, applying for a job, and giving an opinion and recommendation. For the research evaluation, three different approaches to identify genre awareness were used: surveys, interviews, and comparisons of e-mail texts from the beginning and the end of the course. The surveys and interviews indicated that “genre awareness and knowledge that can be developed by email-writing tasks include[d] the following important factors: improved knowledge of genre-specific language choices and enhanced audience awareness” (124). In addition, when completing a comparison of the beginning and ending e-mails written by the participating students, Yasuda states that improved writing fluency and language sophistication were demonstrated (124).
Both of these studies indicate that genre metacognition was improved. While the pedagogical approach and the research evaluations were different in both studies, both study groups showed that the L2FL students were becoming more fluent in English. Since there has not been studies done for L1 students with the same parameters, it is not possible to determine which element of these two studies could work for both L1 and L2 students. When considering the learning outcomes stated in James and Yasuda’s research, it may be beneficial for L1 writers to have the same learning experiences as their L2 counterparts. In order to fill the gap identified by Tardy, future studies could be set up with the same pedagogical structure and evaluative approach for L1 and L2 students to determine where a metacognitive awareness of genre occurs for both groups. If we could identify the similarities and differences between monolingual and multilingual students, then perhaps we might see the most effective learning patterns for both groups that could inform the best teaching practices in both L1 and L2 classrooms. And more importantly, we could then develop a body of research that addresses the teaching of genre metacognition to all students regardless of their identification as a monolingual or multilingual student.

For my current study which does provide very limited insight into differences in genre metacognition acquisition between monolingual and multilingual students, further studies still need to be done to verify the findings. With only twenty students over the course of a semester, the findings that multilingual students have more advanced skills than monolingual students in applying a metacognitive understanding of genre may not be supported in more in-depth studies. In other words, this finding may have only
occurred because of the pool of students who signed up for this particular composition course and/or the pedagogical approach used in the classroom.

Overall, the findings of this study do lead to the need for more research. Once that is completed, if the findings do indicate that multilingual students are more advanced, then identifying how they develop their understanding would be applicable to the pedagogy within a composition classroom that service L1 and L2 students.
Appendix A:

Assignment Prompts

Rhetorical Analysis Prompt

Write two pages in which you identify the purpose, message, audience, and voice in each assigned reading. Give examples from the text to support your statements. Use MLA citation as needed.

**Purpose:**
Every author has a purpose for writing—even if that purpose is to simply to fulfill a writing assignment. A rhetorical purpose seeks to do a bit more; it seeks to persuade an audience, seeks to manipulate the way that audience thinks about the given subject.

What is the objective or goal of the author? Give examples or support for this claim.

**Message:**
Some of the most common messages we hear daily are very simple: buy this; vote for me; take an umbrella when you leave your house because it might rain. Other messages are more subtle: this famous person has a milk mustache; she drinks milk, and because you 1) want to be like her and/or 2) admire her, you should drink milk as well—and doing so will, in some way, make you just like her. Simple or subtle, every author's goal is to clearly communicate her message(s)—and there may be more than one.

What is the author trying to say? Why does the author say this subject is important? Or not important? How is the author suggesting that this subject will affect me? Why should I be concerned? What should I do as a result of that concern? What will happen if I do as the author suggests? What will happen if I don't act?

**Audience:**
When we read, we need to look for clues that would reveal the intended audience.

Are all the examples the author uses similar in some way, or are they varied? Who would be more likely to agree or disagree with the author? Why? What is the author assuming that his audience will know or accept? Is he using a specialized kind of language that only certain readers would understand? Remember that authors sometimes target many different audiences.

**Voice:**
How an author says something can be just as meaningful as what that author says. What type of vocabulary choices has the author made? How does his choice of vocabulary compare or reveal his audience? What types of examples is he using? How does the author treat the reader?
Memoir Prompt

Recall a person, place, or event from your past that represents an aspect of one of your discourse communities, then write a memoir about this recollection. Use a significant amount of detail and sensory impression to recreate all aspects of the person, place, or event that you have selected. The point of a memoir is to reveal the meaning of the past so that your readers can understand the significance your memories hold for the present. Incorporate the significance of your recollection into your essay. Why the reader should be interested in your topic is as important in a memoir as the topic itself. To help you consider what topic would best suit this assignment, consider the following questions and the significance of the answers:

- Consider a tension or conflict that you experienced in the past. How was it resolved? How does that resolution influence your interaction with others in the present?
- Select a photograph that holds memories and emotional associations. While focusing on the details of the captured moment, how has your family history intersected a larger social or historical moment?
- Recall a particular family ritual as a means to focus on an event or person that is especially significant to you. How has this event or person influenced your current life?
- Consider an aspect of your own culture and explain how the past has entered your life. What does this reveal about your relationship to the culture of your ancestors?
- Focus on a childhood incident to recreate the event and your own perspective as a younger person. How has this incident influenced your current view of life?
- Look through an old diary or journal. Consider a moment when you faced a challenge to your values, made a difficult decision, experienced a situation that turned out unexpectedly, or were keenly disappointed. How does this experience fit into a larger context?

These questions are meant to assist you in exploring a topic. They are not intended to be the only topic that you can consider in your memoir essay.

Formatting Guidelines

- Memoir essay should be 3-4 pages in length
- Outside sources are not required, but can be used with MLA citation
- Double-spaced with 1” margins
- Use a 12 point in Times New Roman

(Source for this essay assignment: The Call to Write, pp: 160-161)
Commentary Prompt

Write a commentary that addresses a topic of interest to you. This type of writing involves making an argument about an issue circulating in your culture or one of your discourse communities. Consider what has called other writers to generate a commentary:

- **Trends:** Labeling trends is a strategy commentators use to give readers a handle on what is taking place around them. Trends are not objective phenomena waiting to be discovered, like some new species of animal. Rather, they rely on the interpretive powers of commentators to name what’s happening, thereby giving a series of events a distinct identity and making it available as a topic for public discussion.

- **Policy issues:** Commentators often address issues of public policy. Write a commentary that focuses on the causes of an issue that interest you and the implications for public policy. Accounting for why things happen is often the first step in explaining what should be done – to endorse, alter, or control the situation.

- **Current events:** Stories that break in the news seem to call for a swift response to unite readers’ feelings and influence public reaction. Here is writing at the point of opinion making, shaping the public mood and sense of issue. You might draw on a recent event to serve as the springboard for your commentary, something current that your readers are likely to know about but where the meaning is still open for interpretation.

- **Historical events:** You could comment on a historical event. Commentators often analyze past events and point out implications that would otherwise go unnoticed. You could write a commentary about the significance of a historic event, an invention, a social movement, or an everyday occurrence.

These suggestions are meant to assist you in exploring a topic. They are not intended to be the only topic that you can consider in your commentary essay.

Formatting Guidelines

- Commentary essay should be 4-5 pages in length
- Three outside sources are required and MLA citation should be used when citing sources
- Double-spaced with 1” margins
- Use a 12 point in Times New Roman

(Source for this essay assignment: *The Call to Write*, pp: 301-303.)
Student-selected Essay Prompt

This assignment is on a topic of your own choice. In addition, you may select from the following genres: a review, a profile, a proposal, or a report. The genre you select needs to have a direct correlation to your topic.

The goal of this assignment is to produce a five to six page essay that demonstrates your understanding of a particular genre in relation to a topic of your choosing. Be creative with your pursuit. Pick a topic that you find interesting; consider the appeal of this topic to your audience as well.

To prepare yourself for this assignment, complete steps one through four before you begin your research and writing process.

Step One
All writing is an argument, so before you select a genre, read this information in *A Call to Write: Making an Argument* pp. 66-74

Readers are also influenced by the form given to a text. Three forms are identified in our textbook: top-down order, culminating order, and open form. To understand and incorporate form into your essay, read this information in *A Call to Write: Seeing Patterns of Organization: How Form Embodies Purpose* pp. 507-508

Step Two
Review the information provided in *Purpose/Genre Handout* for ideas about the association between your topic and genre selections. Select two genres that would correlate with your topic. Read the essays for those genres and write two rhetorical analyses.

- Review: “Slum Visits: Tourism or Voyeurism?” in *The Call to Write* pp. 358 – 361.

Step Three
Consider these questions before and during the writing of your essay:

- Why is this topic of interest to me? How can I demonstrate that interest so that the reader will be engaged? What do I want the reader to understand or take action on my topic?

- What genre structure best suits the purpose/message of my topic?

- What sources would best support my topic? How can I integrate them into my essay?
Step Four
Select which genre you want to use for the Student-Selected Essay assignment. Read the section that applies to your genre prior to and during your writing process.

Reviews:
“Thinking about the Genre” in *A Call to Write* pp. 346 – 347
“Writing Assignment” in *A Call to Write* pp. 363 – 369.

Profiles:
“Thinking about the Genre” in *A Call to Write* pp. 214-215
“Writing Assignment” in *A Call to Write* pp. 238 - 244

Proposals:
“Thinking about the Genre” in *A Call to Write* pp. 314 – 315
“Writing Assignment” in *A Call to Write* pp. 333 - 339

Reports:
“Thinking about the Genre” in *A Call to Write* pp. 250 – 251
“Writing Assignment” in *A Call to Write* pp. 274 – 279

Due Dates:
- April 5, 2011: First Rhetorical Analysis due
- April 7, 2011: Second Rhetorical Analysis due
- April 14, 2011: First SS draft due
- April 21, 2011: Second SS draft due
- April 26, 2011: Final SS essay with revision package due

Formatting Guidelines:
- Student-selected essay should be five to six pages in length
- Five outside sources and MLA citations are required
- Double-spaced with 1” margins
- Use a 12 point in Times New Roman
Letter Prompt

Write a letter to your professor in which you describe your writing process. This type of writing involves identifying the elements of your writing process and demonstrating how you have used and will use these steps in your future writing endeavors. Here are a few questions to get you started:

What new things did I learn about with regard to the writing process this semester?

In comparing my writing process at the start and the end of the semester, what changed?

Did the genre affect your writing process? If so, how and why?

What elements of your current writing process will you continue to use in future writing endeavors?

If you had to pick one area of the writing process that still needs to be developed, what would it be? How will you address this need in the future?

You are required to include no fewer than three samples of your writing as attachments to demonstrate the points that you are making about your writing process. These three samples are not part of your letter revision package, but rather, from prior revision packages that you have created over the course of the semester.

Formatting Guidelines

- Your letter should be three pages in length
- Outside sources are not required
- Double-space with 1” margins
- Use a 12 point in Times New Roman
- Provide a salutation and a closing with signature
Appendix B:
Purpose/Genre Handout

“What are Genres? Genres are ways of writing and speaking that help people interact and work together. Genres reflect the things people do, and they are always evolving because human activities change over time to suit new social situations and new challenges. Genres do offer somewhat stable patterns for responding to typical situations. They reflect how people act, react, and interact in these situations. Genre are meeting places – and meaning places (Johnson-Sheehan and Paine, pp: 2-3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I want/need to…..</th>
<th>Primary Purpose</th>
<th>Genre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I want to write about the meaning of something I experienced in my life.</td>
<td>Inform and/or entertain</td>
<td>Memoir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to describe someone else.</td>
<td>Inform and/or entertain</td>
<td>Profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need to critique something I saw, experienced, or read.</td>
<td>Inform, entertain, and/or persuade</td>
<td>Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to show why someone or something does or does not demonstrate high quality.</td>
<td>Inform and/or persuade</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need to explain and interpret a work of literature or art.</td>
<td>Inform and/or persuade</td>
<td>Literary Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need to explain why a text or speech was effective or persuasive, or not.</td>
<td>Inform and/or persuade</td>
<td>Rhetorical Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to express my opinion about the people and events around me.</td>
<td>Inform and/or persuade</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to argue my beliefs or opinion.</td>
<td>Persuade</td>
<td>Position Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to propose a solution to a problem.</td>
<td>Persuade</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need to explain an issue by doing research about it.</td>
<td>Inform</td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source material from *Writing Today* by Richard Johnson-Sheehan and Charles Paine, pg.18)
Appendix C:
Interview Questionnaires
(Initial Questionnaire)

Student’s Name: ________________________________

1) Has any discussion of written genre been provided in any other coursework? If yes, which course provided this instruction? When did this coursework take place? Give a brief description of the instruction:

____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

2) Define written genre:

____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

2) List written genres with which you are familiar:

____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
3) Give examples of when and why you might use each of the written genres given above.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

4) What are some of the differences between the written genres that you named above?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

(If you need additional space, please use the back and provide the question number.)
Student’s Name: 

1) Define written genre:

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

2) List written genres with which you are familiar:

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

3) Give examples of when and why you might use each of the written genres given above.

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
4) What are some of the differences between the written genres that you named above?

(If you need additional space, please use the back and provide the question number.)
# Appendix D:

## Language Diversity Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JA*</td>
<td>English, Portuguese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KF</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG*</td>
<td>English, Ukrainian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ*</td>
<td>English, Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL*</td>
<td>English, Vietnamese, Some French (Not fluent in French)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN*</td>
<td>English Some Hebrew, Some Arabic (Not fluent in other languages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS*</td>
<td>English, Khmer (Cambodian), Te~a Chol (Rural Chinese)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT*</td>
<td>English, Vietnamese, Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eighteen Students

Eleven spoke only English (61%); Seven spoke English and at least one other language (38%). *An asterisk indicates a multilingual student.
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