L2 Writing Teacher Cognition in Context

Sunghee Ahn, M.A.

Assistant Professor of English

Temple University, Japan Campus

(PhD candidate, Graduate School of Education, Temple University, Japan Campus)

Supporting Information

Institutional Description

Temple University, Japan Campus (TUJ) is a full-service branch campus of a U.S. university located in Tokyo, Japan. The student body is highly diverse, including those from the U.S., Japan, and nearly 70 other countries around the world. Undergraduate students work towards fulfilling the same curricular requirements as their main campus counterparts in Temple University in Philadelphia, U.S., and as part of their general education requirements, students are placed into a first-year writing course. The study takes place in an ESL section of the first-year writing course consisting of 12 students enrolled in the course to fulfill their general education requirement. Typically, matriculated English language learner students possess a TOEFL score of at least 550 or have completed an academic English program at the university to meet undergraduate matriculation requirements. The ESL sections enroll both EFL (English as a Foreign Language) and ESL students, resulting in a wide range of English proficiencies in a single class. All courses in the undergraduate first-year writing program take a process-approach to teaching writing in which students compose several multiple draft essays, participate in peer-review activities and in one-on-one writing conferences. Working within the program's curriculum framework and learning outcomes, instructors practice a level of latitude in employing instructional materials and pedagogy that they deem helpful for achieving the writing skills outcomes.

TUJ faculty are hired through international searches and bring diverse academic and professional backgrounds. The faculty members in the First Year Writing Program are experienced in teaching North-American style composition courses and are well versed in process-oriented approaches to writing pedagogy.

Key Theorists Digest

The study reported here was designed to follow the constructivist tradition of understanding and interpreting realities according to individual perspectives. Key theorists that inform the choice of methods and research design are as follows:

Ramanathan, V. & Atkinson, D.

I use an ethnographic approach to observing the participants in their natural setting, specifically in the context of L2 writing instruction. Based on Ramanathan and Atkinson's (1999) notion of ethnographic research, the study aims to describe from an emic perspective the writing instructor's rationale for designing and organizing classroom activities, focusing particularly on understanding the instructor's view of the behavioral and interactional norms of the classroom community.

Borg. S.

My study also draws on Borg's (2003) notion of teacher cognition, broadly defined, "the unobservable cognitive dimension of teaching – what teachers know, believe, and think" (Borg, 2003, p. 81). Particularly, I examine an L2 writing instructor's teacher cognition operating in a particular instructional moment, namely when a writing assignment is introduced.

Cumming, A.

Cumming's (1992) work on ESL composition teachers' teaching routines, i.e., proactive, responsive, and framing routines, is used as one of the several analytic frames when analyzing the qualitative data.

Weissberg, B.

Weissberg's (1994) "initiation-response-evaluation" (I-R-E) analytic frame is another tool I use to understand the discourse patterns occurring in the classroom activities and to triangulate with the interview data.

Glossary

Ethnographic approach – research methods that seek to provide an insider account of their group norms, values, and forms of socialization, by way of participant observation, field notes, and interviews. In this study, *ethnographic approach* denotes the methods used for the purpose of describing an emic view of instructional decisions and classroom interactions. This approach shares many similarities with but is more limited than *ethnography*, a method that typically requires a prolonged and in-depth engagement of the researcher as a participant observer in the social group or community of the participants.

First-year writing program – a two-course sequence designed to introduce students to college-level reading, writing, and thinking skills that help build a foundation for participating in academic discourse. Each course aims to develop students' critical reading skills and rhetorical strategies for making and defending evidence-based arguments as well as reflective skills for becoming self-aware learners. Students complete three major writing assignments, each of which goes through a revision process consisting of peer-review, instructor feedback, and one-on-one teacher-student conference. Classes are typically small to allow extensive peer-to-peer engagement and individualized instruction.

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to describe the beliefs of a first-year writing teacher guiding her instructional decisions in teaching a class of second-language (L2) writers. This line of inquiry is related to the growing body of research on L2 writing teachers' cognition. The term, *teacher cognition* is broadly defined, "the unobservable cognitive dimension of teaching – what teachers know, believe, and think" (Borg, 2003, p. 81). To investigate this realm of L2 writing teachers, the study focuses on one such teacher during instances of a particular instructional moment in the course when she introduces a new writing assignment. Such moments are arguably more mundane and perhaps even uneventful occurrences in process-approach L2 writing classes in contrast to the more clearly defined genres of activities like peer-review workshops and one-on-one teacher-student writing conferences, which have attracted much attention from researchers. However, due to the relative lack of conventions surrounding the act of introducing a writing assignment and the relative freedom typically allotted to the instructor in carrying out this duty, this instructional moment can be an interesting site of research to shed light on L2 writing teachers' beliefs underlying the situation.

The field of teaching and learning L2 writing is continuously growing, and its members and their contexts are becoming increasingly diverse. Accordingly, more studies on L2 writing teacher cognition undertaken in specific teaching contexts can contribute to the growth of knowledge in this field and help inform the practitioners teaching in similar settings.

[More specific information will be added about the type of study, context, and the participants.]

Literature and Conceptual Framework

Teacher cognition is a critical component of the teaching and learning of L2 writing, but not many studies have focused on L2 writing teachers' cognition specifically. Existing studies on teacher cognition have focused on language teachers generally. Of note, the field of research on language teacher cognition has not only emerged recently but has also seen a paradigm shift from the initial positivist ontology to the more recent constructivist, social ontology in the 1990s. The earlier research conducted in the cognitivist tradition tended to focus on quantifying the observable behaviors of the teacher inside the classroom and interviewing them to identify what matches and mismatches could be found between their beliefs and their actions. Prime examples of such methodology are found in Johnson's (1992a) study of experienced ESL teachers investigating the correlation between their theoretical beliefs and their instructional strategies and Johnson's (1992b) work with preservice teachers investigating their instructional strategies utilizing frequency counts. Such postpositivist works gave way to more studies following social constructivist ontology in the mid 1990s, according to Burns et al. (2015). They explain that with the shift some researchers started to examine the individual teacher cognition within the social context of their classrooms rather than as an isolated individual mind at work. Such studies drew their theoretical and research methodological support from situated cognition and Vygotskian sociocultural thinking (Burns et al., 2015). This shift is notable because it has led to an increasing number of studies of teacher cognition that share intellectual roots with other areas of research in the field of language teaching and learning, potentially leading to more dynamic lines of inquiry.

Contributing to the body of works informing the social perspective of teacher cognition, more recently, researchers have theorized about individual and environmental factors contributing to language teachers' cognition. Borg's (2003) conceptual framework

broadly identified four categories of factors contributing to the language teaching mind, namely schooling, professional coursework, classroom practice, and contextual factors. Responding to Borg's (2003) identification of the role of context as a central issue in language teacher cognition, some studies took socioeconomic and socioeducational approaches within local contexts to define contextual influences on English-as-foreign language (EFL) teacher cognition in Japan, producing structural models to represent the weight and the direction of Japanese context-specific influences such as the university exams and attitudes toward communicative language teaching (CLT) on Japanese EFL teachers' instructional decisions (Gorsuch, 2000; Nishino, 2012).

On the other hand, other studies situated their investigation of EFL teachers even more closely in the social interactional milieu of the classroom and highlighted certain teacher-inherent or context-dependent factors influencing teachers' beliefs and attitudes. Clark-Gareca & Gui (2019) compared the beliefs of Chinese English Teachers (CETs) and American English Teachers (AETs) in the context of a summer intensive English program in a Chinese university and found that CETs and AETs shared positive attitudes toward communicative approaches to teaching English but that AETs perceived drastically lower obstacle to implementing communicative activities in a large university class owing possibly to their native speaker instincts whereas the CETs considered a more diverse range of motivations of Chinese students in forming their attitudes toward communicative approaches to teaching.

To advance the research on L2 writing teachers' cognition, one cannot ignore the body of literature on L2 teacher expertise as such knowledge help explain why understanding teacher cognition can better support L2 writers. L2 writing teacher expertise is 'the instructional beliefs, knowledge and skills that may be considered as essential at a certain level of proficiency in order for teachers to guide students towards the acquisition of

beneficial L2 writing ability" (Hirvela, 2009, as cited in Lee & Yuan, 2021, p. 3). Lee and Yuan's (2021) case study of three teachers characterized expert L2 writing teachers as perceiving writing as a socially situated activity, possessing their own integrated knowledge about writing and teaching of writing, interested in helping develop motivation and confidence in L2 writing students through the use of student-centered pedagogy, demonstrating strong reflective abilities and self-agency in problem-solving obstacles in teaching through adaptive behavior, and willing to engage in ongoing learning.

Additionally, the research into L2 writing teachers' cognition can benefit from the deployment of analytical tools that are available in the field of L2 writing research. Several studies documenting the instructional actions of ESL composition teachers in interaction with their L2 writing students in North American university settings offer possible analytical tools that can be used to extend the line of inquiry into L2 writing teachers' cognition. A well-known example of such works is Cumming's (1992) documentation of three experienced ESL composition teachers' teaching routines, which categorized teacher's classroom talk into proactive, responsive, and framing routines, each serving unique functions and capable of being nested in another routine, forming intricate and flexible structures that allowed the teacher to engage students in constructive, meaning-making discourses. Extending Cumming's identification of the teachers' discourse across different types of ESL composition lessons, Weissberg (1994) examined text-based teacher-student discourse in five different L2 writing courses at various levels of the university and identified common patterns of speech episodes and moves involving sequences of "initiation-response-evaluation" (I-R-E) between the teacher and students. These findings provide an array of possible analytical lenses through which L2 writing teacher's cognition can be investigated.

[Literature review will be more fleshed out with more recent publications.]

As discussed above, while active research is emerging from several related fields including EFL/ESL teacher cognition, L2 writing teacher expertise, and L2 writing teacher-student discourse, little attention has been paid directly to L2 writing teachers' cognition operating in more mundane day-to-day teacher-student interactions of L2 freshman composition course. Of course, one must acknowledge that the body of research on L2 writing teachers' beliefs about linguistic errors, types of feedback, plagiarism, and such are plenty and growing; however, to better appreciate the situatedness of L2 writing teacher cognition and its implications for L2 teaching and learning, teacher cognition must be investigated in under-researched L2 writing instructional scenes using existing analytical tools found in adjacent fields of research. Accordingly, this study examines an experienced L2 first-year writing teacher's classroom talk, i.e., teacher talk, in writing-related instructional moments to understand the teacher's thinking and beliefs guiding their instructional decisions. The current study addresses the following questions:

1) How does the teacher introduce a new writing assignment, and specifically what kinds of experiences or activities—if any—does the teacher ask students to engage in to orient them to the assignment? What do the teacher's practices at the time of introducing the new assignment suggest about her beliefs about the role of the activities in the writing process?

2) What knowledge or beliefs about teaching L2 writing inform her pedagogical decisions?

Methodology

Context

To address the research questions, an ethnographic study was conducted involving one writing instructor teaching first-year writing course in a full-service branch campus of a U.S. university located in a metropolitan city in Japan. The student body is highly diverse,

including those from the U.S., Japan, and nearly 70 other countries around the world. Undergraduate students work towards fulfilling the same curricular requirements as their main campus counterparts, and as part of their general education requirements, students are placed into a first-year writing course. The study takes place in an ESL section of the first-year writing course consisting of 12 English students enrolled in the course to fulfill their general education requirement. Typically, matriculated English language learner students possess a TOEFL score of at least 550 or have completed an academic English program at the university to meet undergraduate matriculation requirements. All courses in the undergraduate first-year writing program take a process-approach to teaching writing in which students compose several multiple draft essays, participate in peer-review activities and in one-on-one writing conferences. Working within the program's curriculum framework and learning outcomes, instructors practice a level of latitude in employing instructional materials and pedagogy that they deem helpful for achieving the writing skills outcomes.

Participants

One instructor in the university's first-year writing program was invited to be the main participant in this study. Anita (pseudonym), PhD in Writing and Rhetoric, is certified in teaching ESL and has 10 years of experience teaching first-year writing courses to first-language and second-language writers in U.S. universities and abroad in U.S. affiliated international campuses. Anita recently joined the first-year writing program at the university to teach both native-speaker and non-native speaker courses. A combination of typical case and operational construct sampling strategies (Hatch, 2023, p. 112) were used to identify and invite the participant. Anita represented, arguably a typical writing instructor who has a wealth of experience teaching in several different U.S. universities and has a relevant academic background. Additionally, previous encounters with Anita suggested that her approach to classroom interactions might be deliberate and based on certain pedagogically

informed beliefs. A potential ethical concern, namely any perceived unequal power relations between the researcher and the participant due to my former supervisor role in the program, was addressed early on in the invitation process. Anita was informed of the objectives of the research project as transparently as possible and assured of the absence of any hidden motives such as an evaluation of her teaching.

Positionality

The study reported here was designed within the constructivist paradigm, assuming that "universal, absolute realities are unknowable and the objects of inquiry are individual perspectives or constructions of reality" (Hatch, 2023, p. 17). As such, the study aims understand how the main participant, situated in her first-year writing course with L2 writing students in the instructional moment of introducing a writing assignment, views her own actions and intentions. That is, the design of the study was not limited to documenting "the physical events and behavior that are taking place, but also in how the participants in [the] study make sense of these, and how their understanding influences their behavior" (Maxell, 2005, p. 22). Such a line of inquiry necessarily assumes and is interested in understanding the ways the participants co-construct their reality in the given setting vis a vis their perceptions of and responses to each other's thoughts and actions.

To minimize any changes to the circumstances and the dynamics of the participants' social setting, I decided against participation in the scenes. This was a conscious decision on my part as the researcher because, given that I am another writing teacher in the same program, at times teaching the same course, my participation would have meant inserting a second teacher into the scene, which could offset the usual interactional dynamics between the main participant, the teacher of the class, and her students. To preserve the natural setting of the scene to the extent possible, I made this positionality clear to Anita, and I introduced myself as a PhD student to Anita's class, reassuring them that I was interested in observing

the class in their natural setting. Although this study was not an ethnography involving an extended period of cultural immersion of the researcher as a participant-observer in the setting, it took an ethnographic approach to observing the participants in their natural setting (Ramanathan and Atkinson, 1999) on a few limited occasions. Informed consent forms, one for the main participant, Anita (see Appendix A), and another for the students (see Appendix B), were distributed and collected from all participants.

Data Collection Methods

Data were collected from two lessons that Anita taught in her first-year writing course, Analytical Reading and Writing ESL. The students in Anita's class represented a broad range of writing abilities and L2 backgrounds, including Japanese, Malaysian, Nepalese, Turkish, Saudi Arabian, Singaporean, Filipino and more. During the first observation, Anita introduced a note-taking graphic organizer that asked students to take notes on the articles that they would find from their online database searches for a major essay assignment. During the second observation, Anita introduced the third major essay assignment. Additionally, Anita was interviewed for one hour after each lesson. Field notes were taken during a total of 160 minutes of class observation, and research protocols were produced afterwards. A total of 120 minutes of semi-structured interview was audio-recorded; an initial machine-transcription was manually proofread and time-stamped after which an interview log was created. No video or audio recordings were collected from class observations to avoid obtrusive presence of the researcher. The transcriptions of the interviews with the main participant, Anita, were analyzed to construct an emic perspective of the classroom interactions and the teacher's cognition.

Methods of Analysis

Methods of analyzing the data were informed by both inductive and typological analyses (Hatch, 2023). At the initial stage of analysis, the transcript of the first interview

was read to identify frames of analysis. Once comments related to "student-centeredness", "role of the teacher", "role of the student", and various teacher or student actions were identified as frames of analysis, the fieldnote protocols were examined for evidence of patterns of actions. Using the frames of analysis, the fieldnotes protocol from the class observations were read using process coding, also known as 'action coding' (Saldaña, 2013). Simultaneously, to ground the analysis in substantive and theoretical literature (Hatch, 2023), scholarly works were consulted, and classroom discourse and teacher talk were used as analytical instruments to examine the observable actions of the lesson and were used to triangulate with the participant teachers' articulations of the unobservable cognition guiding her planning and executing the instructional moment. Specifically, the following analytical lenses were used to categorize the observed teacher talk in the instructional moments of introducing a new writing assignment. Overall, Anita's teacher talk were first put into categories according to the patterns of either "*proactive* (i.e., presented to the whole class, planned in advance)...initiated and sustained by the teacher...[and] tended to focus on students seeing a particular 'point'" or "*responsive* routines (i.e., occurring in unplanned exchanges negotiated with individual students"...sometimes nested inside [proactive] routines, thereby increasing student involvement and relevance" (Cumming, 1992). Furthermore, each category of talk was subjected to more micro-level analyses using the notion of negotiation and scaffolding (Ewert, 2009). Although these two speech moves were studied in the context of one-on-one teacher-student writing conferences in Ewert's study (2009), they were useful in understanding the functions of the talk categorized as proactive and responsive. As such, the analytical tools of proactive and response teaching routines as well as the speech moves of scaffolding and negotiation were used as typologies for coding.

Findings

Teacher Belief 1: Activities' Role in Promoting Student Discourse

The activities Anita utilized to orient students to new writing assignments followed predictable patterns of teacher-to-student and student-to-student interactions that were aimed at increasing student-to-student discourse. Typically, a class begins with the teacher initiating the lesson, then engaging the attention of the students on the topic of the lesson and at times inviting more direct participation of the students in activities and finally ending the lesson. This so called, initiation-response-evaluation (I-R-E) speech exchange structure is the overarching prototypical organization of most classroom discourse, and some version of the I-R-E sequence between the teacher and the students repeats during the course of a class period (Markee & Kasper, 2004), and I-R-E is also often used as a unit of analysis in one-on-one writing conferences (Ewert, 2009). In a more traditional teacher-fronted classroom, the teacher's talk might adhere to this structure in a more overt and simplified pattern. For example, to introduce a writing assignment, the teacher might explain what the goals and requirements of the assignment are while students listen, and when the teacher finishes her explanation, she might invite the students to ask questions, to which she would respond. However, Anita's way of introducing writing assignments was more elaborate in nature within the overall I-R-E structure of a prototypical lesson. One typical way that Anita introduced a new writing assignment is through the employment of games or some kind of goal-oriented activity. Although games or similar competitive or goal-oriented activities are novel and engaging instructional strategies in their own right, what was notable about them was not the activities themselves but the layers of teacher-to-student and student-to-student speech exchanges that took place largely owing to Anita's deliberate activity design choices.

Specifically, Anita's activities tended to manipulate the usual I-R-E conversation turn-taking structure in service of increasing students' initiation of interactions within the activity at hand. This pattern can be seen in the design of the grab bag activity used for introducing a major essay assignment. Prior to class, Anita assigns students to read the essay

prompt and to post a question about the assignment on an online discussion board placed in Canvas, the class's course learning management system. During class, Anita asks students to write down their question on a piece of paper, collects the questions into a bag, and passes the bag around the room, allowing each student to draw a question from the grab bag and attempt to answer it to the best of their knowledge. In this system of activity, the I-R-E interactional sequence occurs, however, in contrast to the typical sequence initiated by the teacher, the first turn begins with a student asking a question, which has been composed by a student in writing. After reading the question aloud, the student is held accountable for attempting to answer the question, and if they are unable to produce any response, they are then guided by the teacher to take a guess or other students are engaged. In essence, the I-R-E sequence appears altered to I-I-R-E where students are taking the first three turns; one student initiates by formulating and writing down a question (S1), another student reads the question that has been formulated by a classmate (S2) and responds (S2). At that point, the teacher takes a turn for the first time, evaluating or providing feedback and provides closure to the sequence. The next sequence would commence by the bag being passed to the next student to draw another question.

Teacher Belief 2: Activities' Role in Socializing Students into the Role of Active Learners

The design of the grab bag activity suggests Anita's intention to operationalize the instructional moment to socialize students into the role of active learners who, with some guidance, participate in and direct their own learning process. By requiring students to complete a pre-task of formulating a question based on their reading of the prompt, Anita deliberately aimed to put students in the position to direct the whole-class conversation. Anita's activity design can be understood as a form of what Cumming (1992) calls "proactive routine," initiated and maintained by the teacher, to frame a larger class agenda or activity but

which integrates various forms of "responsive routines" where the teacher addresses impromptu student-initiated actions and issues (p. 22). Anita's proactive and intentional set up of the activity was made clear during an interview:

> ...I really like to have this kind of put it all on the students...students have to come with a question, so they have to have read the prompt well enough to come up with a question about it. They have to actually post the question on a discussion board on Canvas first so that they're prepared, otherwise there's a lot of um people saying, "I don't have a question" or "I don't know" or whatever in class. So, I make sure they formulate their question before...then I have each student draw a question, and then they try to answer it on their own. And if they don't know the answer, then they can kind of ask the class and then if the class doesn't know, then I'll take over and I'll explain it.

As seen in her comments, the multiple turns taken by students during the grab bag activity were a result of her making conscious activity design choices with an increased learner role in mind. To socialize students into the role of active learners in line with the learner-centered approach to second language teaching (Nunan, 2012), Anita not only transferred the responsibility of making meaning of the essay prompt to the students but also played the role of a "facilitator" among the learner rather than a "knower" (Nunan, 2012). Even if the question at hand is rather opaque and something that only the teacher is able to provide a satisfactory response, Anita would encourage the students to generate knowledge, asking, 'Well, what do you think?' or saying, "You don't need to know, but what's a good guess?' This does not mean that Anita relinquishes her responsibilities in clearly conveying the assignment, but her way of accomplishing the goal is by confirming and reinforcing the understanding that has been expressed by the students:

And usually what ends up happening is...sometimes students will know the answer...even if they do answer, I'll kind of reiterate it, um in my own words just to make sure it's all clear. And I have found that that um that method is really nice because it allows the students to direct the conversation, even though I do end up talking most of the time. Their questions bring up, they usually bring up really important things that I wanted to touch on. And so, we kind of navigate the writing assignment requirements, not in a linear way, but kind of like we kind of jump around, but it all kind of ends up coming together nicely...

Her comments combined with the observed patterns in student turn-taking and their collaborative responsibilities in the activities indicate in concrete terms Anita's belief in learner-centeredness as one of the main principles operating in her activity design and implementation. The consistency with which the role of the teacher and the students and the turn-taking are enacted suggest that she mobilizes the instructional moments as a vehicle to socialize the students into the role of active learners who participate in meaning-making in collaboration with their peers and the teacher in a facilitative role.

Teacher Belief 3: Activities' Role in Creating a Process of Inductive Learning

Despite the different types, the activities that Anita used to orient students to new writing assignments appeared to be designed with inductive learning process in mind. Such intent of the facilitative purpose of the activity was more clearly demonstrated in the activity, "Essay 2 Sources Chart Scavenger Hunt Q&A", which on the surface appeared to be more teacher-led but in fact subsumed a more sophisticated student-to-student meaning-making exchanges, followed by a subroutines involving small group-to-teacher responsive routines (Cumming, 1992). The scavenger activity was used to introduce students to a writing assignment involving a multiple-component graphic organizer into which students would take notes while conducting online research of sources for an upcoming essay. For this

activity, Anita created 10 questions about the various aspects of the assignment including the requirements and purposes as well as the strategies for completing it. She put the students in groups of three, and the students were tasked with answering the questions collaboratively by investigating the assignment instructions and discussing them. In terms of the overall structure of the activity, unlike the grab bag activity which had students asking questions, this activity appeared to be a more overtly teacher-proactive in its nature in that the questions had been formulated by the teacher, and the students were in the position of responding to them. However, after this initial framing made by the teacher, student were left to their own devices to collaboratively reach group answers to the questions, which invariably involved some form of speech exchanges among group members, especially given the nature of the questions and the complexity of the assignment. In an interview, Anita articulated her rationale for using this activity as being rooted in her firm belief in "experiential learning" or "learning-by-doing". She said the activity was considered a success if students were "vulnerable with having their not being able to understand" and taking risks by "correcting each other". These comments suggest the value Anita places on the process through which students grasp a concept and the negotiation that it takes. Her thoughts are in direct alignment with the experiential educational models based on the constructivist notion wherein students' experiences with the teacher and other learners provide opportunities for social and communication skills building and allow them to exercise a level of control and direction of their learning (Nunan, 2012).

In Anita's activity, though, experiential learning was not a goal in itself but a means to facilitate inductive learning about the nature and requirements of the assignment. When students engage in the process of negotiating their understanding to construct their group's consensus, Anita seemed to believe that students' experiences of facing disagreements or

feeling uncertain worked to create a teaching moment when teacher talk could have its maximum utility:

> ...I am equally as happy about when I see the right kind of wrong answers...This is a perfect learning opportunity. So, for them to present information that I can like redirect is also a sign of success, I think, because at that point they are listening, because it's something that they are vulnerably put out as their answer. So, they are paying attention.

The comment seemed indicative of Anita's belief that creating social experiences in the context of authentic and open-ended activities promote students' investment in their learning and that she is likely to dispense teacher talk strategically in such optimal moments. By mobilizing moments of student investment, Anita provided corrective feedback or supplemented the group responses when more intricate or more elaborated understanding was called for. In this process, Anita's subroutines responding to each group's answers were used to 'establish criteria' for the assignment and to model relevant thinking processes (Cumming, 1992, p. 25). In this way, the moves in Anita's teacher talk appeared to be carefully orchestrated in concert with the students' participation playing out in real-time without a predetermined script, for the purpose of supporting students' bottom-up, inductive understanding of the assignment.

Teacher Belief 4: Teacher's Role in Connecting Writing Process Activities Across Time

Yet another belief of Anita's that could be gleaned from Anita's classroom teacher talk was the need for the teacher to convey to students the situatedness of the current assignment to activities carried out previously or a larger writing project. In other words, Anita's speech moves took on a more proactive stance, initiating turns to newly introduce a question or to add a comment to explain how a particular lesson from a few days ago can be applied to the assignment being introduced in the current lesson. For the scavenger hunt

Q&A activity, Anita posed 10 questions, question 5 and 9 elicited students to think about its

relatedness to the bigger essay project they were working towards and questions 6, 7, and 8

about the link between previous lessons and assignments to the current one:

SOURCES CHART SCAVENGER QUIZ

1. When is part 1 due?

2. When is part 2 due?

3. What will the first 3 sources of the chart be about?

4. How many sources will you need to find on your own for this chart?

5. How many sources from this chart will you use in your essay?

6. How reading assignment 3 connected to the sources chart?

7. How is Drew the librarian's presentation from last class connected to the sources chart?

8. What is 1 piece of advice from Drew that you can apply when filling out your chart?

9. Why do you think you're locating more sources for this chart than you actually need for your essay?

10. What is 1 question your group has about the sources chart assignment?

Not only did Anita proactively direct these questions to students, but she also inserted

comments while going over group's answers to reference the previous class in which the

librarian had introduced the students to the online research guides and specific resources.

Such speech turns claimed by Anita in the whole-class interaction were not directly in

response to any student comment but self-initiated by Anita. These observations suggest

Anita's perception of the teacher's role in the activity, which is to provide guidance for

students to understand the less salient aspects of the assignment, especially the temporal

place the assignment occupies in the larger composing process. Anita's use of proactive

routines or speech moves supports Cumming's (1992) observation that in ESL composition classes, proactive routines were useful for teachers to make a certain instructional point.

The heightened sense of responsibility to connect lessons and activities together across time appeared to be a prominent consideration when Anita introduced other writing assignments. To introduce essay 3, she created "Party at Denny's" activity, which asked students to participate in an unscripted party scene. Anita's aim was for students to experience the Burkean Parlor metaphor for engaging in an ongoing scholarly conversation (Burke, 1941). In the duration of the activity, some students engaged in topic-based conversations while others joined late and left early. After the activity, Anita facilitated students' reflection by inviting them to ponder their felt needs and obstacles and anticipate similar situations potentially arising in the composing process of the essay. Anita observed the most affirming outcomes of the activity include students relating their experience of feeling disoriented arriving late to the party scene with the need to read research sources well to understand the academic conversation before deciding to pitch in with their argument. This activity also points to Anita's perception of the writing teacher's role in creating experiences that help students grasp the general concept of the writing process, which tended to be more illusory to novice writers because of the less visible contextual dimensions pertaining to time, place, and actors (authors and audience).

Discussion

On a quick glance, the beliefs of the teacher revealed in the analyses do not differ greatly from the tenets of learner-centered approaches to instruction articulated by Nunan (2013) including the principles of the role of the learner as an active participant, the role of the teacher as a facilitator of learning, and the reduced power differences between the teacher and the learner where the learner takes on the responsibility of directing their learning (p. 50). In fact, Anita clearly labeled her instructional aims and actions as "student-centered" in an

interview, and her beliefs were demonstrated consistently in the teacher-to-student and student-to-student interactions during the instructional events. In this sense, it is easy to dismiss the findings of the study as a commonplace campaign for a student-centered L2 writing class.

However, on a closer look, the use of classroom discourse and teacher talk as analytical units reveal the plausibility of this analytical tool in conjunction with interviews as a worthwhile instrument for investigating L2 writing teacher cognition. While the study took an emic perspective and developed themes from Anita's interview statements, they were triangulated with inductive coding of the field observations. In this process, frames of reference for analyzing teacher talk and classroom discourse were adopted from the literature (Cumming, 1992; Ewert, 2009; Weissberg, 1994) and deployed to scrutinize the turn-taking sequences in relation to the larger lesson structure. Because the class interactions were not audio-recorded, conversation analysis (CA) could not be used. However, the field notes protocols still allowed for the analyzing the variations of I-R-E that privileged student turn-taking and the teacher's strategic relinquishing and assertions of conversation turns. Notably, the repeated patterns across the three assignment introduction activities, in the span of two classes, signaled Anita's efforts to socialize the L2 writers into highly communicative and responsibility sharing participants in the meaning-making process. Additionally, the experiences resulting from Anita's activity design revealed an inductive process through which students collaborated to reach their understandings of the assignments. Finally, the instances of teacher talk surfacing over the more dominant student discourse inferred Anita's perception of the teacher's role in providing support to students in grasping the aspects of the assignment that are less visible. These findings support Borg's (2003) notion that "teachers are active, thinking decision-makers who make instructional choices by drawing on complex-practically-oriented, personalized, and context-sensitive networks of knowledge, thoughts,

and beliefs" (p. 81). Anita was observed operationalizing her expert knowledge on writing and rhetoric, her teaching experience to create learner-centered classroom discourse practices, which helped to create experiential, inductive learning process.

Given the scope of the current study, the rich data collected could not be explored in their entirety; however it should be noted that Anita was fully aware of the ways that her intentions for learner-centered activity organization were sometimes at odds with the interactional resources of the students, for example when many students were absent or when the overall energy level of the class was low. In future studies, it would be important to investigate L2 writing teacher's cognition in both similar and different instructional moments to gain more nuanced understanding of the contextual-dependent nature of L2 writing teacher cognition. Such research may help illuminate a range of expert and non-expert coping cognition in situ that may be informative to practitioners and teacher educators. Further, studying the students' experiences for the same context from the students' perspective can help provide a more comprehensive view.

[Discussion will be developed further, drawing more on the key theorists and more recent literature in the field of teacher cognition and classroom discourse.]

Conclusion

More research on L2 writing teacher cognition in the context of more mundane classroom situations is needed to advance the field's understanding of how to better support teachers and learners alike. This study has explored one specific such context via a minute scale study of one experienced L2 first-year writing teacher. The implications of the study are limited due to the specific situatedness of the social setting and may be difficult to extrapolate to other L2 writing circumstances. Yet, the current study may have provided one example, if not the first, of taking up teacher-student speech sequences and teacher talk as analytical tool,

helping other teacher cognition researchers to evaluate the usefulness of the analytical lens in their sites of research.

[Conclusion will be fleshed out more.]

References

Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*. *36*, 81-109.

Burke, K. (1941). *The philosophy of literary form.* University of California Press, 110-11.

Burns, A., Freeman, D., & Edwards, E. (2015). Theorizing and studying the language teaching mind: Mapping research on language teacher cognition. *The Modern Language Journal*, *99*(3), 585–601. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12245

Clark-Gareca, B., & Gui, M. (2019). Chinese and American EFL teachers' beliefs about curricular and pedagogical practices: cross-cultural similarities and differences. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, *19*(2), 137–151. https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2018.1456546

Cumming, A. (1992). Instructional routines in ESL composition teaching: A case study of three teachers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *1*(1), 17–35. https://doi.org/10.1016/1060-3743(92)90018-

Ewert, D. E. (2009). L2 writing conferences: Investigating teacher talk. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *18*(4), 251–269. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2009.06.002

Gorsuch, G. J. (2000). EFL educational policies and educational cultures: Influences on teachers' approval of communicative activities. *TESOL Quarterly*, *34*(4), 675–710. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587781

Hatch, J. A. (2023). *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. (2nd Edition). State University of New York Press.

Johnson, K. E. (1992a). The relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices during literacy instruction for non-native speakers of English. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, *24*(1), 83–108. https://doi.org/10.1080/10862969209547763

Johnson, K. E. (1992b). Learning to teach: Instructional actions and decisions of preservice ESL Teachers. *TESOL Quarterly*, *26*(3), 507–535. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587176

Lee, I., & Yuan, R. (Eric). (2021). Understanding L2 writing teacher expertise. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *52*, 100755-. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100755

Markee, Numa, & Gabriele Kasper. Classroom talks: An introduction. *The Modern Language Journal*, vol. 88, no. 4, 2004, pp. 491–500, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0026-7902.2004.t01-14-.x.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nded.). Thousand Oaks, Sage.

Nishino, T. (2012). Modeling teacher beliefs and practices in context: A multimethods approach. *The Modern Language Journal*, *96*(3), 380–399. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2012.01364.x

Nunan, D. (2013). *Learner-centered English language education: the selected works of David Nunan* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203096888

Ramanathan, V., & Atkinson, D. (1999). Ethnographic approaches and methods in L2 writing research: A critical guide and review. *Applied Linguistics, 20* (1), 44-70. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/20.1.44

Saldaňa, J. (2013). First Cycle Codings. Ch. 3 in J. Saldaňa, *The coding manual for qualitative researchers,* 58-183. Sage.

Weissberg, B. (1994). Speaking of writing: Some functions of talk in the ESL composition class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *3*(2), 121–139. https://doi.org/10.1016/1060-3743(94)90011-6

Appendix A

Informed Consent Form for Anita

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Title of Study Teacher's perceptions of interactional processes in an assignment introduction

Researcher Sunghee Ahn, Ph. D. student in Applied Linguistics at Temple University Japan

Purpose of the Form:
The purpose of this form is to ask you to participate in a research study. I will explain the study to you and ask you to volunteer to participate in the study. Please feel free to ask any questions that you may have before you decide if you want to participate. Whether you take part in the study is entirely up to you, and you are also free to withdraw from the study at any time. By signing this consent form, you are <u>not</u> waiving any legal rights that you have. You are only indicating that the study has been explained to you, that you have had an opportunity to ask questions, that you understand what is involved, and that you are willing to participate in the study.

Explanation of the study
The goal of this study is to investigate the kinds of (learner-centered) experiences or activities the teacher asks students to engage in to orient them to a new assignment and to gain insights into the teacher's beliefs about the role of the experiences or activities in promoting understanding of the assignment and the meanings that the students generate about the assignment. A secondary purpose of this study is for me to gain experience with qualitative research methods. This project is part of my course work at Temple University Japan, but it may evolve into a larger study to be published in the future. Data collected in the study will be used for educational and research purposes only.

Imposition on participants
The estimated duration of your participation in the study is 2 class periods, the first time on February 7th and the second time tentatively on March 3rd. Additionally, after each class observation, I would like to interview you for no more than 60 minutes. In total, participation in this study is estimated to involve 280 minutes (80 min. + 80 min. + 120 minutes) or approximately 4 hours and 40 minutes.

Risks
The reasonably foreseeable risks or discomforts of participating in this study are minimal. I will be observing the usual activities and interactions that naturally occur in your class and will interview you after each class to ask questions about your beliefs about the role of the experiences or activities in promoting understanding of the assignment and the meanings that the students generated about the assignment However, if at any time, you do not feel comfortable having me observe or interview you , please let me know and I will respect your requests.

Benefits
The benefit of participating in this study is knowing that you have contributed to an increased understanding of the types and the nature of classroom experiences or activities that occur when a teacher introduces an assignment and the teacher's perception or rationale for the

experiences or activities. Additionally, you will contribute to the education of a future researcher.

Your rights as a research participant
Your participation is voluntary and is unrelated to any teaching evaluation. You may decide not to participate and you are free to stop participating in the research at any time without penalty. If you decide not to participate at any time, no information related to you will be included in this study.
At any time now and in the future, you may ask me questions about this study and I will do my best to answer your questions to your satisfaction.

Confidentiality
I will do my best to keep data collected for this study confidential. I will keep all of this information in a safe place, and do my best to ensure your anonymity. All the proper names (names of people, institutions, places, etc.) used in this study, including yours, will be changed. I will also do my best to limit the disclosure of your identity, but I cannot promise complete secrecy. There is always a potential risk of loss of confidentiality, and there is a slight chance that fellow researchers who hear your recorded voice might recognize you.

Dissemination
Data collected for this project will go into assignments for my coursework in the Introduction to Qualitative Research course at Temple University Japan. I will also be using the data in a class presentation to my fellow classmates. In the future, the data may also be used for a publication.

Your consent to participate in this study
    Please initial the ways, if any, in which you agree to participate in this study.

1. I do not want to participate in this study in any way.   _____
2. I agree to participate in this research.   _____
3. I agree to be audio-recorded during interviews.   _____
4. I also give permission to Sunghee Ahn to retain the audio-   _____
    recordings for the duration of her research for educational and research purposes only.

8. I give permission to Sunghee Ahn to quote me using a   _____
    pseudonym in future published paper/s.

I understand the information given to me, and I have received answers to any questions I have about the study. I understand and agree to the conditions of this study.

I understand that my participation in this study is voluntary, and that I may withdraw from this study at any time by telling Sunghee Ahn to remove me from the study. Contact information is written below.

I also understand that I will receive a signed copy of this consent form.

_____
       Name (please print)

_____   _____

Signature   Date

Thank you very much for your participation.

_____
     Researcher's Name
_____   _____
     Researcher's signature   Date

Participant's Contact Information
Name: Pietera Fraser
Address: Owl Center
Temple University, Japan Campus
               1-35-7 Sangenjaya, Setagaya-ku, Tokyo, Japan 154-0024
TEL Number +81-3-5441-9800
E-mail   pietera.fraser@tuj.temple.edu

Researcher's Contact Information
Name: Sunghee Ahn
Address: Owl Center
Temple University, Japan Campus
               1-35-7 Sangenjaya, Setagaya-ku, Tokyo, Japan 154-0024
TEL Number +81-3-5441-9800
E-mail   ahn@tuj.temple.edu

Appendix B

Informed Consent Form for Students

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Title of Study Teacher's perceptions of interactional processes in an assignment introduction

Researcher Sunghee Ahn, Ph. D. student in Applied Linguistics at Temple University Japan

Purpose of the Form:
        The purpose of this form is to ask you to participate in a research study. Whether you take part in the study is entirely up to you, and you are also free to withdraw from the study at any time. By signing this consent form, you are not waiving any legal rights that you have. You are only indicating that the study has been explained to you, that you have had an opportunity to ask questions, that you understand what is involved, and that you are willing to participate in the study.

Explanation of the study
        The goal of this study is to investigate the kinds of experiences or activities a teacher asks students to engage in to orient them to a new assignment and to gain an insight into the teacher's beliefs about the role of the experiences or activities in promoting understanding of the assignment and the meanings that the students generate about the assignment. A secondary purpose of this study is for me to gain experience with qualitative research methods. This project is part of my course work at Temple University Japan, but it may evolve into a larger study to be published in the future. Data collected in the study will be used for educational and research purposes only.

Imposition on participants

The estimated duration of your participation in the study is two class periods, the first time on February 7th and the second time tentatively on March 3rd, for a total of 2 hours and 40 minutes.

Risks

The reasonably foreseeable risks or discomforts of participating in this study are minimal. I will be observing the usual activities and interactions that naturally occur in your class. However, if at any time, you do not feel comfortable having me observe you, please let me know and I will respect your requests.

Benefits

The benefit of participating in this study is knowing that you have contributed to an increased understanding of the types and the nature of classroom experiences or activities that occur when a teacher introduces an assignment and the teacher's perception or rationale for the experiences or activities. Additionally, you will contribute to the education of a future researcher.

Your rights as a research participant

Your participation is voluntary and is unrelated to your course evaluation. You may decide not to participate, and if you decide not to participate at any time, no information related to you will be included in this study.

At any time now and in the future, you may ask me questions about this study and I will do my best to answer your questions to your satisfaction.

Confidentiality

I will do my best to keep data collected for this study confidential. I will keep all of this information in a safe place, and do my best to ensure your anonymity. All the proper names (names of people, institutions, places, etc.) used in this study, including yours, will be changed.

Dissemination

Data collected for this project will go into assignments for my coursework in the Introduction to Qualitative Research course at Temple University Japan. I will also be using the data in a class presentation to my fellow classmates. In the future, the data may also be used for a publication.

Your consent to participate in this study

Please indicate whether you agree to participate in this study by putting a check mark (✓) in front of the statements that you agree with:

   I do not want to participate in this study in any way.
   I agree to participate in this research.
   I give permission to Sunghee Ahn to quote me using a pseudonym in future published paper/s.

I understand the information given to me, and I have received answers to any questions I have about the study. I understand and agree to the conditions of this study.

I understand that my participation in this study is voluntary, and that I may withdraw from this study at any time by telling Sunghee Ahn to remove me from the study. Contact information is written below.

I also understand that I will receive a signed copy of this consent form.

_____
      Your Name (please print)

_____   _____

Signature   Date

Thank you very much for your participation.

_____
    Researcher's Name

_____   _____
    Researcher's signature   Date

Researcher's Contact Information
Name: Sunghee Ahn
Address: Owl Center
Temple University, Japan Campus
                1-35-7 Sangenjaya, Setagaya-ku, Tokyo, Japan 154-0024
TEL Number   +81-3-5441-9800
E-mail   ahn@tuj.temple.edu

Appendix C

Data Log of the First Interview

First Interview: February 28, 2025, 9:15-10:15am, Owl Center

Time	Topic	Summary
00:00 – 05:22	Purpose of the interview Research questions	I built rapport with the participant, reiterated the research questions, and clarified the purpose of the interview.
05:23 – 09:14	Typical ways of introducing a writing assignment	P described two different types of activities: (1) Grab bag activity is used to introduce an essay assignment; students read the essay prompt for homework, post a question to the discussion board; in class, each student contributes a question to the grab bag and answers someone else's question from the grab bag; teacher helps out when they need help or clarification is useful.
09:14 – 12:14		(2) Scavenger Hunt, or a gamified Q&A, is used to introduce smaller writing assignments (this is the class I observed on Feb. 7); students answer a list of teacher-generated questions and post their answers to the discussion board; class reviews the answers together and discussion ensues.
12:35 – 17:28	P's definition of "student-centeredness"	P defined what "student-centered" means to her. P repeatedly mentioned "putting it in students' hands", transferring the role of the

		teacher to the students, and the teacher playing the role of a facilitator who "redirects" the discussions if needed but never telling students what the assignment is or "pulling the strings". Students are "beginning the conversation and navigating the conversation and understanding the assignment" (15:22-15:49). They are also collaborating and holding one another accountable to achieve those ends.
18:00 – 24:00	Most important principles that P has in mind when introducing an assignment	P named and described the principles that are important to her when introducing an assignment. • "Not talking at my students" (18:58) • Responsibility of the instructor (19:43) • Capturing students' attention (19:43-22:05) • Internalization of knowledge (21:49-23:27) • Removal of boundary between the student and teacher (23:29)
24:16 – 27:18	P's perception of students' responses to the Scavenger Hunt activity	P was satisfied with the student responses and explained what constitutes a "good" response from students.
		• Students correcting each other's "wrong" answers
27:55		• Students "being me (the teacher) for me" (28:04) • Students taking on the role of the teacher (23:29) • Students reading the instructions • "Learning moment for the other students" (29:09)
30:20 – 34:56	P's criteria for assessing the success of the way the assignment was introduced	P described her criteria for assessing the level of success of the assignment introduction activity.
		• Students produce some "wrong answers in the right way" (31:57) • A moment for a classmate's help or a teacher's "clarifying and redirecting" (33:43)
		• Students are taking risks, being vulnerable with one another, attempting an answer (32:09)
		• Students paying attention (32:59)
		• Students asking questions (34:18)
34:56 – 36:50	What P took notes on after the class that I observed	P described the notes that she took. Normally, she notes things to do differently the next time she does the activity, but for the class

		that I observed, she didn't notice anything that needed major adjustment. Instead she took notes on what to remind students about.
39:49 – 43:50	What informs P's approach to assignment introduction activities	P described her personal beliefs and some past teaching experiences.
		• "Deep, deep within me" - her way of learning by doing (40:52) • Personal preference for a particular way of teaching - "better way" (41:43) • Interested in student experiences – phenomenological inquiry (43:16)
46:25 – 48:30	P's framework for creating the questions for the Scavenger Hunt activity	P needed some clarification of my question. Once clarified, she mentioned the following. (46:25-44:30) • Has some core things that she wants students to know from the assignment • Identifies the most common misconceptions about the assignment • Ensures that all information is "findable" and not just "intuitive" • Identifies the points that are not stated but should be "figured out" from discussion • Decides on ideal group size
	Reason for mentioning the librarian's visit	P explained why a frequent reference to the librarian, who gave a research lesson in a previous class, was made. • To remind students how the assignments are connected and that they have the resources (49:40-50:33)
50:33 – 54:44	Other considerations when designing questions for an activity like the scavenger hunt	P followed her stream of thought into yet another consideration that was specific to this assignment, which later became formulated into Question #9, "Why do you think you're locating more sources for this chart than you actually need?" In her first time teaching the course at TUJ, P wondered why students would do a sources chart before the research proposal but later realized the pedagogical rationale for it and felt that it was important for her students to understand that, too. She devised question #9 in consideration of the pedagogical goal but asked the question in a more student-friendly way. (50:33-54:44)
55:29 – 59:00	P's realization about the curriculum materials that were shared with her when she first started at TUJ FYWP	P explained her initial misunderstanding of the purpose of the shared curriculum materials. She was under the impression that everyone had to teach using the same materials and that the writing process

		activities had to be uniform across all sections in lock step. However, she learned over the course of the semester that there was flexibility and that instructors were encouraged to develop their own materials. P described her initial frustration, her wish to do things her own way, and her current participation in a teaching circle to contribute.

Appendix D

Interview #2 Guiding Questions

What sociocultural situatedness of P's choices and perceptions influence P's choices?

- You mentioned that the activity didn't go as well as you'd thought. Can you talk a little about that?

- What are your concerns when doing the activities?

- Ask probing questions about the situational factors in the activity.

- The party at Denny's activity is a different kind of activity than the scavenger hunt Q&A I observed. What are the considerations that went into choosing that as a way to introduce the essay assignment? What do you think the students got out of the activity?

- Have you used the activity outside of TUJ and if so, do you do them any differently? **(SC)**

  o When is the first time you tried it? How did the activity evolve, if at all, since then? What are the considerations that went into evolving it?

- In hindsight, how do you think the activity helped students become introduced to the essay assignment?

- Can you describe the way that the activity went in the class that Ryan observed and talk about why you felt that the activity was more successful there?

What sociocultural situatedness of P's classroom influences P's choices or perceptions of the activity?