Generation 1.5 Immigrant Students in the Mixed Peer Response Group

Presentation Handout

Patricia Kusumaningtyas | *Columbia University* | *pk2618@columbia.edu*

Subjects	
Generation 1.5 immigrant students	Non-immigrant students
Setting	
First-year college composition classroom	
Things to look for	
Differences in language identity	How these identities interact with one another

First method: Interviews of Generation 1.5 immigrant students & non-immigrant students

Sample questions:

	Generation 1.5 Immigrant students	**Non-immigrant students**
Pre-program interview	What would you consider your first language to be? What are your expectations for your performance in your first-year college composition class?	How would you describe your relationship with the English language? What are your expectations for your performance in your first-year college composition class?
Mid-program interview	How was your interaction with non-immigrant students during collaborative parts of the class and how did that affect your progress in the class? What are some learning strategies you want to explore/change for the next half of the class?	How was your interaction with immigrant students during collaborative parts of the class and how did that affect your progress in the class? What are some learning strategies you want to explore/change for the next half of the class?
Post-program interview	How did you think your first-year college composition class inform your identity as an immigrant? Did collaboration with your peers help you in understanding the place of English as a language that shapes your identity? What methods did you wish the class could've implemented to help you learn better?	How did you think your first-year college composition class inform your relationship with the English language? How is that informed based on your collaboration with your peers? What methods did you wish the class could've implemented to help you learn better?

Successful studies employing the method of interviewing immigrant student subjects:

- Chiang, Y.-S. D. & Schmida, M. (2011). Language identity and language ownership: Linguistic conflicts of first-year university writing students. In Matsuda, P. K., Cox, M., Jordan, J. & Ortmeier-Hooper, C. (Eds.). *Second-language writing in the composition classroom*, pp. 95-108. Bedford/St. Martin's: Boston.
- Vieira, K. (2010). "American by Paper": Assimilation and Documentation in a Biliterate, Bi-Ethnic Immigrant Community. *College English*, 73(1), 50-72. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/25790459

- Ortmeier-Hooper, C. (2008). "English May Be My Second Language, but I'm Not 'ESL'". *College Composition and Communication*, 59(3), 389-419. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/20457011

Second method: Recordings of peer response group discussions

Things to look for in peer response group discussions:

- *Editing for higher-order concerns vs lower-order concerns:* This factor is likely to show how comfortable they are in stepping into another person's individual thoughts and language use.
- *Justification for their work:* Explaining their rationale, as compared to responding criticism by using "I should've done that" and "I could've…," would be a sign of ownership to their own language use.
- *Activity/passivity in the peer response group:* Although activity/passivity can be a clear indicator of the student's agency in the group, it would also be useful to consider the circumstances they are facing with regards to their mode of working with other people.
- *Obvious moments of macro- or microaggression and discrimination:* Looking for this is an obvious indicator of conflict between language identities for the students.

Successful studies employing the method of recording collaborative classroom settings:

- Reynolds, Julie & Russell, Vicki. (2008). Can You Hear Us Now? A comparison of peer review quality when students give audio versus written feedback. *Writing Across The Curriculum Journal*. 19. 29-44.
- Chang, Ching-Fen. (2012). Peer Review via Three Modes in an EFL Writing Course. *Computers and Composition*. 29. 63–78. 10.1016/j.compcom.2012.01.001.
- Anderson, P., Bergman, B., Bradley, L., Gustafsson, M., & Matzke, A. (2010). Peer reviewing across the Atlantic: Patterns and trends in L1 and L2 comments made in an asynchronous online collaborative learning exchange between technical communication students in Sweden and in the United States: JBTC JBTC. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 24(3), 296. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/724232468?accountid=10226

Third method: Revision tracking

Things to look for in revision tracking:

- *How much of revision is accepted/not accepted:* By accepting more revision without weeding out conflicting ones, there is a possibility that the students might have less of a grip on the ownership of their work.
- *From which student population revision is accepted/not accepted*: This might show how much a student values their peers' contribution, and even if taken to the extreme, their peers' language identities.
- *Self-edits:* Looking into these self-edits and which ones are inspired by the discussion in the peer response group can help identify if these students want to take feedback from their peers further.

Successful studies employing the method of revision tracking:

- Ferris, D. (1997). The Influence of Teacher Commentary on Student Revision. TESOL Quarterly, 31(2), 315-339. doi:10.2307/3588049
- Truscott, J., & Hsu, A. Y. (2008). Error correction, revision, and learning. *Journal of Second Language Writing,* 17(4), 292-305. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2008.05.003
- Spycher, P. (2007). Academic writing of adolescent English learners: Learning to use "although". *Journal of Second Language Writing,* 16(4), 238-254. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.07.001