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ABSTRACT

Community College ESL and English Composition Faculty Collaboration

by Lynn Hovde

Purpose. The purpose of this study was to examine the collaboration between ESL and English composition instructors at the community college level using the Kolb and Gray (2005) collaboration leadership model in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respective and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict. A secondary purpose was to explore barriers to collaboration and describe what strategies and practices could improve collaboration.

Methodology. An explanatory sequential mixed method study was chosen because it offered a multifaceted and in-depth view of current practice, which allowed for a more thorough analysis. In the first phase, quantitative data was collected via a survey distributed to all ESL and English composition instructors at three Washington State community colleges. In the second phase, qualitative data was collected via six interviews, three with ESL instructors and three with English composition instructors. Following the two phases, conclusions were drawn regarding how the qualitative results explained the quantitative results.

Findings. Minimal collaboration between ESL and English composition instructors was discovered, yet instructors said they would participate if professional development opportunities were made available. Eleven of 19 barriers from Kolb and Gray (2005) were identified. Common mission and necessary resources were the top strategies identified from the collaborative leadership model.
Conclusions. The data gathered established a need for and an interest in collaboration between ESL and English composition faculty. The collaborative leadership model (Kolb & Gray, 2005) provides strategies to address the barriers that both survey and interview participants identified in this study.

Recommendations. Community colleges should use these findings to develop collaborative training programs for ESL and English composition faculty engaged in teaching ESL students. Educators, working in collaboration with one another, should use these findings to improve the methods used to meet the learning needs of ESL students and to develop ways to streamline the transition from ESL to English 101.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

As of 2014, there was an influx of international students coming to the United States to pursue college degrees. International exchange programs were established in the United States in the 1940s, and the numbers of international students coming to the United States to study has been increasing ever since (Lu, 2001). Ith (2014) stated, “From 1999 to 2004, the number of international students in universities [worldwide] went up from 25 million to 175 million” (p. 14). The Institute for International Education (IIE, 2014), which partners with the U.S. Department of State’s Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs in collecting data on international students in the United States, reported the United States hosts more international college students than any other country, and “the number of international students at colleges and universities in the United States increased by 8% to a record high of 886,052 in the 2013/14 academic year” (p. 1).

Anayah (2012) stated enrollment of international students at community colleges is a growing trend. Several reasons exist for this rising trend. One reason is colleges help improve intercultural awareness (Lu, 2001). The presence of international students on a college campus creates a rich cultural experience from which all students can benefit. Another reason is the tuition international students pay boosts the U.S. economy. In 2013, international students contributed $27 billion to the U.S. economy (IIE, 2014). In a report on the attitudes and perceptions of international students in study abroad programs, a top reason for the students was the quality of academic programs (IIE, 2010). Another reason included wanting to become more proficient in English. English is the
global language, and international students are attracted to colleges in the United States to acquire the English language skills they need to succeed in a global economy.

Anayah (2012) indicated international students attend community colleges because of the opportunity to transfer to a university. A community college is a cost-effective steppingstone to the 4-year degree these students ultimately desire (Anayah, 2012). According to Zeszotarski (2003), community colleges are attractive to international students because they offer “open admission standards, low cost, and opportunities for vocational training and English as a second language study” (p. 1). Given these benefits, international students enrolled in community colleges nationwide increased by 61% whereas other institutions of higher education experienced an increase closer to 20% (Zeszotarksi, 2003). Community colleges seem to be riding on the crest of a wave of dramatic change in a world that is becoming increasingly global.

International students coming to study in the United States often begin in an English as a second language (ESL) program at a community college. Upon completion of a community college ESL program, students move into mainstream community college classes to pursue an associate degree. Once they obtain the 2-year degree, they often transfer to a 4-year college or university. In this process, international students face several hurdles: (a) transitioning from the education system in their home country to the education in their host country, (b) transitioning from an ESL program into mainstream community college classes, and (c) transitioning from community college to a 4-year college or university. If international students experience difficulty with any of these transitions, that could affect their academic success. The community college is a
common factor in all of these transitions; thus, the role that community colleges play regarding international student success is important (Anayah, 2012).

Community colleges offer various kinds and degrees of support to international students through the administrators, advisors, ESL faculty, and tutoring centers. Many community colleges have ESL programs in place to assist international students in preparing for college-level classes. According to Simon (2006), ESL programs are experiencing rapid growth, with a 38% increase in ESL programs across the country.

Although international program administrators, advisors, and ESL faculty are trained to assist international students, mainstream faculty work directly with these students as well. English composition (or English 101) instructors are of particular importance because writing is a core college skill across the curriculum. Writing is a developmental skill, and one course or instructor cannot capture all of the needs of international students in one semester. Each writing course has certain target outcomes that must be achieved before a student can move from one level to another.

One of the hurdles international community college students face when pursuing an education in the United States is the transition from an ESL program to English composition classes. Gil (2013) explained these programs may not be aligned. Andrews (2008) discussed the importance of faculty collaboration to enhance student learning. This study explored the level of collaboration between ESL and English 101 instructors, the barriers these two faculty groups experience in terms of collaboration, and strategies for improving collaboration. The study contributed to a better understanding of how collaboration between these two faculty groups can enhance student learning and help international students transition from one program to another.
Background

Statistics on International Students Attending Colleges in the United States

The IIE recorded past and present statistics on the number of international students studying at institutes of higher learning in the United States. Table 1 was constructed by the researcher based on data from the IIE (Open Door, 2015) and shows the increase in students in 10-year intervals.

Table 1

*International Students Studying in the United States*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th># of International Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1953–1954</td>
<td>34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963–1964</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973–1974</td>
<td>151,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983–1984</td>
<td>339,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993–1994</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003–2004</td>
<td>573,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013–2014</td>
<td>886,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zhadko (2011) reported the United States attracts more international students than any other country. Of the international students studying in the United States in 2013–2014, 87,963 (approximately 10%) were studying at the community college level. Of the top 40 community colleges hosting international students in 2013–2014, California was at the top with nine schools, Washington was second with six schools, and Texas was third with five schools.

Reasons for the Rising Trend

**Globalization.** Globalization is affecting the world in many ways and affecting higher education in that more and more international students are choosing to study in the United States (Johnson, 2012). Johnson (2012) found higher education was in a state of
transition because of globalization. Johnson (2012) stated higher education experienced two previous rapid transition periods, one reflecting “the innovation of the university and the subsequent expansion of research funding, student financial aid and the increase of student populations through diversity” (p. 8). He explained the first transition period occurred between 1880 and 1910 and was related to “the Germanic model of research and education” (Johnson, 2012, p. 8), and the second period occurred right after World War II when the United States experienced rapid entry into higher education with the introduction of education benefits for military service. Johnson noted the world was experiencing a third transition period due to globalization.

Several findings emerged from Johnson’s (2012) research that are important to the current study. He found international staff and students are vital to globalization and continued growth because studying abroad contributed to cultural awareness and global consciousness. Additionally, international students build brand recognition for colleges and universities and enhance their global profile. International students also promote cross-border collaboration that is essential in a global economy. Johnson found administrative engagement and proactive policies are needed to recruit and support international students; his findings relate the importance of collaboration between administrators, faculty, and students.

Colleges of today are different than those of the past. Colleges are building globalization verbiage into their mission statements. Johnson (2012) stated “internal and external forces are pushing universities to embrace a more universal perspective” (p. 8). This trend has made its way into the classroom. Classrooms in the United States no longer consist predominantly of native English-speaking students. International students
are entering the classroom from a variety of cultures with varying learning needs. Kaur (2007) stated these different cultures require different teaching and learning practices, with some international students experiencing longer adjustment periods than others. This provides mainstream instructors with a greater challenge in that they have a wider range of students to accommodate. English 101 instructors play a key role in helping international students become more proficient in their English language skills; thus, it would be beneficial for English 101 instructors to have a better understanding of ESL methods that address international student needs by collaborating with ESL faculty trained to work with international students (Gil, 2013)

**English as an international language.** English is emerging as a crucial language in the global world. According to Baccaglini (2013), the use of the English language is spreading rapidly. Vistawide (2004) reported that, of all the languages in the world, English is spoken by the greatest number of non-native speakers. It is important for those who want to succeed in the global marketplace to communicate effectively in English because it is considered the international language for communication and business (Baccaglini, 2013; Fenner & Kuhlman, 2012).

**Technology.** Current technologies have made studying abroad more accessible to students. Globalization is a result of technology, as computers and other technological tools allow for international communication and collaboration (Zhadko, 2011). Through these networks, students receive information about studying abroad. At the same time, colleges and universities around the world have been reaching out to international student “to provide opportunities for increasing intercultural awareness and to offset declining enrollment of domestic students” (Lu, 2001, p. 7).
Another feature attracting students to study abroad is the aspect of learning more about technology so they can become more marketable in the global world. The use of technology is now considered an important life skill (Zhadko, 2011). In a college environment, students develop technological skills, which enhances their critical thinking and problem-solving skills. Zhadko (2011) stated many international students flock to the United States to learn about and gain access to more advanced technology.

The Role of Community Colleges in Meeting the Needs of the Global Student

To understand the need for collaboration among ESL and English composition programs and instruction, it helps to understand student needs and the barriers that exist. Vifansi (2002) differentiated between target needs and learning needs. Target needs are the outcomes students are expected to accomplish at the end of a course to progress to the next writing level. Learning needs are specific to each student, and if they are met, target needs are more likely to be met as well. Vifansi stated when instructors build their curriculum, they often focus too much on target needs rather than learning needs. He indicated it was fine to have the same target goals for native English-speaking students and ESL students; however, ESL student learning needs should be considered when building the curriculum, especially in terms of writing. Baccaglini (2013) agreed the diversity of learners in higher education requires different approaches to teaching and learning.

In addition to the learning needs of ESL students varying from native-English speaking students, learning needs between groups of ESL students differ. Kaur (2007) noted students come from different cultures with varied perceptions about education; thus, ESL student needs vary based on their culture and previous education experiences.
Kaur (2007) also stated, “Most research studies conducted on international students in the past have grouped all international students into one category and they have overlooked their unique adjustment problems” (p. 4).

As the world becomes more global, more students are crossing borders to obtain an education outside their home countries (IIE, 2014). Community colleges are a popular first step toward their academic goals. As Kaur (2007) related, international students often leave their home country to achieve their academic goals, with some starting their academic endeavors at community colleges. This trend has impacted the infrastructure of the community college, and community colleges need to prepare for the present and projected increase in international students.

Although each community college has its own mission statement, a common goal of community colleges tends to focus on meeting the learning needs of students and promoting diversity (Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, 2021). To meet the learning needs of all students, international students must be considered. Community college classrooms in the United States need to be seen as global classrooms, embracing both native English speakers and a range of ESL students from a variety of cultures with differing learning needs.

The ESL Program

The United States has been a country of immigrants since John Smith and William Bradford established colonies on its soil. Up until the 1960s, immigrants were expected to mainstream into U.S. culture, often losing their cultures in the process—hence the term melting pot. Three key things happened in the 1960s to create a change. First, in 1963, Florida experienced an influx of Cuban immigrants, and the first large-
scale bilingual program was developed, which later served as a national model (Grekin, 2008). Second, in 1966, the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) program was founded. Third, the Bilingual Act of 1968 was enacted and acknowledged the needs of children entering U.S. schools without speaking English. Moving into the 1970s, another key event launching current ESL programs was the 1974 *Lau v. Nichols* case in which the U.S. Supreme Court ruled Chinese students in San Francisco were denied an adequate education because they could not understand the English instruction (Grekin, 2008).

As events occurred and programs were established, theories of teaching ESL also evolved. Taber (2006) provided a detailed synopsis of the evolution of the theories for ESL instruction. Table 2 presents a summary of the evolution of ESL instruction based on Taber’s article.

**Table 2**

*History of English as a Second Language Instructional Methods*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 19th Century</td>
<td>Classical Method of teaching Latin and Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800-late 1940s</td>
<td>Grammar-Translation Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850s-early 1900s</td>
<td>The Series Method and The Direct Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World War II</td>
<td>Audiolingual Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s</td>
<td>Universal Grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>The Silent Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Community Language Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Total Physical Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Suggestopedia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>The Natural Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since the 1990s</td>
<td>Eclecticism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taber (2006) noted the challenges teachers experience in classrooms with multilingual students and the multiple methods used to instruct them. Present-day ESL
instructors are familiar with these different methods, and eclecticism is a popular approach because it actively engages students, addresses a variety of learning needs, and creates a positive learning environment for ESL students (Taber, 2006).

**Collaboration**

Mainstream English 101 instructors are trained writing specialists who may or may not have ESL training. Thus, the theories and methods ESL instructors use with ESL students may be unfamiliar to English 101 instructors. This could create a gap between what ESL and English 101 instructors are doing in the classroom. Collaboration would be one way to bridge that gap.

Bandura (1977) and Vygotsky (1978), two learning theorists, focused on the importance of learning through collaboration. Learning through collaboration can take place in the classroom between students, between instructor and student, and can take place outside of the classroom between instructors. It can be applied when faculty work together through professional development opportunities to enhance student achievement. More specifically, it can be applied when ESL and English composition instructors collaborate on how to create a seamless transition for students moving from one program to the other.

Andrews (2008) stated, “When faculty communicate about teaching and learning, they improve the learning experience of their students” (p. ii). He described building a learning-centered paradigm based on the six culture of learning principles developed by O’Banion in 1997. These principles could guide ESL and English composition faculty when they collaborate on teaching and learning strategies. Thus, ESL and English 101 instructors may find themselves involved in two conversations: (a) on teaching and
learning in relation to international students and (b) on teaching writing and the
development of writing skills for ESL students.

Several studies discussed how collaboration could help meet the needs of ESL
students transitioning from one program to the next. Harrison (2014) studied students
transitioning from a community college ESL program to a first-year English composition
course and advocated for collaboration among departments. Gil (2013) focused on the
perceptions of English 101 instructors in relation to college readiness of ESL students.
Gil (2013) found “an underlying assumption of many community college instructional
environments is that [English composition] instructors and other mainstream faculty do
not always design their course syllabi in collaboration with their ESL counterparts” (p.
1). Gil indicated aligning syllabi would help to create a smoother transition for
international students. Anayah (2012) explored whether the needs of international
students at the community college level were met. As this involved both ESL and
English 101 instructors, the study was important in relation to what both sectors could do
collaboratively to meet the needs of the international students.

Another important study by Booth (2009) advocated for implementation of
learning communities within the ESL program. Learning communities group students
into cohorts to learn together and support each other. Learning communities require
collaboration between faculty of different disciplines to help students to see connections
between subject matters. This brings up an interesting idea related to implementing a
learning community for ESL students determined to be college ready and a college
developmental writing program. ESL and English 101 instructors could collaborate on a
learning community for the developmental writing level to help students transition more effectively between ESL and mainstream English courses (Booth, 2009).

The studies reviewed suggested collaboration between ESL and English 101 instructors could help bridge the gap between the writing students do in ESL classes to prepare them for college writing and the writing they do in composition classes that target specific outcomes. It could be beneficial for English 101 instructors to have a better understanding of ESL methods that address international student needs (Gil, 2013). In addition, it could be beneficial for ESL instructors to have a better understanding of the course outcomes international students will strive to achieve once they enter English 101.

**Theoretical Framework**

The collaborative leadership model (Kolb & Gray, 2005) was selected as a theoretical framework for this study because it most closely reflected the needs identified in the background, and it was the best fit for this study. Kolb and Gray (2005) reported on the Leadership for Institutional Change (LINC) initiative implemented at Pennsylvania State University. LINC was a national development initiative funded by the Kellogg Foundation with over 100 colleges and universities participating. Encouraging engagement, facilitating change in higher education, and establishing connections to learners and communities through collaboration were key goals. Kolb and Gray participated in the 5-year Pennsylvania State University LINC project as members of the steering committee, facilitators of learning communities in Phase 1, and trainers/facilitators in Phase 2. The collaborative leadership model was developed to guide the workshops that were part of this program. The seven principles of the leadership model served as a guide to what a successful collaboration should entail.
Those seven principles included (a) common mission, (b) collective responsibility, (c) necessary resources, (d) respectful and supportive climate, (e) awareness of group process, (f) creativity, and (g) capacity to deal with conflict.

The collaborative leadership model used at Pennsylvania University served as the theoretical framework for this study on the collaboration between community college ESL and English composition instructors. Collaboration between these two faculty groups will be studied through the lens of the seven principles.

**Statement of the Research Problem**

More students are crossing boundaries from home to host country to pursue a college education (Lu, 2001; Zeszotarski, 2003; Zhadko, 2011). Community colleges in the United States are seeing the greatest influx of international students because they are a cost-effective steppingstone to the 4-year degree these students ultimately desire (Anayah, 2012; Zeszotarksi, 2003). Anayah (2012) explained international students are pursuing an education in the United States because of educational quality and the social and cultural experiences. Additionally, community colleges are pursuing international students to increase diversity and revenue, although they may not be prepared for the increase in international students (Anayah, 2012).

International students face a large hurdle when they move from ESL to college-level English courses. Elliot-Nelson (2011) discussed the challenges ESL students experience transitioning from ESL to English 101 courses. ESL instructors help international students to bridge into the required English classes, but these students still experience obstacles that affect their academic performance. Many international students placed in English 101 struggle with reading and writing assignments and need a lot of
instructor support. At the English 101 level, international students do not get the same type of support from instructors to which they are accustomed in ESL classes (Elliot-Nelson, 2011). Open Door (2015) reported ESL classes generally do not exceed 15 students per instructor, whereas English 101 classes average 25 students. Because English 101 instructors have more students, they cannot give as much attention to each student as an ESL instructor can. English 101 instructors are trained in teaching writing and may not necessarily be trained in teaching international students. Gil (2013) found many English 101 instructors lacked training in ESL methods, and Harrison (2014) found English 101 instructors needed more training related to multi-linguistic classrooms.

At most community colleges, students must pass a placement test to enter English 101. Most community college English departments outline the skills students must accomplish to move to the next level. Students entering English 101 from ESL and developmental writing programs must meet certain criteria to be ready for English 101. Therefore, it is reasonable for English 101 instructors to believe the criteria has been met and the incoming students possess a certain skill level. English 101 coursework is geared toward English department outcomes, and assignments move at a faster pace than in ESL courses. English 101 instructors are not expected to lower course standards to accommodate international students. International students are expected to keep up and are encouraged to use college writing labs in addition to scheduling appointments with the instructor during office hours. Gil (2013) found “some English composition instructors may perceive ESL students as being academically underprepared to succeed in academic writing” (p. 4).
Several experts identified the problem as important and suggested further research be conducted. Harrison (2014) noted the need for collaboration between the ESL and English departments, and for training for composition instructors. Gil (2013) stated ESL students are not prepared for mainstream composition courses and a gap in writing instruction exists between ESL and English 101. ESL and English departments need to collaborate to better understand and accommodate the needs of international students. Kaur (2007) suggested comparing criteria was important, but perceptions should be discussed as well.

It is believed, through collaboration, instructors can help smooth the transition for international students (Andrews, 2008). Through analysis of existing barriers, instructors on both sides of the divide could become more aware of what needs to occur to create a bridge for international students as they transition from one program to another. Sharing strategies and best practices could foster a creative, productive, and positive learning community among faculty to help students be more successful.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this explanatory sequential mixed method study was to examine the collaboration between ESL and English 101 instructors at the community college level using the Kolb and Gray (2005) collaboration leadership model in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respective and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict. A secondary purpose was to explore barriers between the two groups of instructors and to describe what strategies and practices could improve collaboration.
The following research questions were used to address the purpose of this study:

1. How do community college ESL and English 101 instructors perceive the frequency and opportunities for collaboration with one another in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?

2. What do community college ESL instructors perceive as barriers to collaborating with English 101 instructors in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?

3. What do community college English 101 instructors perceive as barriers to collaborating with ESL instructors in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?

4. What do ESL instructors identify as strategies and practices that could improve collaboration with English 101 instructors in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, and awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?

5. What do English 101 instructors identify as strategies and practices that could improve collaboration with ESL instructors in the areas of common mission,
collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?

Significance of the Problem

Community colleges are at the forefront in introducing international students to the education system in the United States. Anayah (2012) stated community colleges are the steppingstone to the 4-year education that many international students strive to attain. First impressions and strong starts are so important to the success of these students. Community college ESL programs provide international students with the strong foundation and background they need to transition into mainstream college courses.

International students commonly experience a gap between the ESL program and English 101 classes when they transition from one to the other (Gil, 2013). Andrews (2008) discussed the importance of faculty collaboration, stating, “faculty will learn new ways to communicate about teaching and learning and learn new ways to share and advance learning in their colleagues and students” (p. 6). With the number of international students coming to the United States to study, it is crucial community colleges foster collaboration between departments to create what Andrews (2008) called a learning-centered college.

Writing is a core skill in most college courses. However, Gil (2013) found a gap between ESL and English 101 in terms of writing proficiency. Thus, it is especially important for ESL and English 101 instructors to find ways to streamline the transition from one course to another. Collaboration is an effective tool to increase faculty understanding of student needs, which can result in enhanced student learning (Andrews,
2008). In sharing strategies, faculty can acquire tools to help address the needs of international students as they transition from ESL to mainstream English courses. Therefore, this study contributed to a better understanding of the barriers limiting faculty collaboration and the strategies for overcoming those barriers.

**Definitions**

The following terms were used throughout this study.

**Academic writing.** This is a type of writing expected in college courses involving scholarly discourse and written for an academic audience.

**Adjunct faculty.** Faculty members who are hired on quarterly or semester contracts and teach part time are referred to as adjunct faculty.

**Awareness of group process.** This is one of the seven key characteristics identified in the collaborative leadership model (Kolb & Gray, 2005). In effective teams, individual and team needs are balanced. Both individual and group efforts are valued and rewarded.

**Capacity to deal with conflict.** This is one of the seven key characteristics identified in the collaborative leadership model (Kolb & Gray, 2005). Team members must develop a plan and negotiating techniques for addressing and resolving problems that hinder their ability to reach their collaborative goals.

**Collaboration.** According to Wood and Gray (1991), collaboration is “when a group of autonomous stakeholders of a problem domain engage in an interactive process, using shared rules, norms, and structures, to act or decide on issues related to that domain” (p. 146).
Collective responsibility. This is one of the seven key characteristics identified in the collaborative leadership model in which group members understand their roles and responsibilities and hold each other accountable for success (Kolb & Gray, 2005).

College readiness. College-readiness is a standard used to determine whether a student is ready to succeed in college-level coursework.

Common mission. This is one of the seven key characteristics identified in the collaborative leadership model (Kolb & Gray, 2005). A common mission builds collaborative alliances and spirit among members of a community by having them engage in necessary team projects that create a foundation for change. These projects must have clear goals in for teams to function effectively.

Community college. A community college is a higher education institution that offers open enrollment, workforce education, college transfer programs, associate degrees, certifications, and English as a second language study.

Creativity. This is one of the seven key characteristics identified in the collaborative leadership model (Kolb & Gray, 2005). Team members share their knowledge, experiences, and insights as a way to address issues and as a foundation for change within their community.

Cultural intelligence. Cultural intelligence refers to a person’s ability to interact effectively with those of various cultures due to a higher level of awareness regarding the importance of differences among those who share a finite planet.

Culture shock. Culture shock is a period of potential confusion and anxiety as someone experiences transitioning from the culture of his or her home country to a host country.
**English as a Second Language (ESL).** ESL is a term applicable to students whose first language is something other than English.

**English language learners (ELL).** ELL is a term applicable to students learning the English language. It is used for second language learners, as well as those learning English as a third or subsequent language.

**Global consciousness.** Global consciousness is a term referring to those whose thoughts and speech encompass an awareness of the world and who think in terms of what is best for all of humanity rather than a small part of humanity.

**Immigrants.** Immigrants are “foreign-born students, or students whose parents were foreign-born” (Ahmed, 2013, p. 13).

**Instructor.** This is a term referring to both full-time, tenured faculty and part-time, adjunct faculty and used to refer to both professors and teachers.

**International students.** Students who cross international borders to study in a host country rather than their home country are referred to as international students.

**Learning community.** A learning community is a cohort that combines two or more academic courses into a single college course. Faculty for different disciplines meet with the students to explore a class theme.

**Necessary resources.** This is one of the seven key characteristics identified in the collaborative leadership model (Kolb & Gray, 2005). A team needs adequate information, training, and resources to accomplish its goals. Deadlines must be clear and realistic.

**Respect and supportive climate.** This is one of the seven key characteristics identified in the collaborative leadership model (Kolb & Gray, 2005). Team members
must be respectful of one another and operate within a positive climate. They must practice open communication as they align their interests, priorities, and plans.

**Professional development.** Professional development provides professionals in any trade an opportunity to pursue continued education in their field.

**Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL).** TESOL is a program and certification acknowledging teachers qualified to teach English to international students.

**Delimitations**

This study was delimitated to three Washington community colleges—Edmonds College, Peninsula College, and Olympic College—and ESL and English 101 instructors. These three community colleges were chosen because they were geographically close to the researcher, and the researcher had professional contacts with these colleges, which enabled access to staff during the COVID-19 pandemic. International students attend all three colleges, and Edmonds College ranks 3rd on the list of community colleges with the highest number of international students in Washington state (Institute of International Education, 2020). This study was further delimited to the ESL and English 101 instructors working at these three community colleges.

**Organization of the Study**

This study is divided into five chapters and includes references and appendices. Chapter I provided the background, purpose, and rationale for the study. Chapter II presents a review of current research to support the need for collaboration between ESL and English 101 instructors. Chapter III provides the methods used in this study and includes the research design, participants, instrumentation, data collection, and data
analysis. Chapter IV presents the research findings, and Chapter V presents results, conclusions, and recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter showcases a variety of themes from relevant research, and in particular the Kolb and Gray (2005) collaboration leadership model in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respective and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict. The review is organized into four parts. Part I includes the theoretical foundation for this study. Part II discusses the increasing diversity of students enrolling in community colleges in the United States and the reasons for this increase. Part III provides a brief history of community colleges, and the role of community colleges in educating immigrant and international students through English as Second Language (ESL) programs. Part IV focuses on the diverse nature of the ESL population, and the challenges educators and administrators face in helping these students transition into mainstream classes is examined. Additionally, their academic needs and barriers are considered, with a focus on language and culture. Part V discusses ESL students transitioning to mainstream classes. This leads to the benefits and need for faculty collaboration between ESL instructors and English 101 instructors as a way to create a smoother, more successful transition for students advancing from ESL to mainstream English classes. As collaboration between these two faculty groups is key to this study, possible barriers to collaboration and strategies for overcoming those barriers are discussed.

This chapter begins with the theoretical foundation for this study, and a look at collaboration within organizations and on college campuses from the 1960s to the present day. The theories covered in this section include Bandura’s (1977) social cognitive and

Theoretical Foundation

The idea of collaboration within organizations and on college campuses is not new. Research dates back to the 1960s and even before that, yet there was a movement in the 1960s promoting the idea that organizational effectiveness is strengthened through collaboration. This theoretical framework cannot cover all of the studies on collaboration, but will provide some of the key theories, especially those that apply to education.

Bowers and Seashore (1966) focused on the organizational family, where individuals work on tasks independently and collaboratively. This can be applied to faculty teaching independently in a classroom, yet also functioning as one department and the success of the department in delivering the product (education) to the consumer. They stated, “The ideal is that a group of people work effectively together toward the accomplishment of some common aim” (Bowers & Seashore, 1966, p. 239).

Bandura (1977) and Vygotsky (1978), two learning theorists, focused on the importance of learning through collaboration. Bandura (1977) stated “most human behavior is learned observationally through modeling: from observing others one forms an idea of how new behaviors are performed, and on later occasions this coded information serves as a guide for action” (as cited in Ormond, 2003, p. 22). Bandura’s social cognitive and self-efficacy theory covers both individual and collective self-
efficacy, which are important when faculty work together through professional
development opportunities to enhance student achievement.

Although Vygotsky (1978) developed his social development theory with younger
students in mind, the concept can be applied to people of all ages, especially if teachers
are viewed as lifelong learners or students of learning. Vygotsky said learning is social
and collaborative. Through a facilitator, participants in a collaborative session learn
through guided participation, scaffolding, peer interaction, and apprenticeships. Guided
participation works well in pairs or teams, where participants help one another to analyze,
infer, synthesize, or evaluate information. Through social interaction and collaboration,
they discover answers in a more meaningful way than if working alone.

Bruffee (1984) explained the term collaborative learning first appeared as a topic
for inquiry and conversation at the Conference on College Composition and
Communication in 1982, and at that time was listed 8th or 9th on the list. By 1983, it was
listed as the number one topic on the list. Also, in 1983, collaborative practices were
examined at the annual Modern Language Association convention. He discussed
reflective thought as the conversation that takes place within an individual and pointed to
Vygotsky’s theory that “reflective thought is public or social conversation internalized”
(Bruffee, 1984, p. 639).

In 1989, Gray expanded upon the negotiated order theory (Austin & Baldwin,
1991). Collaboration is the vehicle through which individuals connect; share
perspectives on an issue; and through discussion and consensus, arrive at agreements, for
which they all share responsibility. The negotiated order theory “emphasizes the
temporary and emergent nature of collaboration as participants work out the details of executing a shared project or activity” (Austin & Baldwin, 1991, p. 6).

Collaboration

Wood and Gray (1991) reviewed nine research-based articles on collaboration to develop a comprehensive theory of collaboration. The nine articles showcased varied perspectives on collaborative alliances, with several overarching ideas: (a) a common definition of collaboration, (b) the role of the convener, (c) environmental factors, and (d) self-interest versus collective interest.

A common definition of collaboration. Wood and Gray (1991) explained the starting point to developing a theory of collaboration is to come up with a common definition. Of the nine research articles they reviewed, they found different definitions of collaboration, but they also found commonalities and constructed the following definition: “Collaboration occurs when a group of autonomous stakeholders of a problem domain engage in an interactive process, using shared rules, norms, and structures, to act or decide on issues related to that domain” (Wood & Gray, 1991, p. 146).

The role of the convener. For a collaboration to be successful, the convener must find value in the collaboration. Participants must trust the convener’s authority. In addition, the convener must be able to persuade stakeholders to participate, and must establish and facilitate the collaborative process in a fair manner (Wood & Gray, 1991).

Environmental factors. Wood and Gray (1991) discussed the benefit of simple models and simple environments, stating, “complex phenomenon cannot be understood well enough to be controlled” (p. 158). Collaboration is a way to reduce environmental complexity and turbulence. Collaborative participants can voluntarily share their
understanding of a problem and can negotiate and create rules for managing relationships and seeking solutions.

**Self-interest versus collective interest.** Relationships can create a complex dynamic. An individual stakeholder’s interest and the collective interest can be similar or different. In addition, the interests of one stakeholder may not be the same as another’s. Wood and Gray (1991) identified three types of interests: shared, differing, and opposing. Shared interests are common for all stakeholders. Differing interests refer to different values that do not interfere with the collaborative process, and opposing interests do interfere with the collaborative process. Whether interests are shared, differing, or opposing will have an effect on the outcome of the collaboration.

Senge et al. (2005) discussed the importance of participating in the culture in which one is a part. Participants who go to meetings and observe and reflect can learn about the organization and their relationship to it. Through being an active participant, they develop a fresh vision that can be shared with others and that can benefit the organization. They stated only when participants network with real awareness and a deep commitment can they sense the possibilities seeking to emerge.

Dolman (2019) examined how contextual, constructive, self-directed, and collaborative learning theories could better align with project-based learning. The constructive learning theory involves activating prior knowledge to acquire new knowledge. This works in conjunction with the elaboration theory; through elaboration prior knowledge can be connected to new knowledge. Prior knowledge can be expanded upon through collaboration. The collaborative learning theory involves two or more people interacting to share ideas.
Dolman (2019) discussed the community of practice theory introduced by Lave and Wenger in 1991. The community of practice theory involves groups who meet on a regular basis to share practices and learn from one another. Harvey and Drolet (2006) stated, “Team-building cannot be a one-time event” (p. 13). Their work focused on building people and teams as way to address a turbulent future. They believed organizations need creative and positive people to work together toward a positive future.

**Community of practice theory.** There are three components to communities of practice (CoP): the domain, the community, and the practice (see Figure 2). The domain or space participants share can be online or offline. For faculty, the domain would be the college for which they teach. The community consists of people who come together due to a shared interest. Members create a shared identity as they come together to actively participate in discussions, discover solutions to problems, and build innovations. Through active participation within the community, individuals contribute to practices of that community (Wenger, 1998).
Theoretical Framework

Kolb and Gray (2005) reviewed one university’s experience implementing the collaborative leadership model. This was part of a 5-year initiative called the Leadership for Institutional Change (LINC) funded by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. The purpose of the initiative was to develop collaborative models for higher education that would address the changing culture of the institutions. Teams were formed to work on collaborative projects, and then they reported on the challenges to collaboration. The final analysis was that clear goals, realistic deadlines, sufficient resources, and integrating individual and group goals were crucial factors in collaborative group success.

Kolb and Gray (2005) participated in the project as members of the steering committee, facilitators of learning communities in Phase 1, and trainers/facilitators in Phase 2. In Phase 1, “the University leadership and the LINC steering committee created leadership learning communities (LLCs) that focused on various aspects of leadership and change within higher education institutions” (Kolb & Gray, 2005, p. 247). Department heads, faculty, and administrators were nominated to be part of these learning communities. Of the 43 invitations, 38 members of the university community accepted. Later, undergraduate students were added. At the end of the academic year, the communities met and shared their projects.

In Phase 2, LINC sponsored mini grants for collaborative partnerships, which resulted in 29 collaborative projects. The goal of Phase 2 was to facilitate “change within the University by linking university activities with the needs of the greater community” (Kolb & Gray, 2005, p. 247). Each of the 29 teams were encouraged to participate in six workshops over a 3-year period that focused on building collaborative skills. The
workshop objectives were to “1) identify the key characteristics of an effective collaborative team and 2) use the following process tools: nominal group technique, interest-based conflict resolution, and creative reframing” (Kolb & Gray, 2005, p. 248).

The collaborative leadership model was developed to guide the six workshops, also referred to as Leadership Consortiums. Kolb and Gray (2005) reviewed several studies (e.g., Hackman, 1990; Health & Silas, 1999; Larson & LaFasto, 1989; Kolb, 1996; Lipman-Blumen, 2000) as well as information from the LINC steering committee and Phase 1 participants to develop this model. This model is pictured in Figure 3.

![Collaborative leadership model](image)

**Figure 3.** Collaborative leadership model.

In addition, a one-page survey based on the collaborative leadership model was developed. In each of the six sessions, participants used the model and the survey as a discussion tool to generate a list of obstacles to collaboration. Obstacles from the six workshops were recorded, and the most important obstacles were prioritized. Kolb and Gray (2005) reported the results and evaluated “the utility of the model and the success of
the training for enhancing interactions among collaborative partners” (p. 247). The purpose of their report was to provide a model of collaborative skills that would improve the team process in a university setting.

The top four obstacles that were reported during Phase 2 were: (a) missing or unclear goals, (b) individuals not pulling their weight, (c) lack of time, and (d) lack of resources. Other factors included (a) loss of vision, (b) lack of a point person, (c) talk instead of action, (d) dysfunctional alliances, (e) lack of collaborative skills, (f) logistics, (g) frustration with the process, and (h) individual agendas. In September of the third year, additional challenges were added: (a) the need for more student involvement and more resource people to conduct the project, (b) the alignment of faculty interests and priorities, (c) funding, (d) timing in academic calendar, and (e) the ability to overcome community resistance to new ideas and turf battles among participants.

Kolb and Gray (2005) concluded teams benefitted from (a) identification of collaborative skills, (b) problem solving about obstacles to collaboration, (c) an awareness that obstacles were common to collaborative work, and (d) a periodic review of team members. Because the LINC project received positive responses, Kolb and Gray also concluded the collaborative leadership model could be applied in other settings as a model on how to collaborate effectively.

**Diverse Community College Populations**

The student population at community colleges is becoming more diverse due to the increasing number of immigrants and international students coming to the United States. Ahmed (2013) indicated a trend of immigrants from less developed nations attending college in more developed, western nations. Jordan (2012) reported the United
States was home to over 670,000 international college and university students in the 2008–2009 school year. However, that number increased to 974,926 students by the 2014–2015 school year (IIE, 2016).

The open-door policy at community colleges provides a good starting point for both immigrant and international students who need to develop their skills to be college ready. However, defining ESL students becomes a complicated process, as not all immigrants or international students are second-language learners. Jordan (2012) noted a “partial uncertainty about who ESL students are, where they are from, and how they may best be educated in US context” (p. 4). Immigrant students may be foreign born or have foreign born parents, and they may enroll in community college to improve their skills so that they can enter the workforce as a steppingstone to a 4-year degree (Ahmed, 2013). These students may be bilingual, and it may be hard to determine whether English is their first or second language. International students come from a variety of cultures, and English may or may not be their second language. The IIE (2020) reported 1,095,299 international students studied in the United States during the 2018–2019 academic year. The six top places of origin of international students studying in the United States were China, India, South Korea, Saudi Arabia, Canada, and Vietnam.

**Reasons International Students Study in the United States**

International students choose to study abroad for a variety of reasons. Some countries lack enough universities to accommodate those who want to pursue a college degree. The competition is tough, and those who are admitted scored the highest on the university exam. Clausen-Sells (2014) stated international students sought higher education in the United States to obtain opportunities not available in their native
country. Kaur (2007) found many countries lack the higher education infrastructure needed to accommodate all those seeking a college degree and the abundance of higher education institutions in the United States made them more accessible. Those not accepted to a university in their home county look for alternatives, such as studying abroad.

Additionally, obtaining a degree in the United States is seen as prestigious and those with degrees from U.S. universities are more employable in the global marketplace. Many people view the United States as the top education system in the world and an entry point to the global economy (Kaur, 2007; Young, 2011). Many are drawn by the opportunity to learn about other cultures or master the English language, both of which make them more marketable in an increasingly global world (Banegas, 2013; Ith, 2014). Urban (2012) found international students choose to study in the United States mainly for professional reasons, such as the quality of the education, varied ways of thinking, exposure to their field of study, skill development, exposure to a cross-cultural environment, and the expertise available in the United States. Shenoy (2013) added international students choose community colleges to (a) study English as a second language, (b) gain the skills to enter a 4-year institution, (c) take advantage of vocational training, or (d) take advantage of open admission standards and lower cost.

Colleges in the United States encourage foreign students to come study for two main reasons. First, international students bring needed revenue to the colleges and communities (Kaur, 2007). In 2019, international students contributed more than $44 billion to the U.S. economy (Open Doors Data, 2016). As the international student population increases, so do the benefits to the U.S. economy. Shenoy (2013) stated
globalization and commercialization are increasing the number of international students in the United States.

Second, as the world becomes more global, colleges are interested in promoting diversity on their campuses. Ith (2014) found universities around the world were becoming more diverse as a result of globalization. This is a plus for students, faculty, administrators, and communities. It is no longer necessary to travel to another country to learn about another culture. International students enrich academic life by introducing their diverse cultures. At colleges and universities, students interact with people from varied cultural, social, economic, and educational backgrounds (Ahmed, 2013), which can provide them with a global perspective and a tolerance for different viewpoints. Young (2011) suggested culturally diversity was beneficial for both international and native students. Urban (2012) and Anayah (2012) found American students who did not travel or study abroad benefited from interacting with those from different cultures.

Urban (2012) further explored the idea of internationalization of college campuses. She cited Wit (2011) in noting simple enrollment of international students does not equate to enriching internationalization. For internationalization to be successful and beneficial, administrators, faculty, and students need to be involved. Urban explained faculty and staff needed to develop cultural competence and alternative approaches to working with diverse students. She mentioned faculty members are faced with the challenge of changing their teaching practices to accommodate ESL students and those with different educational backgrounds. She also explained the internationalization of college campuses requires integration of native and international students both in and
outside the classroom, and many international students lack contact with native students outside of the classroom (Urban, 2012).

**History of Community Colleges**

The first community college, called a junior college, was founded in 1901. In 1924, the American Association of Junior Colleges was established; however, it was after World War II and the passage of the GI Bill of Rights in 1944 that community colleges gained momentum in the United States. Since then, community colleges continued to evolve and grow with more than 1,100 serving more than 10.5 million students (Mellow, 2000).

The mission of the community college is tied to a nationwide campaign to expand higher education (Mellow, 2000). Community colleges make a college education accessible through open-door policies and low tuition. They provide educational opportunities to unrepresented populations, immigrants, and adults who want to learn new skills. They prepare students for transfer to a 4-year college or university and enrich the communities where they are located (Mellow, 2000).

**Role of Community Colleges**

The role of community college is “to provide open access to all individuals in a community, to provide English as second language instruction, and to provide means for students to transfer to four-year postsecondary institutions” (Lee, 2014, p. 19). Community colleges enroll the highest percentage of immigrant and international students due to their open-door policy, with an estimated one quarter of the community college population being immigrants (Booth, 2009). Elliot-Nelson (2011) found community colleges helped immigrants assimilate to the U.S. culture and was the primary
institution from which immigrants learned English, thus providing a gateway to higher education.

When immigrant and international students decide to enroll in community college, they must undergo language testing and the placement process. Three tests measure English language ability: TOEFL, ACCUPLACER, and CELSA. Each test measures a different aspect of English language proficiency, allowing colleges to select the test(s) most aligned with their programs (Banegas, 2013). Banegas (2013) mentioned assessments and placement test vary from one state to another and advocated for a standard and accurate system to better meet the needs of ESL students.

Once immigrant and international students are admitted, placement in noncredit and nontransferable developmental courses can be problematic (Banegas, 2013). The placement process is important because if students are placed incorrectly, they may take additional ESL courses without credit before they can transition into mainstream courses counting toward their desired academic goals. Banegas (2013) stated improper placement delays academic progress, reduces motivation, and contributes to student dropouts.

Booth (2009) focused on Hudson College, where all incoming students take placement tests to for English proficiency. Those students without the prerequisite skills needed for college-level coursework were placed in developmental classes to get them college ready. Prior to taking credit-bearing classes, students needed to successfully test out of developmental courses. Booth examined the retention of ESL students and the use of learning communities as an intervention strategy. She concluded the issue was not enrollment but moving students from developmental to credit-bearing courses before they
dropped out (Booth, 2009). It may take time for ESL students to develop the skills necessary to take credit-bearing classes. Creating learning communities could be one way to increase retention. Learning communities involve the same group of students taking two or more courses together. The theory is students form stronger relationships, which cause them to be more engaged in what they are learning because they can collaborate and share ideas, thus learning from the instructor and each other.

Learning communities place the learner in the forefront by offering an integrated curriculum and faculty collaboration. For example, a noncredit ESL class can be linked to a credited class. Booth (2009) mentioned students at Hudson College who had a certain writing test score could sign up for a package of four classes that included ESL grammar, writing, and reading, and one content course. In this way, students made some progress toward their degree while acquiring the basic skills needed to succeed academically. However, Booth found it is important to ensure ESL students reached a certain level before being placed in learning communities; otherwise, they were ill prepared to succeed with the academic content.

Banegas (2013) also mentioned learning communities as a strategy that colleges use to help ESL students gain the skills they need to transition into mainstream classes. Other strategies included “accelerated coursework . . . or the mainstreaming of underprepared students into college courses with extra assistance” (Banegas, 2013, p. 91). The Bridge Program is another option, which allows ESL students to receive college credit in other classes while going through the ESL program (Banegas, 2013).
ESL Programs in Community Colleges

Bilingual education has been part of U.S. society since the first colonies settled on its shores. Native Americans spoke many different languages, as did the immigrants coming from a variety of countries. For the groups to communicate, they had to teach and learn each other’s languages. Since that time, immigrants continued to settle in the United States, and bilingual education evolved into the ESL programs of today (Grekin, 2008). Three key events played a part in this evolution: in 1963, the first government-sanctioned bilingual program was started in Florida; in 1968, TESOL was founded; and in 1984, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was founded (Grekin, 2008).

International exchange programs began in the 1940s and increased after World War II. Lu (2001) noted a 1,200% increase in the number of exchange students between 1954 and 1997. In the 1980s, due to a decreasing birth rate in the United States, colleges and universities recruited international students to offset declining enrollment (Lu, 2001). Since then, colleges and universities focused on the importance of increasing intercultural awareness to ready students for the global marketplace.

As the number of immigrant and international students continues to increase, community colleges need to start thinking of themselves as multicultural organizations and rethink the way in which they move forward. Ahmed (2013) stated colleges and universities take a fragmented approach toward becoming multicultural organizations, with some institutions unaware of the varied needs of ELL students. Spangenberg, president of the Council for Advancement of Adult Literacy, stated, “Most colleges . . . offer different types of ESL programs . . . but there is little solid understanding of
variations and challenges in their management, faculty, curriculum, and assessment”
(Crandall & Sheppard, 2004, para. 2).

**English as Second Language Students**

ESL students are often treated as one group, yet they are a diverse group of individuals with different backgrounds, goals, and learning needs. They come from a variety of cultures, each with their own education systems and preferred learning styles (Elliot-Nelson, 2011). ESL students include immigrants and refugees who may or may not have academic backgrounds, adults who recently moved to the United States, or international students with strong academic backgrounds. Crandall and Sheppard (2004) agreed “there is no typical adult ESL student” (p. 4). This diverse group of students includes refugees, immigrants, permanent residents, and international students with different languages, cultures, educational backgrounds, literacy skills in their native languages, employment experiences, and English language proficiency. They also attend community college for a variety of reasons, including for employment, English language acquisition, citizenship, trade skills, and as a steppingstone to a 4-year degree (Crandall & Sheppard, 2004). Some ESL students pursue a degree, some pursue specific training to become employable, and some attend for personal enrichment or to improve their linguistic skills.

Both Elliot-Nelson (2011) and Crandall and Sheppard (2004) addressed the challenges educators face when working with diverse groups of students. Elliot-Nelson explained the diverse reasons for attending community college made it difficult to measure retention or program success. Similarly, Crandall and Sheppard noted it was
difficult to develop educational programs to meet the needs of such a diverse group of learners.

Vifansì (2002) further explained the diversity of ESL students by breaking them into two subgroups: international ESL students and U.S. ESL students. International students come to the United States to pursue a college education and were educated in their home countries prior to their arrival. They typically have the equivalent of a high school diploma or may have a degree in their home country. U.S. ESL students were further disaggregated into three subgroups: (a) students born in the United States to immigrant families, (b) students who immigrated to the United States when they were young and speak their native tongue, and (c) students who started school in another country before coming to the United States (Vifansì, 2002).

The first group of students, born in the United States to immigrant families, may speak English at home and at school, or they may be raised in families speaking a language other than English at home while learning English through their K-12 schools (Vifansì, 2002). This latter group may enter college with more English language development needs than native speakers, but often understand the U.S. education system and have greater English fluency than international ESL students. The second group of students refers to those who immigrated to the United States when they were young, having learned their mother tongue before they learned English. Vifanski (2002) stated, “For those who have not yet started school in their countries of origin, English would be the first language they learned to write, even though they may not be quite proficient in spoken English” (p. 24). The third group of students, who started school in another country, spoke and wrote in a language other than English before coming to the United
States. Vifanski (2002) stated these students have the most difficulty learning English, and many struggled throughout secondary school. They also have limited exposure to U.S. culture and may struggle to adjust (Vifanski, 2002).

**The Needs of English as Second Language Students**

Vifanski (2002) discussed the needs of ESL students in college writing courses. He differentiated between target needs and learning needs. Target needs refer to the required outcomes of a particular course, determined by department faculty and deans. These target needs apply to both ESL students and those whose native language is English. All students need to meet the target needs to successfully complete a course. Learning needs refer to the need each individual student has to reach the outcomes. The learning needs of ESL students and native English-speaking students differ. Two differences are ESL students are writing in a second language and must shift to a foreign discourse; thus, language differences impact learning and cultural differences. The needs were also different between immigrant and international students.

**Immigrant students.** Kilbridge and D’Arcangelo (2002) placed community college immigrant student needs into five categories: (a) education, (b) basic needs, (c) emotional or moral support, (d) financial support, and (e) information on services and issues. First, these students enrolled into the community college to address their educational needs. The main academic hurdle for these students is becoming proficient in English. Second, their basic needs (e.g., food, clothing, shelter) must be met for them to concentrate on their studies. Next, to be successful, they need a support system within the college community, such as friends and the college staff. In addition, these students have financial needs, and they need to pay college tuition and fees as well as living
expenses. Finally, they need to be informed about services available to them and be
guided in accessing those resources (Kilbridge & D’Arcangelo, 2002).

**International students.** International students experience a variety of problems
when first adjusting to academic life in the United States. Any college student moving
away their parents’ home and residing on or near a college campus is going to go through
an adjustment period. Many of the adjustments international students go through are
common to what many native-born U.S. students go through when experiencing this
major transition. These include being away from home for the first time and trying to
cope with daily tasks such as food shopping, laundry, and house cleaning. At the same
time, international students experience a cultural shift not experienced by native-born
U.S. students (Lee, 2014).

For the first 6 months of their stay in the United States, international students
commonly experience culture shock because students are unfamiliar with American
customs and lose “previously held social networks and support systems” (Lee, 2014, p.
29). They face an extra challenge in adapting to a different culture in a short period of
time so they can perform well in school. Their problems may be institutional (related to
the academic setting), emotional, or attitudinal. The primary cause of academic problems
is their English language skills. They have difficulty reading, writing, participating in
class, understanding lectures, taking notes, presenting oral reports, and using the library
(Lee, 2014). Ith (2014) explained international students are hesitant to speak up in class
because they feel insecure about their verbal communication skills. They often withdraw
in class so they do not appear foolish, which can cause them to feel alienated.
Ith (2014) applied Maslow’s hierarchy of needs to international students. Maslow developed five categories of needs, each building on the other in a pyramid fashion. The needs progress from physiological needs, to safety, love and belonging, self-esteem, and finally self-actualization. Ith stated many international students have not satisfied belonging and self-esteem needs, and, as the needs build on one another, these students struggle to reach self-actualization. They struggle because of language difficulties and limited support. Ith stressed the importance of communication education, which refers to a learning environment focused on the needs of a multicultural population. Ith (2014) believed colleges and universities “must establish a cross-cultural learning environment to include international students in the discourse” (p. 16).

Lu (2001) also focused on the stressors international students face when first coming to a new country and categorized their needs based on Maslow’s hierarchy. She linked physiological needs, such as housing and food, and safety needs, such as health, to academic performance. She tied in the third tier of Maslow’s pyramid by stating “social interaction between international students and Americans is rare” (Lu, 2001, p. 40). Because of language difficulties and other stressors international students face, they often socialize with other international students. Those international students who room with American students have a more positive experience and an easier time transitioning from their home to host country. She stated academic struggles center on language and communication, which are tied to psychological and personal needs. These connections reveal the complex nature of student obstacles. She established that colleges could better provide support to students by relating needs to success (Lu, 2001).
Shenoy (2013) discussed the expectations international students have when coming to the United States to study. They expect (a) their education will make them globally competent, (b) classes will operate in the same way in their home country, and (c) they will develop relationships easily. Shenoy (2013) stated, “If international students’ expectations for attending community college are understood, perhaps their needs can be met or information given to help manage expectations” (p. 39).

**Challenges for English as Second Language Students**

Community college ESL students face a variety of challenges. They express difficulty navigating the education system (Lee, 2014) and dealing with testing, placement, registration, and course selection. Khoshlessan (2013) found anxiety influences student learning. Language, cultural, academic, and financial challenges can create stress for ESL students.

**Immigrant students.** Lee (2014) focused on Latina immigrant community college students and their transition from ESL to mainstream classes. He interviewed Latina students regarding the challenges they experienced. They expressed difficulty navigating the education system and accessing resources and services, and struggled with mainstream courses because of the language barrier. They experienced stress because they were unfamiliar with American customs and often lost access to their social networks and support systems. Students also described financial challenges, with many working while attending school part time to care for their families. Lee (2014) stated, “Research has indicated that part-time enrollment adversely affects student persistent in higher education” (p. 27).
Another significant challenge expressed by over half of the student was that mainstream instructors were unaware of their needs. ESL students found it difficult to meet instructor language expectations in mainstream classes. Lee (2014) suggested ESL students needed continued language support far beyond their ESL and remedial programs. He added, “Studies on language acquisition suggest that it takes anywhere from five to seven years of formal language instruction in order for language learners to develop the level of language proficiency necessary for academic functioning” (Lee, 2014, p. 32). Lee (2014) indicated colleges need to do more to address the needs of all students.

**International students.** International students also experience academic barriers. They must deal with testing, placement, registration, and course selection. Once they navigate through the system, they often find teaching and learning approaches and expectations from one culture to the next radically different. Liton (2016) found one of the challenges facing international students is “the difference between the past and present style of teaching” (p. 92). In addition, each instructor has different expectations and awareness of language and cultural differences. Liton (2016) found instructors who are culturally aware and who include relevant materials into their lessons minimize the challenges students face.

Adbullah, Aziz, and Ibrahim (2014) stated the number of students moving across borders to pursue a higher education is increasing rapidly and this trend is challenging colleges. They discussed the diverse populations predominantly crossing borders to pursue a college degree, noting the differences in educational systems from one country
to the next. Adbullah et al. (2014) stated international students are seen, but their experiences in the education system are often not heard.

Adbullah et al. (2014) reviewed 497 journal articles written in the past 30 years. They explored the challenges international higher education students face to determine how higher education institutions could become more aware of student needs to help them through their learning experience. They identified three challenges for international students: (a) a limited voice in higher education, (b) ill-defined student experiences, and (c) the top-down approach conceptualizing their experience. The third finding in their study suggested institutions need to become more aware of student needs. They recommended student experiences need to be researched and defined, and higher education administrators and faculty need to play a larger role in the well-being of international students (Adbullah et al., 2014).

Urban (2012) found international students were highly motivated. They felt pressure from their parents, who pay a lot of money for them to attend college abroad. Many international students were grade motivated, because they wanted to transfer to a 4-year university. These students worked hard because English was a challenge for them. At the same time, they realized the importance of it and had a strong desire to succeed (Urban, 2012).

**Anxiety as a barrier to learning.** Khoshlessan (2013) explored the impact anxiety has on learning and whether active and collaborative learning strategies can lessen anxiety. He focused on the anxiety English learners experience. Khoshlessan found anxiety had a critical influence over student learning, especially in terms of learning a second language. The author explained three stages of learning: input,
processing, and output. He then explored these stages in relation to English learners. During the input phase, if a student is anxious, they will be distracted and may miss crucial information. During the processing phase, if a student is anxious, they will be unable to retain the information. During the output phase, if a student is anxious, they will be unable to retrieve whatever information was taken in and retained (Khoshlessan, 2013).

Khoshlessan (2013) discussed the reasons immigrant and international students experience stress and how stress can be reduced. He related language difficulties as a major contributor to student stress. He also found English learners fear negative evaluations. He believed instructors could reduce student anxiety by providing a supportive environment and building each student’s confidence. He suggested active and collaborative activities were a good way to lower stress levels in the classroom (Khoshlessan, 2013).

Language barriers. Sylvain (2010) discussed the language barriers ESL students must overcome to achieve their academic goals. She stated acquiring the English language while keeping up with other content taught in English was a difficult task. Developing English language skills is crucial, yet it takes years to become proficient. Sylvain stated becoming proficient in English could take 4–7 years.

Sylvain (2010) examined what causes ESL students to succeed or fail due to language barriers. She asserted those who succeeded had a high level of resilience along with a strong vision and purposeful mind. She mentioned having a strong support system aided in their success. Sylvain (2010) found the failures of ESL students in college could be caused by “deficiency in the first-language acquisition of writing and reading skills,
insufficient target language use, limited exposure and practice of the English language the practice of speaking their native language in the home” (p. 3). Language barriers can affect ESL students academically in several ways. They may struggle with the connotation of words in the English language. They may not understand the teacher, the assignment, or what is expected of them. They may need more time to understand the subject matter and the prompt before performing the required task. They may hold back from expressing their ideas or reaching out for assistance because they lack confidence in their language skills (Sylvain, 2010).

**The effects of globalization on language.** To understand the influx of international students coming to the United States, it is important to understand the connection between globalization and language. Baccaglini (2013) stated English is used to communicate and conduct business throughout the world. Kawamura (2011) explained English is the most studied and most spoken language in the world. Kawamura (2011) said, “The English language, in particular, has become a part of the core studies in many non-English speaking countries due to rapidly globalizing societies” (p. 10).

According to Kawamura (2011), the English language:

- Significantly affects today’s world economy;
- Plays a significant role in linking people around the world;
- Is a major contributor to globalizing development as people use it to communicate for business and social exchange;
- Is an essential tool for many countries to develop their business relations with cross-cultural partners to build their own economies.
For these reasons, overcoming language barriers is a strong motivator for both immigrant and international students.

**Cultural barriers.** ESL students face challenges adapting to U.S. culture. Differences between the home country and host country can be significant. Sylvain (2010) provided examples of these differences. She stated that, in China, teachers serve as parental figures and moral guides, whereas in most Western countries, the teacher role is to develop student knowledge and skills. She explained Chinese society advocates hard work as a way to improve intelligence, whereas Western society views intelligence as a fixed trait. Another difference was the promotion of collectivism in China compared to individualism in Western societies (Sylvain, 2010). Ith (2014) compared China’s collectivist culture to the United States’s individualistic culture, noting Chinese students are “told what to learn, what to read, the type of answers to produce” (p. 20). The instructor is viewed as an authority and is not challenged. In contrast, American students are encouraged to engage in critical thinking and instructors serve as facilitators (Ith, 2014).

In Asian countries, students are used to a more formal education system and a more passive learning style (Young, 2011). Teachers are all knowing and highly respected. Students are expected to follow the teacher’s direction without question. Learning activities are centered on the textbook, lectures, handouts, and multiple choice and true-false tests. Students must learn through rote memorization, meaning their study involves memorizing data rather than actually learning it (Young, 2011). American classrooms are less formal, and teachers are guides who encourage students to be active
learners. They advocate reflection, critical thinking, questioning, and sharing ideas and viewpoints through small group and larger class discussions and interactive projects.

**English as Second Language Students Transitioning to Mainstream Classes**

Simon (2006) discussed mobility and mainstreaming ESL students in community colleges. She found ESL programs were varied in structure. First, they may contain multi-skill or single-skill courses. A single-skill course focuses on one skill, such as just reading or just writing. A multi-skill course combines two or more skills within a course, such as reading, writing, and oral skills. Second, ESL programs may be integrated or centralized. For example, if an ESL program is housed within the English department, then it is integrated, but if it is its own department, then it is centralized. Finally, Simon found some ESL programs were truncated and some were comprehensive. If they were truncated, then they were separated into levels from high to low; if they were comprehensive, then all levels were combined.

Simon (2006) contended multi-skilled, integrated, and comprehensive ESL programs promoted earlier mainstreaming and thus led to more student success. She stated multi-skilled courses allowed more flexibility and choice for the students, integrated programs help prevent tracking of students, and comprehensive programs built a stronger pipeline. She found the sooner ESL students mainstreamed, the more likely they were to succeed in community college classes. She also asserted, in a truncated system, the “initial placement affects ESL students’ mainstreaming” (Simon, 2006, p. 21) in that those placed in the lower levels required more persistence to move into college level courses. Simon found with the lower the level of placement, the less likely the student was to mainstream.
Simon (2006) provided some suggestions to improve mobility between ESL programs and mainstream community college courses. Because many ESL students feel isolated from other students on campus when they are in the ESL program, it would be important to find ways for them to connect with native-speaking students. On a community college campus, interaction between ESL students and native-speaking students happens primarily in the classroom, so the sooner they can mainstream, the less isolated they feel. Next, it is important for ESL programs to have strong working relationships with English departments and other departments on campus. Additionally, she asserted “counselors and faculty should not discourage students from taking mainstream classes while enrolled in ESL” (Simon, 2006, p. 98).

Harrison (2014) discussed ways to better prepare ESL students who are transitioning into first-year composition and other mainstream classes. She suggested community college ESL programs include the following into the curriculum: (a) writing assignments commonly assigned in first-year composition classes, such as genre analysis; (b) more challenging reading assignments; (c) more multimodal composition projects; and (d) the opportunity for students to share their experiences.

Harrison (2014) advocated for collaboration between academic departments. She stated, “The English Department and ESL program, as well as other content areas, should communicate frequently so that the ESL program is continually preparing its students for the types of literacy tasks they might encounter in for-credit courses” (Harrison, 2014, p. 193). She also suggested community colleges consider cross-training composition instructors in both ESL and composition pedagogy. Harrison (2014), citing Matsuda
(1999), said in the 21st century, writing courses needs to be reimagined for multilingual students.

**The Role of English Composition Instructors**

With the increasing numbers of immigrant and international students entering community colleges in the United States, non-ESL instructors teach students of different cultures with different language backgrounds. English 101 instructors do not have to possess a TESOL certification or acquire formal training in teaching ESL students. This means they may need to pursue information on their own to address the learning needs of ESL students. Young (2011) expressed the importance of expertise when teaching diverse students, but noted limited research examining how teachers developed the skills needed to teach international students. Kawamura (2011) explained, “Integrating issues and awareness of different cultures is left to each individual teacher” (p. iv). Some instructors have more intercultural intelligence than others, which creates an inconsistent learning experience for immigrant and international students. Kawamura (2011) asserted instructors need to be aware of the cultural backgrounds of their students.

**Teaching styles.** Instructors are leaders in their classrooms with various types of leadership styles. Seaver (2010) distinguished between four types of leadership styles: (a) servant, (b) situational, (c) transactional, and (d) transformational. Servant leaders focus on serving those they lead. They encourage the pursuit of knowledge, autonomy, and freedom. Situational leaders focus on providing support for those they serve by diagnosing problems and providing guidance on how to solve problems. Transactional leaders focus on the value both leaders and followers exchange in the process of working together. Transformational leaders focus on treating others as assets. All of these
leadership styles are used in a community college classroom. Through collaboration, instructors with various leadership styles can share their strategies for success (Seaver, 2010).

Cowardin-Lee (2012) explained the importance of challenging one’s values and becoming an intercultural leader through transformational learning experiences. She discussed three aspects of transformation: (a) the need to sacrifice, (b) the move from dependence to independence, and (c) the discovery of universal power within oneself. This concept can apply to both students and instructors. Students who decided to study abroad are on a transformational journey. They are in the process of adapting to a new country and culture, and self-discovery and change inevitably follow. Instructors who want to be truly transformative must “trigger, challenge, and engage those deeper core aspects of self” (Cowardin-Lee, 2012, p. 110). Considering international students are on this path of self-discovery already, one can conclude if they could interact with instructors who were truly transformational, the learning experience would be greatly enhanced.

**Instructor perceptions.** Gil (2013) examined the perceptions of community college English instructors regarding teaching students who transitioned from ESL classes. Instructors in the study expressed that ESL students “lack the necessary writing skills to succeed in English courses” (Gil, 2013, p. 2). English composition instructors typically emphasized rhetoric over grammar, and some participants believed ESL students should learn English grammar and syntax in their ELS courses.
Professional Development

Community colleges need to provide professional development opportunities for all mainstream instructors, and especially English composition instructors, working with students on reading and writing skills, which are needed to succeed in college. Ahmed (2013) stated instructors “need to become more diverse and sensitive to cultural differences” (p. 22). Gay (1996) suggested professional development on cultural diversity was needed to allow for self-reflection and exploration of student perspectives. Young (2011) stated instructors “need to understand how learners interpret content material” (p. 6). For example, in the United States, coursework includes group discussions and collaborative activities, which may be vastly different instruction strategies for students accustomed to learning by rote memorization (Clasusen-Sells, 2014).

Professional development experiences can provide face-to-face interaction between faculty with different perspectives on teaching and learning, and through shared practices, can question and challenge one another. Instructors who engage in this process of self-discovery can continually refine what they do, which can then be carried over into the classroom. Instead of repeating tried and true lessons over and over, instructors can try new things, continually assessing their work, which makes the teaching and learning process active rather than passive (Cowardin-Lee, 2012).

Chandler (2011) studied the impact professional development opportunities have on community college faculty, and on part-time faculty, in particular. He uncovered several past studies revealing the lack of professional development opportunities at community colleges. In 2001, Murray conducted a nationwide survey on types of
professional development programs offered at community colleges, and, in 2003, Cohen and Brawer conducted a similar study. Both studies found professional development programs at community colleges were either lacking in their approach or not used at all (Chandler, 2011). Studies since then have revealed “the lack of professional development support given to community college part-time faculty” (Chandler, 2011, p. 68).

Chandler (2011) explained professional development programs provide faculty with instructional tools they can choose from to best meet varied student needs. Professional development programs provide collaborative learning through peer discussion, which can improve faculty awareness and understanding of diverse students. Professional development programs also encourage faculty to reflect of their practice.

Benefits of and Need for Faculty Collaboration

Collaboration is a necessary skill students need to develop to be ready to move into the workplace. Companies form partnerships and coworkers collaborate on projects in teams. Networking within and outside of a company provides greater insight and better results. The same holds true for colleges and universities. The better administrators, departments, and faculty can communicate and work together, the more functional the college.

Instructors have different values and styles that affect the ways in which they teach. They may be directed to teach the same curriculum with the same textbook and with the same outcomes, yet the way in which they organize their classes, present the information, and implement the tasks is different. Andrews (2008) talked about the importance of collaboration between faculty. He advocated for a learning-centered
college in which teachers are learners and work with students to identify new meanings. Andrews (2008) described the benefits of a learning-centered college as:

- Regular communication between college faculty about teaching and learning and sharing of new insights, best practices, and ways to teach in the 21st century;
- Systems in place to develop ways to be better teachers; and
- Programs and activities focused on personal and professional growth.

Clauson-Sells (2014) explained professional development can have a powerful impact on both instructors and students when instructors use this opportunity for self-reflection. Instructors examining student work as a reflective practice greatly impact student learning, which can also increase ESL student acculturation, academic self-efficacy, and academic achievement. Collaboration opens communication pathways for those involved in the education experience of international students (Clauson-Sells, 2014).

Teaching cannot and should not a static set of practices. Teaching, like learning to write, is developmental; no one is perfect, and there is always more to learn (Waye, 2010). If teaching is seen as a static skill, instructors are not rewarded for reflection or improvement. As reflection in isolation is challenging, and teaching is done mainly in isolation, the creation of communities of those interested in exploring their teaching is needed. These communities of practice can foster organized evaluation of teaching and learning (Waye, 2010).

When considering the benefit of collaboration between ESL and English 101 faculty at a community college, one must take part-time or adjunct faculty into account.
Part-time faculty often work in isolation and lack a voice to make a difference in the college community. Several studies noted up to two thirds of community college instructors were part-time, adjunct faculty members (Chandler, 2011; Hardy & Laanan, 2006; Rosser & Townsend, 2009; Twombly & Towsend, 2008; Winter, Petrosko, & Rodriguez, 2007). As such, they receive little support to improve their instructional strategies (Chandler, 2011; Sorcinelli, 2007). Chandler (2011) asserted for community colleges to offer the highest quality education to their students, part-time faculty need to be provided professional development opportunities.

**Barriers to collaboration.** Despite increasing attention placed on collaboration in the educational field, Osman (2004) asserted most collaborative endeavors fail because they are not planned and implemented correctly. Osman (2004) stated, “Collaborating by simply exchanging information does not result in the realization of strategic goals; it is a process that requires planning, action, evaluation, and implementation” (p. 19).

**Strategies to overcome barriers.** Chandler (2011) made several suggestions on how professional development programs could be implemented to overcome barriers. First, they should not be random or one-time events, but instead continuously offered and sustained over time. Next, the program itself should be systematically implemented, have measurable outcomes, be task-oriented, and immediately applicable. Finally, they should “support both professional and personal development” (Chandler, 2011, p. 52).

**Strategies for Student Success**

Elliot-Nelson (2011) discussed the challenges ESL students face when transitioning to mainstream English classes. She described the best teaching and learning practices to help ESL students transition into academic English classes. First, instructors
should get to know each student on a personal level and assess his or her learning style and needs. Next, instructors should provide a safe learning environment where students feel comfortable asking questions and relating their struggles. Through open communication between the instructor and student, student anxiety can be kept low. Instructors can encourage students by offering timely and constructive feedback and acknowledging their progress. ESL students benefit from extensive reading and writing activities focused on communicating ideas (e.g., discussion boards, blogs, letters, journals). Topics should be meaningful and interesting to the students, and the instructor should relate the material to their lives (Elliot-Nelson, 2011).

Clausen-Sells (2014) stated international students “often deal with high levels of acculturative stress when studying in the United States” (p. 48). She provided ways in which instructors can help to reduce the stress. Techniques for reducing academic stress included considering the rate in which the information was presented; breaking assignments into parts and setting easily attainable deadlines; intervening between prewriting, drafting, and revising; giving students a chance to turn in multiple drafts; presenting feedback for improvement in a timely and positive manner; and pointing out strengths, not just weaknesses (Clausen-Sells, 2014).

Several studies focused on strategies that help ESL students when transitioning to a mainstream college composition class. These are topics ESL and English 101 instructors can discuss when collaborating on best practices. Those strategies are described in more detail below.

**Rubrics.** Each assignment should be presented with clear written instructions and rubrics. Rubrics relate the learning outcomes, quality expected, and criteria used when
grading. Students can use rubrics as a guide and checklist prior to turning in their work, which in turn helps them be more successful (Waye, 2010).

**Modeling.** Modeling is helpful for all students, but especially international students who may have difficulty processing assignment details. When students receive a prompt verbally or textually, then they are processing this prompt through language. When English is the second language, some students have difficulty understanding the prompt. By explaining, demonstrating, and providing hands-on activities, an instructor can reach auditory, visual, and hands-on learners. Waye (2010) stated international students “would likely find it useful to see models provided by the instructor regarding what the pages should look like, how the argument is developed, and what the length looks like, in advance of the assignment being due” (p. 40).

**Prewriting activities.** A variety of prewriting strategies can help all student writers get their ideas on paper before they begin their first draft. Dujski (2008) researched the effect prewriting had on the quantity and quality of writing produced by ESL students. Dujski (2008) defined prewriting as “conscious thoughts, actions, or behaviors used by writers when they plan before writing” (p. 129). Examples include freewriting, listing, and outlining. In his study, he also included clustering, the use of graphic organizers, and the program Inspiration. He found evidence that prewriting helped improve the length of student papers (Dujski, 2008).

**Collaboration.** Collaboration is a best practice for all writing classes. Gil (2013) referenced Bandera (1977) and Vygotsky (1978), two learning theorists, when explaining the importance of collaboration in the classroom. Bandera’s social cognitive and self-efficacy theory focuses on both individual and collective self-efficacy. Gil (2013) stated,
“When self-efficacy concepts are applied to the classroom environment, the learning outcomes are predictably higher, as efficacy beliefs are directly related to academic achievement” (p. 32). In an academic environment, students work together in the classroom to address issues and solve problems, and faculty work together through professional development opportunities to enhance student achievement. Vygotsky also found collaboration to be an effective learning tool in a classroom. Gil (2013) stated students can “learn more effectively because they offer each other perspectives and experiences” (p. 33). Thus, it can be concluded teachers can enhance student learning by providing a classroom environment focused on positive sharing of ideas and where each person feels as though they have an important voice.

Feedback. Elbow (1981) described two kinds of feedback: criterion-based and reader-based feedback. Criterion-based feedback is the kind of feedback instructors commonly give based on a specific learning goal or standard. Reader-based feedback focuses on content and meaning and is tied to voice and tone, which can be difficult to teach. Elbow also talked about early versus late feedback. Waye (2010) called early feedback formative with the purpose to give feedback before the student turns in the work for a grade. Waye called late feedback summative, which occurs when a student receives the grade on the assignment, letting them know the outcome.

Waye (2010) asserted formative feedback is helpful for students because it “signals gaps between the current level of performance and the desired level of performance” (p. 16). Formative feedback gives students a chance to make corrections and learn the value of the revision process prior to submitting their work. Through peer-
review workshops, students can give and receive formative feedback. As readers and writers, “students develop a critical eye for writing” (Waye, 2010, p. 36).

Summative feedback, or criterion-based feedback, is also an important part of student learning. Waye (2010) stated summative feedback can be helpful for students if it is timely, focused, clearly written, and limited to a few main errors. Students can get overwhelmed by too much feedback and not know where to start when trying to revise their work. Also, they may be unable to differentiate between the importance of one kind of error over another. Finally, they may get frustrated and not be able to see the progress they make over time. Waye (2010) stated, “Ample practice over time leads to gradual improvement” (p. 21).

**Revision.** Ferris (2007) discussed the different ways in which immigrant and international students respond to revisions strategies. She found “immigrant students are comfortable with feedback-and-revision cycles, that they perceive the value of improving their writing and of teacher feedback in achieving that goal” (Ferris, 2007, p. 88-89). She explained immigrant students may struggle to understand the terminology instructors use when commenting on papers, but instructors can follow up with students to check for understanding and provide further activities that help with the revising phase. In contrast, Ferris (2007) said international students “have limited experience with or training in strategies for substantive revision and/or insufficient motivation for making major changes in their papers” (p. 89). Many international students are grade motivated because they are attending community college as a steppingstone to a 4-year college. Thus, one could conclude if instructors provide students with opportunities to better their grade through revised drafts, then that could increase student motivation.
Use of writing labs. Writing labs perform a variety of functions that are helpful for immigrant and international students who may need help outside the scope of an English class. Gil (2013) stated, “ESL students would face fewer challenges in English composition courses if writing or grammar tutors could offer them more individualized training” (p. 111). This could be accomplished through college writing labs that, as described by Central Texas College (2015):

- help students to understand a writing prompt;
- help students to get started on an essay;
- help students to find a topic or generate a thesis;
- help students to outline an idea;
- provide feedback on drafts before the student submit the paper for a grade;
- answer questions regarding research, writing, and grammar;
- provide handouts and workshops; and
- provide help assessing instructor feedback between first and second drafts.

Gil (2013) interviewed English composition instructors, who “said they could not carry out their duties realistically if they did not have additional support from writing tutors in writing labs” (p. 130). The instructors stated they were limited by class size and lack of time, making it difficult to give ESL students the individual attention they need; thus, it is important for instructors to encourage students to make a connection with the writing lab.

Technology as a teaching and learning tool. Higher education changed dramatically over the past 10 years due to integrating technology into the classroom. Web-based learning platforms are used in both online and face-to-face classes. Students
bring laptops, iPads, and flash drives to the classroom, and use online drop boxes so they can retrieve their work from any place at any time. Students and teachers communicate 24/7 throughout email and can talk or chat live during online office hours.

Integrating technology into the classroom can enhance student learning. Technologies used include computers, digital cameras, video cameras, recorders, scanners, printers, iPods, and cell phones. Although cell phones at one time were forbidden in the classroom, now they can be used to take a picture of a bulletin board full of notes, to record a lecture, to look up the meaning of word while reading or discussing a text, or to do quick research on a fact that could contribute to class discussions. Videos, blogs, wikis, email, and texting can be accessed through computers with Internet capabilities. Computers can be used for research, hands-on learning, and project-based learning. The Internet provides a wealth of information that extends far beyond the walls of the classroom. Students can access scholarly journals through academic databases and build their research skills. They can create PowerPoint slides to accompany their presentations, which merges visual images, text, and auditory skills and can help them when they transition from college into the world outside the classroom. Computers can also be used to enhance reading and writing skills, and software makes writing and editing much easier.

College provides students with the skills they need to succeed in what is now a global workplace. Computer literacy is required in many trades these days, and those competent with these technological tools will be more prepared for their futures. This is a global trend that affects students of different cultures. Kawamura (2011) stated, “Technology can be a bridge to bring students closer to different cultures” (p. 38). He
explained a student’s intercultural awareness can be enhanced by exposure to cultural issues and exchanges with students from different locations around the world.

International students inherently become global learners when they decide to attend college in the United States. Bauler (2012) believed “ESL learning, especially in the 21st century, entails active participation in the both more conventional as well as emerging digital practices of literacy” (p. 3). She noted digital literacy is particular important because it empowers international students to participate in a way they might not otherwise when in the classroom. Because there is a cultural divide between the educational system they are used to and the system they have become a part of in the United States, offering them varied ways of communicating empowers them and allows “them to participate in privileged and less alienating ways through reading and writing” (Bauler, 2012, p. 186).

A good example of this is the implementation of online discussion boards (Bauler, 2012). Participating in class discussions can be difficult for some international students who are not used to expressing their opinions in class. Others may feel insecure about their use of the English language or be hesitant to speak out on the spur of the moment. Online discussion boards give English language learners time to construct a response. It also provides them with an opportunity to interact and share their ideas with other students in the class. The use of online discussion boards “involves a strong view on the social nature of language learning aligned with a belief that writing is a social process that involves multiple steps and collaboration among peers to develop a sense of audience” (Bauler, 2012, p. 182). Through online discussions, ESL students can practice
their reading and writing skills in a more comfortable setting where the focus is on sharing ideas rather than on correctness.

Zhadko (2011) examined how international students are responding to the digital culture in U.S. colleges. Zhadko (2011) stated, “Exposure to new technology in the United States becomes a learning experience and definitely a challenge to many newly arrived international students” (p. 14). These students enter U.S. colleges with varying degrees of technological experiences. Technology can be used as part of instruction, to communicate with students and instructors, to gain access to resources, and as a guide for technological improvement. Technology provides swift access to information, boosts thinking levels, and facilitates problem-solving skills. Becoming digital learners prepares students for the global workplace beyond college.

Using digital tools in the classroom supports the kind of reading and writing students do in their lives outside of school. Outside of school, students engage in emailing, texting, chatting, and posting to Facebook, all of which involve communicating with others through reading and writing. When writing is used to communicate, then it becomes reader-centered, which is an important principle for developing writers. Through online discussion boards, students publish their words and experience the effect their ideas have on others through peer feedback (Wilber, 2010).

Summary

This review of literature covered a variety of topics beginning with the diverse community college population, the increasing number of immigrant and international students enrolling in community college, and the reasons for this growth. The history and role of community colleges and the history and role of ESL programs in community
colleges was explored. The research explained the challenge community colleges face in addressing the needs of the increasing diverse student population. Also, the research revealed the ESL population is a diverse group and many variables need to be considered when teaching them. Various studies revealed the needs and challenges of ESL students, especially as they transition into mainstream college classes. Their transition into college-level English composition was a primary focus because writing is a necessary skill to develop to be successful across the curriculum. Also reviewed was the role of English composition instructors and the importance of professional development opportunities to allow them to address the needs of this diverse student population. Research showed how faculty collaboration between ESL and English departments benefit ESL students.

Due to the increasing number of immigrant and international students seeking a college education through community colleges in the United States, it is important to change the mindset of the U.S. classroom to a global classroom. English composition instructors have an important role in helping ESL students transition into English 101 and transition into all college courses that embrace reading, writing, and critical thinking. They also play a vital role in helping international students acclimate to a new culture and education system. To effectively teach to this population, English 101 instructors need to more fully understand the backgrounds and needs of these students. This can be accomplished through professional development opportunities focused on the collaboration between ESL and English 101 instructors.

A synthesis matrix (see Appendix A) was used to organize the variables presented in this literature review. The researcher used the problem statement and research
questions to begin researching the collaboration between community college ESL and English composition instructors. Key concepts were pulled from each article referenced and used as headings for the matrix. This process enabled the researcher to view the literature in a table format, clearly see patterns and similarities and differences, and draw conclusions about the relationship between the ideas presented in the articles. In this way, the larger study topic was broken into subtopics that revealed the major themes that served as headings for this chapter.
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Chapter III presents the research methodology used to examine the collaboration between community college English as a second language (ESL) and English composition faculty who teach the English 101 course (referred to as English 101 instructors). The purpose statement and research questions provide the foundation that guided the study. An explanatory sequential mixed method study design, combining quantitative and qualitative methods, was chosen because it offered a multifaceted and in-depth view of current practice. McMillan and Schumacher (2010) stated:

The best approach to answering research questions is to use both quantitative and qualitative methods in the same study or when using solely a quantitative or qualitative would be insufficient to provide complete answers that meet the goal or purpose of the study. (p. 395)

Data for the study were collected through retrieval of demographic archival data and through surveys and interviews.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this explanatory sequential mixed method study was to examine the collaboration between ESL and English 101 instructors at the community college level using the Kolb and Gray (2005) collaboration leadership model in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respective and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict. A secondary purpose was to explore barriers between the two groups of instructors and to describe what strategies and practices could improve collaboration.
Research Questions

The following research questions were used to address the purpose of this study:

1. How do community college ESL and English 101 instructors perceive the frequency and opportunities for collaboration with one another in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?

2. What do community college ESL instructors perceive as barriers to collaborating with English 101 instructors in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?

3. What do community college English 101 instructors perceive as barriers to collaborating with ESL instructors in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?

4. What do ESL instructors identify as strategies and practices that could improve collaboration with English 101 instructors in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?

5. What do English 101 instructors identify as strategies and practices that could improve collaboration with ESL instructors in the areas of common mission,
collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?

**Research Design**

The purpose of this research was to describe the perceived collaboration between community college ESL and English 101 instructors using the collaborative leadership model (Kolb & Gray, 2005) and to explore the need for improved faculty collaboration as a way to help ESL students transition more smoothly from one program to another. An explanatory sequential mixed method study was chosen for this project because it offered a multifaceted and in-depth view of current practice, which allowed for a more thorough analysis. Creswell (2015) explained the explanatory sequential design has two phases. In the first phase, quantitative data are collected and analyzed. In the second phase, qualitative data are collected and analyzed. Following the two phases, conclusions are drawn on how the qualitative results explain the quantitative results.

There are advantages and disadvantages to an explanatory sequential mixed method research design. One advantage is “the two phases build upon each other so that there are distinct, easily recognized stages of conducting the design” (Creswell, 2015, p. 38). Another advantage is it “allows investigation of different types of research questions” (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010, p. 397), allowing the researcher greater flexibility. A third advantage is it “[maximizes] the potential of obtaining results both verifiable and repeatable” (Banegas, 2013, p. 38). The disadvantage is it requires “extensive data collection” (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010, p. 397), and it is time consuming (Creswell, 2015); however, the researcher believed the quantity of data to be
collected was manageable and the advantages outweighed the disadvantage. To address the research questions in this study, data were obtained from demographic archival data, surveys, and interviews.

The first step of this research study was to collect demographic information, which involved both quantitative and qualitative methods. This was done to acquire background information. According to Joye (2005), demographic archival data “puts qualitative and quantitative data in parallel” (para. 2). McMillan and Schumacher (2010) discussed three types of artifacts: (a) personal documents, (b) official documents, and (c) objects. For this study, official documents were gathered. With the collection of official documents, researchers can “question the social process that produced the data and how the data have been used” (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010, p. 362). In this way, the research combines both qualitative and quantitative data.

The second step in this study involved quantitative methods. One type of quantitative data collection is the survey, in which a questionnaire is distributed to a group of people. McMillan and Schumacher (2010) discussed the benefit of a quantitative design in that it “emphasizes objectivity in measuring and describing phenomena” (p. 21). Objectivity was important as the researcher examined data related to the frequency and opportunities for collaboration, as well as the barriers, strategies, and practices community college ESL and English 101 instructors identify. McMillan and Schumacher (2010) also stated, “Surveys are used frequently in educational research to describe attitudes, beliefs, opinions, and other types of information” (pp. 22–23), which the research questions sought to address.
With the quantitative data, a comparative analysis followed to determine if differences existed between the perceptions of ESL and English 101 instructors. Two surveys were constructed, one geared for ESL instructors and one geared for English 101 instructors. The two surveys asked the same questions but were tailored to each group. The researcher then looked for similarities and differences between the groups.

The third step in this study involved collecting qualitative data. Qualitative research is a flexible process based on words and ideas rather than numbers. Ideas are converted into themes. With this approach, researchers consider multiple perspectives and draw conclusions based on those perspectives. The focus is on the meaning of participant experiences and conveying meaning through description and narration. Kawamura (2011) stated, “Qualitative studies focus on the importance of the participants’ perspective and how it informs the personal meaning behind the participant” (p. 72). This type of study aligned with Research Questions 2, 3, 4, and 5, which address the perspectives ESL and English 101 instructors. Kawamura (2011) also stated qualitative research “is inquiry based exploring an occurrence through questions, narrative descriptions and analysis of emerging themes, based on interpretation of lived experiences” (p. 72). This definition of qualitative research aligned with Research Questions 4 and 5, which explored strategies and practices to improve collaboration based on faculty experiences.

**Population**

McMillan and Schumacher (2010) defined a population as the “total group to which results can be generalized” (p. 129). ESL and English composition instructors at the community college level represented the population for this study. There are 1,202
The number of ESL instructors and English instructors working in the community colleges in the United States can only be estimated, because there are so many variables, including location, college size, size of the ESL and English programs within each college, and finally the year and even the quarter. It is estimated that there are at least 6,000 ESL instructors and at least 36,000 English instructors working in community colleges in the United States. Given this was too large a population to reasonably study, a sampling frame was selected.

**Sampling Frame**

Creswell (2015) defined the target population or sampling frame as a small percentage of the total population, narrowed to specifically define participants who display clear characteristics of significance and concern to the study. The sampling frame is the list from which units are drawn for the sample. Because a researcher rarely has direct access to the entire population of interest in social science research, a researcher must rely upon a sampling frame to represent all of the elements of the population of interest (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). The sampling frame consists of individuals who can answer the questions specific to this study (Lentz Emmons, 2018; McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). For this study, the sampling frame was ESL and English composition instructors at the 29 community colleges in Washington state, which is estimated to be 145 ESL instructors and 770 English instructors. The Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (2021) lists 29 community colleges and five technical colleges. Community colleges in Washington were the focus of this study because (a) immigrant and international students often seek a community college education as a gateway to higher learning, and (b) the researcher resides in Washington.
and works in the community college system with ESL students who transitioned into English 101 courses.

**Sample**

McMillan and Schumacher (2010) defined a sample as the “group of individuals from whom data are collected” (p. 129). The researcher narrowed the study to three community colleges in Washington state: Edmonds College, Olympic College, and Peninsula College. These community colleges were chosen due to logistical, time, and resource constraints. These three community colleges were geographically close to the researcher, and the researcher had professional contacts with these three colleges, which would enable access to staff during the COVID-19 pandemic. The three community colleges that were selected represented nearly 10% of the community colleges in the state. Because international and immigrant students studied at each of the three community colleges, faculty would have experience to draw upon when describing the collaboration between ESL and English 101 instructors.

The quantitative survey sample included all ESL and English 101 instructors teaching at the three targeted community colleges in Washington state. Based on data pulled from the Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (2020), these three community colleges employed a total of 20 ESL instructors and 60 English 101 instructors in 2018-2019.

The quantitative survey was followed by interviews targeting a smaller sample. For phenomenological studies, Creswell (2015) recommended 3-10 and Morse (1994) suggested at least six. There are no specific rules when determining an appropriate sample size in qualitative research. Qualitative sample size may best be determined by
the time allotted, resources available, and study objectives (Patton, 2002). The interview sample included one ESL and one English instructors at each of the three community colleges in Washington state, which totaled six instructors. Purposeful sampling was used to select those interviewees. In purposeful sampling, the “researcher selects particular elements from the population that will be representative or informative about the topic of interest” (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010, p. 148). Volunteers for the interviews were pursued based on the recommendations of the department deans.

The two groups of instructors differed from one another in that the ESL instructors taught language skills to prepare immigrant and international students for success in mainstream college classes, whereas English composition instructors assumed a minimum skill level for students and focused more on rhetoric than grammar. ESL classes were typically smaller (with no more than 15 students) with more one-on-one time with instructors, and all students in the class spoke English as a second. English composition classes were typically comprised of 25 or more students who spoke English as their first language or passed a test indicating they were fluent in English. Because writing is a developmental process, the two groups of instructors worked with different skill levels and their objectives for course completion differed. Figure 4 illustrates the population, sampling frame, and sample for this study.
**Figure 4.** Population, sampling frame, and sample.

**Instrumentation**

Instruments are used to measure knowledge, skills, beliefs, and attitudes.

Quantitative data are gathered through “test items, survey questions or other measuring tools” (Patton, 2002, p. 14). Qualitative data are gathered through “examining documents, observing behavior, or interviewing participants” (Creswell, 2015, p. 185). In this study, archival data, surveys, and interviews were used to explore the five research questions.

**Quantitative Instrument**

To measure quantitative data, the researcher developed a 9–item survey based on the collaborative leadership model (Kolb & Gray, 2005). The survey questions sought responses related to the five research questions. The survey was conducted through SurveyMonkey in a closed-response format using Likert-type response options. The
research questions focused on the instructor perceptions and attitudes; thus, a survey was a suitable option for addressing the research questions. The survey questions (see Appendix G) were developed based on the literature review and synthesis matrix and were aligned to the research questions. The survey questions related to Research Question 1 were developed by the researcher and directly related to the perceived level of collaboration between ESL and English faculty. The collaborative leadership model (Kolb & Gray, 2005) was used to develop survey questions related to Research Questions 2–5, as that model focuses on barriers to collaboration and strategies (see Table 3).

Table 3

Variables, Research Questions, and Survey Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency and Opportunities for Collaboration</td>
<td>How do community college ESL and English 101 instructors perceive the collaboration with one another in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?</td>
<td>Three main questions and 13 sub-questions related to the frequency and opportunities for collaboration between ESL and English composition faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers to Collaboration</td>
<td>What do community college ESL instructors perceive as barriers to collaborating with English 101 instructors in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?</td>
<td>To what extent do the following factors from the collaborative leadership model (Kolb &amp; Gray, 2005) hinder ESL-English composition instructor collaboration at the college for which you teach?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers to Collaboration</td>
<td>What do community college English 101 instructors perceive as barriers to collaborating with ESL instructors in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate,</td>
<td>To what extent do the following factors from the collaborative leadership model (Kolb &amp; Gray, 2005) hinder ESL-English composition instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Research Questions</td>
<td>Survey Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?</td>
<td>collaboration at the college for which you teach?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies to Improve Collaboration</td>
<td>What do ESL instructors identify as strategies and practices that could improve collaboration with English 101 instructors in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?</td>
<td>To what extent would the following strategies from the collaborative leadership model (Kolb &amp; Gray, 2005) increase ESL-English composition instructor collaboration at the college for which you teach?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies to Improve Collaboration</td>
<td>What do English 101 instructors identify as strategies and practices that could improve collaboration with ESL instructors in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?</td>
<td>To what extent would the following strategies from the collaborative leadership model (Kolb &amp; Gray, 2005) increase ESL-English composition instructor collaboration at the college for which you teach?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior to data collection, a field test was conducted. The researcher contacted a recently retired community college English professor and asked if he would participate in a field test for the survey. He matched the target audience in that he was a community college English teacher. Because he retired recently, he offered a fresh perspective without being part of the sample. Once permission was granted, a survey link was emailed to him. Upon completing the survey, he provided written feedback about the survey, identifying any issues with individual questions or the survey overall. Based on his feedback, the survey was fine tuned. The field test feedback form for the survey is presented in Appendix I. The final survey instrument is presented in Appendix G.

**Qualitative Instrument**

To measure qualitative data, the researcher developed five interview questions.

The first two interview questions aligned with Research Question 1, and participants
were asked to describe the collaboration between ESL and English instructors at the community college for which they teach. Interview Question 3 related to Research Questions 2 and 3, and Interview Question 4 related to Research Questions 4 and 5.

To gather qualitative data, the researcher interviewed one ESL and one English 101 instructor from each participating community college, totaling six interviewees. Department heads were contacted regarding volunteers for these interviews. Once those volunteers were identified, the researcher contacted the potential interviewees via email to request an interview. When the six interviewees were obtained and interview dates were set, then the researcher met with each interviewee through Zoom for 30–45 minutes to ask the same five questions, which were generated by the researcher and which addressed the research questions. The interviews provided a more in-depth and personal perspective regarding the issues and solutions regarding how faculty collaboration can help ESL students to transition more smoothly into mainstream English composition courses. The interview questions are included in Appendix H and address the five research questions in this study (see Table 4).

Table 4

*Variables, Research Questions, and Interview Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Interview Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Frequency and Opportunities for Collaboration | How do community college ESL and English 101 instructors perceive their collaboration with one another in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, | How would you describe the ideal frequency of collaboration between ESL and English 101 instructors at your community college?  
<p>|                                                |                                                                                    | What do you think the ideal frequency of collaboration should be between the two departments? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Interview Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?</td>
<td>Can you describe a time when the ideas situation occurred and why it was successful?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers to Collaboration</td>
<td>What do community college ESL instructors perceive as barriers to collaborating with English 101 instructors in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?</td>
<td>Describe the barriers to collaboration between ESL and English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What factors limited the ability of ESL and English 101 composition instructors to collaborate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Were the barriers you describe imposed by the staff or administrative procedures?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers to Collaboration</td>
<td>What do community college English 101 instructors perceive as barriers to collaborating with ESL instructors in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?</td>
<td>Describe the barriers to collaboration between ESL and English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What factors limited the ability of ESL and English 101 composition instructors to collaborate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Were the barriers you describe imposed by the staff or administrative procedures?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies to Improve</td>
<td>What do ESL instructors identify as strategies and practices that could improve collaboration with English 101 instructors in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?</td>
<td>What strategies and practices could improve collaboration between ESL and English 101 instructors?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td>Describe the ideal situation for this to occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Has this been experienced before and what were the results?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What can the administration, departments, or instructors do to increase collaboration?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies to Improve</td>
<td>What do English 101 instructors identify as strategies and practices that</td>
<td>What strategies and practices could improve collaboration between ESL and English 101 instructors?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

80
Variable | Research Questions | Interview Questions
---|---|---
could improve collaboration with ESL instructors in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict? | Describe the ideal situation for this to occur. | Has this been experienced before and what were the results? | What can the administration, departments, or instructors do to increase collaboration?

Prior to conducting the interviews, a field test was conducted. Similar to the field test for the survey, the researcher again contacted a recently retired community college English professor and asked if he would participate in a field test for the interview. A professor at Brandman University was asked to observe the interview and provide feedback. Once permission was granted from both, the interview was scheduled through Zoom. It could not be conducted in person because of COVID. Both the participant and observer provided feedback at the end of the interview by completing a feedback form. Based on their feedback, the interview was fine tuned. The field test feedback form for the interview is presented in Appendix J. The final interview instrument is presented in Appendix H.

**Validity and Reliability**

Validity refers to the instrument that measures “what it is designed to measure and accurately performs the function(s) it is purported to perform” (Patten, 2012, p. 61). Reliability refers to the consistency of the results. A traditional scientific research approach was taken to establish validity and reliability. Validity was established in that the instruments were designed to gather data aligned with the purpose of the study. Patten (2012) stated an instrument “is valid to the extent that it measures what it is
designed to measure and accurately performs the function(s) it is purposed to perform” (p. 61). Retrieval of archival data helped the researcher determine the prior and existing level of faculty collaboration at the six community colleges, which aligned with Research Question 1. Surveying and interviewing ESL and English 101 instructors revealed their perspectives regarding collaboration, which aligned with Research Questions 1-5. Kimberlin and Winterstein (2008) stated, “The process of developing and validating an instrument is in large part focused on reducing error in the measurement process” (p. 2277). The steps taken to reduce error during data collection included:

1. **Parallel locations.** Three community colleges in Washington state were selected for the study. The Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges oversees 34 public community and technical colleges in Washington state. Each of the three community colleges in this study were part of this organization and must comply with its standards.

2. **Parallel numbers for interviews.** The same number of participants who shared the same roles within each college were selected for interviews. One ESL and one English composition instructor at each of the three community colleges were interviewed, totaling six participants.

3. **Inclusive surveying.** The survey was administered to all ESL and English 101 instructors at each of the three colleges rather than selecting a smaller sample from each college.

4. **Consistent data collection methods.** The same steps for gathering archival data, administering surveys, and conducting interviews were followed for each of the three community colleges.
5. **Consistent protocols.** The same survey and interview questions were used at each college.

6. **Triangulation.** Multiple types of data were collected from different sources. Each type of data underwent a comparative analysis based on how the types of data intersected and differed. Triangulating data across multiple sources helped ensure the findings were valid and reliable.

7. **Consistent timing.** Data were collected from all three community colleges within a 2-month period to limit the chance of changing policies or practices during the data collection process.

Kimberlin and Winterstein (2008) stated, “Validity is the extent to which the interpretations of the results of a test are warranted” (p. 2278). The steps taken to ensure interpretations were warranted included:

1. **Member checking.** Upon completion of the interviews, respondents were sent a copy of the transcript from their interview to review it for accuracy and add any additional thoughts or comments that occurred after the interview. This ensured interview data were accurate and representative of the instructors’ perceptions.

2. **Compare-contrast.** Patten (2012) defined *constant comparison* as the process of “constantly comparing each new element of the data with all previous elements that have been coded in order to establish and refine categories” (p. 159). Creating a compare-contrast table and drawing parallels between the similarities and differences in the perceptions of ESL and English
101 instructors was done in a methodical way. By taking this approach, the researcher was able to reduce bias.

3. **External audit.** Patton (2012) stated an outside expert can examine the data collection process, the results, and the conclusions to ensure the quality of the research. To reduce the potential for researcher bias, an external researcher conducted an audit of the study, reviewing the protocols and procedures used, performing an inter-rater reliability check, and reviewing the findings and conclusions to ensure they were clearly drawn from and accurately reflected the data collected.

Patton (2002) provided a list of criteria to test reliability; these criteria were applied to this study. First, the research attempted to minimize bias by examining all forms of data through an objective lens. Second, triangulation examined the “consistency of findings across methods and data sources” (Patton, 2002, p. 544). Archival data were used in addition to surveys and interviews, allowing for triangulation across varied types of data. Third, purposeful sampling was used to identify a sample representative of the target population. Also, a recorder was used for all the interviews and the recordings were transcribed so the information could be cross-checked and quotations could be extracted. Fourth, the instruments were field-tested prior to data collection to ensure the survey and interview questions would collect the data needed to address the research questions. Finally, data collection and analysis were systematic and rigorous, and documented and reviewed by an external researcher.
Data Collection

Prior to contacting community colleges to participate in the study, the researcher submitted a proposal to the Brandman University Institutional Review Board (BUIRB) seeking approval to conduct research. In research, the IRB reviews study instruments and procedures to ensure they meet ethical standards (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005). This involved detailing the research plans, including steps to protect participant confidentiality and keeping all data secure.

After obtaining IRB permission to proceed with the research study, the researcher contacted deans or heads of the ESL and English departments in the following three Washington state community colleges: Edmonds College, Olympic College, and Peninsula College. The researcher was informed each college had an IRB process. Once all three colleges had granted IRB permission, the researcher made initial contacts through email addresses, which were obtained through the college websites and the researcher’s professional network. The researcher briefly explained the nature of the study and asked to schedule Zoom meetings to explain the project in more detail. Once appointments were scheduled, the researcher met one on one with each interview participants. Interviews occurred between April 16-April 22, 2021.

Archival Data

To acquire background information related to Research Question 1, demographic archival data were collected, including (a) college mission and vision statements; (b) ESL and English department outcomes; (c) notes from department meetings, especially when teaching ESL students and teaching and learning was discussed; and (d) course syllabi, assignment prompts, and rubrics from ESL and English composition instructors.
The researcher examined the data to establish a background on what occurred. Samuel (2006) discussed how mission and vision statements reveal several things about an organization, stating a mission statement “provides a sense of purpose for the organization” (p. 78) and a vision statement provides direction. Mission and vision statements were accessed by going to each of the community college websites. In addition to providing information specific to the research questions, the researcher thought it was important to know if each college promoted diversity and cultural exchange, as the overarching focus of each college affected the English and ESL departments.

Department notes and faculty workshops from the past 2 academic years, 2017–2018 and 2018–2019, were obtained from each of the three community colleges. These were used to note the number of times faculty collaboration between ESL and English instructors was mentioned or occurred. Course outcomes were collected to examine the skills students needed to accomplish by the end of the course to pass to the next level. Additionally, course syllabi, writing assignments, and rubrics were collected to determine how the ESL and English 101 programs aligned and to determine the college readiness of the ESL students transitioning to English 101.

**Surveys**

McMillan and Schumacher (2010) explained surveys administered to a representative group can “allow for generalizability across the population” (p. 236). The ability to generalize provided the researcher with a broader picture compared to the smaller, more personal view interviews provided. To address all of the research questions, all ESL and English instructors at the three community colleges were asked to
complete a survey. The survey was sent to participants through their campus email addresses, either directly if the college provided contact information to the researcher or indirectly when the college chose to send the survey link on behalf of the researcher. The survey was used to measure instructor perception about collaboration.

The web-based survey was administered through SurveyMonkey. ESL and English composition instructors at three Washington state community colleges were contacted via email. The number of ESL and English composition instructors at each college varied, depending on the locale, the student population, and the adjunct pool who helps to serve that population. The email sent to instructors (see Appendix D) included an explanation of the study and its purpose, why their response was important, how the data would be used, and a link to complete the survey. Participants were asked to complete the survey by a certain date. Twenty-four hours prior to due date, the researcher sent out a reminder to those who had not responded to increase the response rate.

**Interviews**

In addition to the survey, one ESL and one English 101 instructor at each community college was interviewed, totaling six interviewees. Interview participants were contacted via email with an explanation of the project and a request for an interview. Interviews were conducted through Zoom. At the start of each interview, the researcher reviewed the study purpose, answered any questions, and received a signed copy of the informed consent form. Once the form was signed, the interview commenced. Interviews lasted approximately 30–45 minutes. The researcher took notes
and recorded each interview. Upon completion of the interview, participants were thanked for their time.

After the interview, recordings were transcribed by hand. A copy of the transcript was sent to each instructor to confirm its accuracy and completeness. Once reviewed, both the notes and transcriptions were placed in a secure file folder and prepared for data analysis. Separate file folders were created for each interviewee that included their transcription and any artifacts provided. This structure helped keep the data organized during the analysis process.

Data Analysis

Demographic Archival Data Analysis

Artifacts were gathered to generate a narrative of what occurred prior to the study, and to determine the common and different experiences at each community college. Through examining the syllabi, assignment prompts, and rubrics from ESL and English 101 instructors, analysis was conducted to shed light on prior collaboration between the two programs. A checklist was developed to help analyze the demographic archival data collected from each of the three Washington state community colleges. The checklist was used to note any reference to diversity, collaboration, alignment between ESL and English 101, or other relevant information. Through this chart, the researcher gained context and developed a picture of the artifacts gathered at each college. Also, the chart provided an organizational tool for moving to a more complex comparison between the two focus groups: ESL instructors and English 101 instructors. McMillan and Schumacher (2010) described comparative research as that which “examines the difference between two or more groups on a variable” (p. 222). For example, each of the
three colleges was broken down further to fit into eight categories: (a) mission statements, (b) department meetings, (c) faculty workshops, (d) ESL course outcomes, (e) English 101 course outcomes, (f) syllabi, (g) writing assignments, and (h) rubrics. Within each category, the researcher looked for similarities and differences to make comparisons.

**Survey Data Analysis**

All ESL and English 101 instructors at the three community colleges were emailed a link to the web-based survey. The survey questions were grouped into five parts, seeking responses related to the five research questions. The survey included nine items to assess the frequency and opportunities for collaboration and the extent to which barriers constrained collaboration. Descriptive statistics (e.g., means, standards deviations) were calculated to determine the frequency and opportunities for collaboration between ESL and English 101 instructors at three community colleges.

McMillan and Schumacher (2010) stated, “Descriptive statistics is the most fundamental way to summarize data” (p. 149). Results were put into a table format, which allowed for a visual overview that could be more easily compared and contrasted to determine similarities and differences in the perceptions of each of the two focus groups: ESL instructors and English composition instructors.

**Interview Data Analysis**

Data were collected through recordings and detailed notes. The researcher listened to the recordings and transcribed them word for word, ensuring the accuracy of the transcription by listening to each recording multiple times. By personally transcribing the recordings, the researcher became familiar with the data. Once the
transcription process was finalized, the researcher began to code the data. Initial codes were generated based on thoughts that emerged during the transcription process. NVivo was used to assist the researcher in storing, organizing, and coding the data. Once the data were coded, codes were reviewed for themes and commonalities.

**Intercoder/inter-rater reliability.** Inter-rater reliability was used as a way to ensure results were reliable (McMillian & Schumacher, 2010). Inter-rater reliability can be used with semistructured interview questions (Patton, 2015). Patton (2015) also stated inter-rater reliability is appropriate when “all participants are asked the same questions, in the same order, and data are coded all at once at the end of the data collection period” (p. 667). In this study, a peer researcher reviewed 10% of the data. Creswell and Poth (2018) recommended a standard of 80% agreement among researchers coding the data and themes. The findings that have emerged from the data analysis are included in Chapter IV.

**Limitations**

Limitations are factors typically outside the control of the researcher than may affect a study (Patton, 2002). One limitation of this study was the use of archival data. Patton (2002) explained archival data “may be incomplete or inaccurate. Client files maintained by programs are notoriously variable in quantity and completeness, with great detail in some cases, and virtually nothing in others” (pp. 306–307). This study was limited by the availability and completeness of the archival data for each college.

Dillan, Smyth, and Christian (2014) suggested the following ways in which to increase the response rate of a survey so that it does not become a limitation:
• Provide a welcome page with the title of the survey, a brief description of the purpose of the survey, and instructions on how to proceed.
• Include how long the survey will take and how many questions are involved.
• Reduce the burden of length and complexity by limiting the questions and by constructing questions that the participants can easily answer.
• Inform the participants of the purpose and use of the data.
• Let the participants know that their answers are anonymous, confidential, will be stored in a safe place, and destroyed after the publication of the dissertation. This will create a sense of trust, which is paramount in getting participants to complete the survey.
• Use a consistent visual design to enhance usability: with a header and footer, one question per page, and a chance to move forward and back.
• Choose a design that is readable on all devices due to the increasing use of mobile devices in accessing the Internet.
• Provide options not to answer a question, such as other, not applicable, prefer not to answer, or do not know.
• Provide an option to stop the survey and finish completing it at a later time.
• Implement a pilot test with an external user.
• Test the survey on a variety of devices, connections, speeds, and browsers.

The researcher followed these guidelines to ensure the response rate did not become a limitation.

It is possible the perceptions of those who responded differed from those who did not respond, potentially limiting the generalizability of the survey. This was also a
limitation with the interview data. Interviewees were recommended by the department heads. It is possible the interviewees were not representative of their respective college but selected for other reasons. It is also possible the interviewees shared incomplete information or information they thought the researcher wanted to hear rather than accurate representations. However, the impact of this limitation was reduced by collecting survey data, interviewing instructors from multiple colleges, and interviewing both ESL and English 101 instructors. Patton (2002) stated, “Using a combination of data types . . . increases validity as the strengths of one approach can compensate for the weaknesses of another” (Marshall & Rossman, 1989, p. 306).

Summary

This study combined quantitative and qualitative methods to contribute to a better understanding of the level of and barriers to collaboration between ESL and English 101 instructors at the community college. This chapter provided the purpose statement, research questions, and research design used. The chapter also described the population, sample, instrumentation, validity and reliability, data collection, and data analysis. Chapter VI presents findings from the data collected, and Chapter V presents the conclusions, implications for action, recommendations for future research, and concluding remarks.
CHAPTER IV: FINDINGS

This research project set out to examine the collaboration between community college English as a second language (ESL) and English composition (English 101) faculty. In this chapter, the purpose statement and research questions guiding the study are restated along with a summary of the methodology, population, and sample. This is followed by a presentation and analysis of the data. An explanatory sequential mixed method design, combining quantitative and qualitative methods, was chosen. Data for the study were collected through retrieval of archival data and through surveys and interviews. A summary of the findings is offered at the end of the chapter.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this explanatory sequential mixed method study was to examine the collaboration between ESL and English 101 instructors at the community college level using the Kolb and Gray (2005) collaboration leadership model in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respective and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict. A secondary purpose was to explore barriers between the two groups of instructors and to describe what strategies and practices could improve collaboration.

Research Questions

The following research questions were used to address the purpose of this study:

1. How do community college ESL and English 101 instructors perceive the frequency and opportunities for collaboration with one another in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and
supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to
deal with conflict?

2. What do community college ESL instructors perceive as barriers to
   collaborating with English 101 instructors in the areas of common mission,
   collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive
   climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with
   conflict?

3. What do community college English 101 instructors perceive as barriers to
   collaborating with ESL instructors in the areas of common mission, collective
   responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate,
   awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?

4. What do ESL instructors identify as strategies and practices that could
   improve collaboration with English 101 instructors in the areas of common
   mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and
   supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to
   deal with conflict?

5. What do English 101 instructors identify as strategies and practices that could
   improve collaboration with ESL instructors in the areas of common mission,
   collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive
   climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with
   conflict?
Methodology

An explanatory sequential mixed method study was chosen for this project because it offered a multifaceted and in-depth view of current practice, which allowed for a more thorough analysis. The explanatory sequential design has two phases (Creswell, 2015). In the first phase quantitative, data are collected and analyzed. In the second phase, qualitative data are collected and analyzed. Following the two phases, conclusions are drawn on how the qualitative results explain the quantitative results.

To address the research questions in this study, data were obtained from archival sources, surveys, and interviews. The first step of this research study was to collect background information about the community colleges included in the study. The second step involved the quantitative method; a survey was distributed to all ESL and English 101 instructors at three Washington state community colleges. With the quantitative data, a comparative analysis followed to determine if similarities and differences existed between the perceptions of ESL and English 101 instructors. In addition to the quantitative data, qualitative data were collected through six interviews: three interviews with ESL instructors and three interviews with English 101 instructors.

Population and Sample

ESL and English 101 instructors at the community college level represented the population for this study. It was estimated 6,000 ESL and 36,000 English 101 instructors worked in community colleges in the United States (Wilmington Trust, 2013). Given this was too large a population to reasonably study, a sampling frame was selected. The sampling frame was ESL and English 101 instructors at the 29 community colleges in Washington state, which was estimated to be 145 ESL and 770 English 101 instructors.
The study was further narrowed to three community colleges: Edmonds College, Olympic College, and Peninsula College. This sample was chosen due to logistical, time, and resource constraints. These three community colleges were geographically close to the researcher, and the researcher had professional contacts with these three colleges, which would enable access to staff during the COVID-19 pandemic. The three community colleges that were selected represented nearly 10% of the community colleges in the state.

The quantitative survey included all ESL and English 101 instructors teaching at the three targeted community colleges. The quantitative survey was followed by interviews, which included one ESL and one English instructor at each of the three community colleges for a total of six instructors. Purposeful sampling was used to select those interviewees.

**Data Collection Process**

**Archival**

All of the archival data were collected through the websites at the three Washington state community colleges. First, the researcher collected the mission and vision statements from each of the three community colleges. The researcher looked in particular for language suggesting similar or different goals and how that might relate to the study. The mission statements at all three colleges included the word “diverse.” Edmonds College aims to strengthen its diverse community, Olympic College enriches its diverse community, and Peninsula College educates its diverse population. The vision statements at all three colleges referred to either transforming lives or embarking on a life-enhancing journey. Two of the three colleges referred to culture or a global society
in their vision statements. Johnson (2012) stated colleges are building globalization verbiage into their mission statements because internal and external forces are “pushing universities to embrace a more universal perspective” (p. 8).

**English as a second language programs.** The researcher examined the ESL program at each college to better understand the structure: placement, course focus, levels, and progression from one level to the next. At Edmonds College, there are two tracks: English Language Acquisition (ELA) and Intensive ESL. ELA is for residential students who need more English—refugees, immigrants, citizens, and asylees. ELA has six levels and is funded by the state. International students coming to the United States on a F1 visa—or sometimes a spousal visa—enter the Intensive ESL program. There are five levels, and after the fifth level, they take the Learning Assistance Program (LAP). ELA and Intensive English have parallel ways to get into AENGL or English 101.

Olympic College offers English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) and English as a Second Language (ESL) for non-native English speakers and refugees, and focuses on English skills in listening, reading, writing, and speaking. Students with a F-1 or M-1 visa are referred to the Intensive English program, which prepares them for academic study at higher education institutions in the United States. Students are placed based on their Accuplacer ESL score. Intensive English has five levels, and each level addresses writing and grammar, reading and vocabulary, and listening and speaking. Once students complete the fourth level with a B+, they are college ready.

At Peninsula College, ESL is part of adult basic education (ABE) and focuses on improving English listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills. Intensive English as a Second Language (IESL) is designed for international students and has three levels:
basic, intermediate, and high intensity. At each level, students work on listening and speaking skills, reading skills, and writing and grammar skills. After the Intensive English program, students traditionally bridge to the fourth level, which is English 90.

Simon (2006) stated community college ESL programs vary in structure. First, they may contain single-skilled or multi-skilled courses. A single-skill course focuses on one skill, such as just reading or just writing, while a multi-skilled course combines two or more skills within a course. Second, they may be integrated (housed within the English department) or centralized (in its own department). Third, they may be truncated (separated into levels from high to low) or comprehensive (all levels are combined). The ESL programs at the three community colleges in this study offered multi-skilled courses, and were centralized and truncated.

Vifansi (2002) further explained the diversity of ESL students by breaking them into two subgroups: U.S. ESL students and international ESL students. This correlates with the archival data represented in Table 5: The program for non-native English speakers falls under Vifansi’s first subgroup, and the program for international students falls under Vifansi’s second subgroup. He further divided U.S. ESL students into three subgroups: (a) those born in the United States to immigrant families, (b) those who immigrated to the United States when young, and (c) those who started school in another country before coming to the United States.

In relation to this, ESL instructors are diverse in that they may teach one or both groups of ESL students. The three ESL instructors in this study taught strictly for one group: One instructor taught U.S. ESL students, and two instructors taught international ESL students.
Table 5

About the ESL Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colleges in Study</th>
<th>Program for Non-Native English Speakers</th>
<th>Program for International Students</th>
<th>Bridge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edmonds College</td>
<td>ELA 6 levels Funded by the state</td>
<td>Intensive English 5 levels Self-supported</td>
<td>To AENGL or English 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic College</td>
<td>ESOL/ ESL 5 levels</td>
<td>Intensive English 5 levels</td>
<td>Bridge to English 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula College</td>
<td>ESL Beginning, Intermediate, Advanced</td>
<td>Intensive English 3 levels</td>
<td>4th Level / English 90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**English 101 Programs.** The researcher examined the English program at each college to better understand the structure, placement, and course objectives. Each of the three colleges requires either the appropriate placement test score or the completion of a particular course with a certain grade. At Edmonds College, students must pass the ACCUPLACER, have an ACCUPLACER exemption, or pass English 99 or PREP 99 with a minimum of 2.0. At Olympic College, students must pass the placement test, English 91 with a 3.3, or English 99 with a 2.0. At Peninsula College, students must place the ACCUPLACER or pass English 90, 91, or 92.

Although the wording of the course objectives at each college differs, all three college have common outcomes to include: (a) critical thinking and reading strategies applied to the analysis of texts; (b) the writing process and composition methods; (c) an academic writing style to include structure, grammar, and mechanics; (d) rhetorical principles—audience, purpose, genre, thesis—applied to the development of analytical and argumentative essays; and (e) research techniques to include integrating sources and proper citation format.
In addition, syllabi were collected from eight English 101 instructors. Table 6 shows 7 of the 8 instructors assign three essays per quarter. Six instructors use peer review, six instructors assign final drafts or a portfolio, and seven instructors refer students to the writing lab. This table shows not only the quantity of writing students are being asked to do in English 101, but also the process approach to writing through peer review and multiple drafts.

Table 6

*English Instructor Syllabi*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English 101 Instructor</th>
<th>Number of Essays</th>
<th>Peer Review</th>
<th>Final Draft/Portfolio</th>
<th>Reference to Writing Lab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 short papers</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 large paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Syllabi were not collected from ESL faculty; thus, a comparative analysis between the ESL and English 101 faculty syllabi could not be done. However, Harrison (2014) suggested the community college ESL programs include writing assignments commonly assigned in first-year composition classes, such as genre analysis and more multimodal composition projects. Clausen-Sells (2014) stated collaboration opens communication pathways for those involved in the education experience of international students. Thus, through opening the communication pathway between ESL and English faculty, syllabi from both groups could be examined.
Theme for the collection of archival data. The theme developed from the collection of archival data was that ESL programs in community colleges differ in structure, have a diverse range of students, and ESL instructors differ in the classes and levels of students they teach.

Participant Demographics From the Survey and Interviews

Table 7 illustrates the participant demographics from the survey conducted through SurveyMonkey. This survey was emailed to all ESL and English composition faculty at the three Washington state community colleges taking part in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English 101</th>
<th></th>
<th>ESL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct, part-time</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or less</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey. All English and ESL faculty at Edmonds College, Olympic College, and Peninsula College were emailed a survey request through SurveyMonkey. Out of 110 total invitations, 24 faculty responded (21.82%). Of the 15 English 101 faculty and the nine ESL faculty who responded, all but one participant had been teaching in their discipline for over 10 years. Six English 101 faculty were full-time, and five ESL faculty were full-time, totaling 11 full-time faculty responding to the survey. Nine adjunct, part-
time English 101 faculty and four adjunct, part-time ESL faculty responded, totaling 13 adjunct, part-time faculty responding to the survey. More adjunct, part-time faculty responded to the survey than full-time faculty.

**Interviews.** In addition to the survey, three English 101 faculty and three ESL faculty were interviewed. The three English 101 faculty were adjunct, part time, and the three ESL faculty were full time. The researcher requested interviews with three full-time English faculty, and those requests were denied or not answered.

**Data Analysis for Research Question 1**

**Frequency of Collaboration.** The first research question asked, “How do community college ESL and English 101 instructors perceive the frequency and opportunities for collaboration with one another in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?”

Wood and Gray (1991) defined collaboration as “when a group of autonomous stakeholders of a problem domain engage in an interactive process, using shared rules, norms, and structures, to act or decide on issues related to that domain” (p. 146). Andrews (2008) talked about the importance of collaboration between faculty. The first survey and interview question addressed the frequency of collaboration between ESL and English 101 instructors.

**Frequency of collaboration (survey).** Table 8 illustrates there is some collaboration between English 101 and ESL instructors, but there have been few collaborative workshops focused on the learning needs and transition of ESL students to composition courses. However, some English and ESL faculty are discussing the
learning needs and transition of ESL students with another instructor in their department, but minimally with a faculty member outside of their department. Simon (2006) stated community college ESL programs may be integrated (housed within the English department) or centralized (in its own department). The ESL programs at the three community colleges in this study were centralized. Thus, collaboration between ESL and English faculty would take place outside of their respective departments.

Table 8

*Survey on the Frequency of Collaboration at the College*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of...</th>
<th>English 101</th>
<th>ESL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English 101 and ESL instructor collaboration</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative workshops focused on the learning needs of ESL students</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative workshops focused on the transition of ESL students to composition courses</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing the learning needs of ESL students with another instructor</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing the transition of ESL students to composition courses with another instructor</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversations regarding ESL learning needs and transition with a colleague in your department</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversations regarding ESL learning needs and transition with a colleague outside your department</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Frequency of Collaboration (Interview).* Interview participants supported the survey data that relate to the frequency of collaboration between faculty in the English and ESL departments. Table 9 reveals four instructors relate no to minimal collaboration, one relates some, and one relates a strong effort on the part of the English department to collaborate with the ESL department.
Table 9

*Interview on the Frequency of Collaboration at the College*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Minimal</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Strong effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 3</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participant 1 stated there has been minimal collaboration outside of all campus meetings. Participation 1 stated, “Part of it is the pandemic, especially during the first 6 months when people were trying to stay afloat and make a successful transition to all online and to help the students do the same.”

Participant 2 stated there has been some collaboration during his 15 years teaching at the college:

My main knowledge is based on the number of years I did a collaborative teacher project with EAP. This started in 2014 and ended in 2018. I worked with two different EAP instructors who were teaching English 131, and I was teaching English 101. The EAP class had 25 students who were enrolled in my 101 class concurrently, and it was split so there were 12 students in one section of my 101 and 12 students in the other section of 101. That was, I thought, a really good collaboration. There was something nice about the way that was set up. It
seemed like a nice apparatus for encouraging students to complete the course. 

Having ways of supporting students beyond the boundaries of the traditional 101 class was helpful.

Because this collaborative class ended in 2018, Participant 2 was not aware of any collaboration occurring between the ESL and English faculty.

Participant 3 stated the faculty within the ESL department meet and collaborate quarterly, but there had not been any collaboration between the ESL and English departments, she had not had any contact with English 101 instructors.

Participant 4 shared, due to the pandemic, she had had little communication with any faculty members for the last year. Prior to the pandemic, as an English 101 instructor, she never met with ESL instructors. She stated there was not much in place to help adjunct faculty in particular. She also stated:

At our school I know there’s help for people who have English as a second language, but it’s a separate program, and I can say I know it exists because I’ve had people in my classes that make note of it to me, but I’ve never met those people who help the students. I’ve never had any interaction with them to know what they are trying to do in their classes.

Participant 5 stated the English department has made a strong effort to collaborate. When she first arrived at the college, the head of the English department invited her to give a workshop on working with multilingual writers, and she has continued to meet with English faculty.

Participant 6 stated he was not aware of any official collaboration at the college for which he teaches. He said if someone brought it up at English department meetings,
there would be a discussion about it and a committee might form; other than that, he had not heard anything more about it. He said, especially during this last year with the pandemic, everyone is feeling overwhelmed and less willing to “go the extra mile” like they might if they were on campus.

**Perceptions regarding opportunities for collaboration.** Next, both the survey and interview questions addressed the perceptions regarding opportunities for collaboration.

**Faculty perceptions regarding collaboration (survey).** Vifanski (2002) discussed the learning needs of ESL students in college writing classes and said there were differences between the learning needs of (a) ESL students and native English-speaking students and of (b) immigrant and international students. Clausen-Sells (2014) explained professional development can have a powerful impact on both instructors and students when instructors use this opportunity for self-reflection. Waye (2010) stated communities of practice can foster organized evaluation of teaching and learning.

Participants were surveyed on the potential impact of professional development opportunities focused on collaboration. Table 10 shows English 101 and ESL faculty perceive a fairly positive impact regarding ESL transition into composition classes and in aiding teaching practice. ESL faculty perceive more of an increase in student learning than English instructors do.

**Table 10**

*Potential Impact of Professional Development – Survey Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood PD will…</th>
<th>English 101</th>
<th>ESL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase student learning</td>
<td>2.87 .92</td>
<td>3.22 .67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ease ESL student transition to composition classes 3.07  .70  3.33  .50
Aid in teaching practice 3.00  .93  3.22  .67

Table 11 shows a fair number of English 101 and ESL faculty would engage in collaborative professional development opportunities, although ESL faculty would be less likely to participate if the workshops were online. Neither English 101 nor ESL faculty were interested in sharing practices through discussion boards.

### Table 11

*Potential Engagement in Professional Development – Survey Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood instructor would engage in…</th>
<th>English 101</th>
<th>ESL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development focused on collaboration</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online synchronous workshops</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion boards to share best practices</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty perceptions regarding collaboration (interview).** Participant 1 stated meetings or workshops to talk about course outcomes for both programs and shared strategies would be beneficial. Participant 1 stated it would be good to hear from English faculty on the skills ESL students need when entering English 101 to determine if the activities are scaffolded so ESL students arrive prepared. Also helpful would be to talk about common pedagogical approaches, because there is a difference between a classroom of students who grew up speaking English and are culturally familiar with the community college system and a classroom that is predominantly international students. Participant 1 would like more collaboration between ESL and the English department and would participate in those meetings or workshops. Participant 2 stated:
I am in favor of more discussions with faculty members about what they are actually teaching, which is something that is not discussed very much on any level—actually, talking about teaching not only as an interdepartmental issue but within the department, too. Those conversations would just lead to better overall relationships. It just seems like a lot of times the discussions become bureaucratic in nature and people are really busy and it will take a lot of time.

Participant 3 agreed it was likely that collaborative professional development opportunities between ESL and English 101 instructors would aid in teaching practice and ease ESL student transition into English 101. Participant 3 stated collaborative workshops would help ESL instructors to hear about the difficulties students encounter when transitioning from ESL to English 101. ESL instructors “could identify the weaknesses of the program and develop strategies according to that.” In addition, Participant 3 stated, “it would be good for 101 instructors to know the things we are doing.” Participant 3 engaged in professional development focused on collaboration.

Participant 4 agreed that it is important to find ways to help ESL students to be successful and that collaboration sessions would be beneficial if they were focused. She suggested a small group or even one or two people could investigate strategies to aid in the success of ESL students in a Comp 101 class.

Participant 5, an Intensive English faculty, shared her experience teaching an English 90 class and how it aided her in her teaching practice. She met with other English 90 faculty, and they gave her access to their past shells. She stated:

As a transition instructor I always want to know what the students are going to be doing next so I can try to link up with it so I can bring that awareness to my
students. I need to know not just with English, but in their pathway, what are the language demands of their next classes, so that helped me a lot because just teaching that I could really see that and there is a lot of variety. People have different assignments and people use different texts, but I think it helped me develop a deeper understanding of what current English 90 is and especially what that accelerated model looks like.

Participant 5 added:

It is really important for all faculty to get professional development training in working with multilingual writers and for so long we have had this deficiency model with these students—“okay, well, they need to learn English and then they can come into my classes”—The onus is on us as faculty on how we can change our classes so we support our students.

Participant 6 stated having more knowledge of how language works would be of use, and what he does know about it has helped him when teaching ESL students. He would like to see more discussion on the difficulties in language and how people express their ideas to other cultures. He would like to see a language/linguistic workshop where participants could create practical tools for teaching ESL students.

**Desired frequency of professional development.** Also related to Research Question 1 was a question regarding the desired frequency of collaboration between ESL and English 101 instructors.

**Desired frequency of professional development (survey).** Andrews (2008) advocated for regular communication between college faculty about teaching and learning and sharing of new insights, best practices, and ways to teach in the 21st century,
and for programs and activities focused on personal and professional growth. Chandler (2011) stated professional development should not be a random or one-time event but instead should be continuously offered and sustained over time. Harrison (2014) stated, “The English department and ESL program, as well as other content areas, should communicate frequently so that the ESL program is continually preparing its students for the types of literacy tasks they might encounter in for-credit courses” (p. 193).

Table 12 shows English 101 instructors suggest meeting once an academic year whereas ESL instructors are interested in meeting once a quarter. Data show English 101 instructors are interested in collaboration, either once a year or once a quarter. However, a third of the ESL instructors suggest a one-time event or not at all. Data show 86.6% of the English 101 instructors are interested in collaboration either once a quarter or once a year, whereas only 66.6% of ESL instructors are interested; thus, English 101 instructors are more interested in professional development opportunities focused on collaboration with ESL instructors than ESL instructors are. Table 13 shows interview participants’ response to the desired frequency of professional development.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired Frequency of Professional Development – Survey Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired Frequency of Professional Development – Interview Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Desired frequency of professional development (interview). Of the six faculty interviewed, two participants stated faculty in the two departments should meet regularly and work on projects together, two participants stated collaboration between departments should happen two times per quarter, and two faculty stated it should occur quarterly.

Table 14 shows interviewees support a higher level of collaboration that is evident in the survey results.

Table 14

Factors That Hinder Collaboration – Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Missing or unclear goals</th>
<th>English 101</th>
<th>ESL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals not pulling their weight</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of resources</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of vision</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a point person</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk instead of action</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dysfunctional alliances</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of collaborative skills</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustration with the process</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual agendas</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for more student involvement</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment of faculty interests and priorities</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing in academic calendar</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community resistance to new ideas</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turf battles among participants</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant 1 also stated, “It would be very powerful if the administration requested more collaboration, as that request would imply support.” Participant 1 stated one way would be making time available during at day that’s set aside for meetings. Building it into a division meeting could be possible and that would allow associate faculty to be paid to attend, as it involves time and money to get the best participation possible and to hear from as many voices as possible.

Participant 1 said the faculty retreat at the beginning of the academic year could be a good time and place for a collaborative workshop for ESL and English faculty.

Participant 2 shared:

I have been teaching for almost 15 years, but it can be hard when you’re outside of the department discussions to follow shifting terms and relationships. I do think having more frequent departmental check-ins would be good . . . maybe quarterly.

Participant 3 suggested ESL and English 101 instructors meet twice a quarter: in the beginning of the quarter to set goals and at the end of the quarter to see if the goals were met. Participant 3 said, that way, instructors could analyze what could be improved upon and applied to the following quarter.

Participant 4 shared it would be more beneficial to have a smaller faculty group that met two times a quarter rather than trying to get the entire faculty from both departments together. This smaller group could meet twice a quarter. Participant 4 said:
Students would need to be writing all the time, and there would be the opportunity for both ESL and Comp 101 instructors to see where there might be problems . . . or come up with strategies on how to help the students.

Participant 5 stated ideally ESL and English faculty should meet regularly: “If it’s true collaboration, it would be great to be working on projects together.”

Participant 6 related the collaboration needs to be ongoing. He stated he is not a fan of generalized meetings because it is rare for something to come out of it. He would like to see a contextualized course combining ESL and English. He stated:

Culturally there could be some contextualization that could better prepare ESL students, and maybe if we did it right, it could help built up a little worldliness for our local students to have to interact with these people in a guided way that highlights language issues.

He also stated the faculty retreat at the beginning of each academic year might be a good time and place for a collaborative workshop for ESL and English faculty.

**Themes generated from Research Question 1.** First, the ESL and English programs at all three community colleges are housed in different departments, making it less likely for collaboration to occur, because there is more collaboration within departments than between departments. Secondly, ESL instructors see increased student learning as a collaboration outcome, and English instructors see transitioning and aiding practice as collaboration outcomes. Thirdly, although researchers believe collaboration between faculty should be frequent and ongoing, the data show both ESL and English instructors have a limited desire to meet.
Data Analysis for Research Questions 2 and 3

The second research question asked, “What do community college ESL instructors perceive as barriers to collaborating with English 101 instructors in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?” The third research question asked, “What do community college English 101 instructors perceive as barriers to collaborating with ESL instructors in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?”

Osman (2004) asserted despite increasing attention placed on collaboration in the educational field, most collaborative endeavors fail because they are not planned and implemented correctly. Chandler (2011) stated professional development programs should be systematically implemented, have measurable outcomes, be task oriented, and immediately applicable. Table 14 shows data collected from the survey, and Table 15 shows data collected from the interviews.

Table 15
Factors That Hinder Collaboration – Interview Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Lack of Funding</th>
<th>No Point Person</th>
<th>Perception of Faculty Expertise</th>
<th>Administration/Structure</th>
<th>College Culture</th>
<th>Not a priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kolb and Gray (2005) developed the collaborative leadership model to guide six workshops during a 5-year initiative called Leadership for Institutional Change funded by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. The purpose was to develop collaborative models for higher education that would address the changing culture of the institutions. A survey followed each of the six workshops regarding the obstacles to collaboration, which were recorded and prioritized. Table 14 lists factors that hinder collaboration in the same order of importance as they were listed in Kolb and Gray’s study.

**Factors that hinder collaboration (survey).** Table 14 shows lack of time is the main barrier for English 101 instructors. Lack of resources and funding are also a concern for English 101 instructors. ESL instructors perceived lack of resources and funding as the primary barriers with lack of time, talk instead of action, individual agendas, alignment of faculty interests and priorities, and turf battles among participants as secondary concerns.

**Factors that hinder collaboration (interviews).** Participant 1 provided three barriers: (a) part of it is a scheduling issue because faculty are busy taking care of their classes and participating in departmental committees, and being in separate divisions makes meeting together more challenging; (b) there is no point person to lead the project; and (c) the perception of faculty expertise in certain areas. Comments have been made about there being a big difference between Intensive English and English 101. Participant 1 stated barriers have arisen over how things are organized and not because any individual or policy is trying to keep faculty from collaborating. It is more a part of the culture of the college and how departments have historically worked.
Participant 2 stated even though the collaborative teaching project had a high success rate with 80%–95% of the students passing, it ended. He stated, “There was something about the stress and strain of the registration process from having two sections of student in one section being too complicated and then there was a proposal.” The English department said no to the proposal, and that is when the collaboration ended. The barrier is whatever administrative process makes that so complicated.

Participant 3 shared one barrier to collaboration: Coordinating a meeting time. She stated, “The first step is trying to get people together.” Participant 4 said:

This is very large. To me there’s a gulf. It seems that really helping students in the area of writing—English as their second language—it seems like it’s really not a high priority for faculty. It seems as though it is not that important to seriously sit down and have some dialogue about it and figure out ways to help and be consistent. It’s as though there are so many other expectations coming at full-time faculty from the administration. They are busy. The adjuncts are busy. It’s very difficult.

Participant 4 related this issue needs to be a priority for the administration. She related she does not have hope it could happen, and, for there to be collaboration, she would have to make the first move. She would have to find people who would be interested in working together and plan times to get together. Because of that, she said:

There would need to be a change in the way adjuncts are received within community at a college. They are just so separate from what is going on. In order to really be working together, people need to be on a level playing field. It is just not the way it is in community college and in colleges in general. You
have the tenured people and you have the adjuncts. Sometimes they get work and sometimes they don’t. They might be there for two quarters and then they are gone. This is no way to build a program. It’s harder to build a program when you don’t have people who have bought into the idea and who are willing to commit to a period of time to make something happen. It just takes a lot of time. There is consistency you want to see in a program—consistency in the methods that are used and consistency in the pedagogy.

Another barrier Participant 4 shared was:

It is just a mindset we have about English and writing and teaching it. That seems to be what it is more than anything else, and then there are people teaching writing who hold those same kinds of mindsets and then there are other people in the same department that hold different mindsets on what’s important in the teaching of writing. It’s quite fluid and it’s a broad group of people who are quite adverse in their thinking. That in itself makes it hard.

Participant 5 related three barriers:

1. Time was stated first as an obvious barrier.

2. A second barrier is lack of funding. A lot of the English faculty she works with are adjuncts, and she questioned whether they would be paid to attend the meetings or work on collaborative projects.

3. A third barrier is the orientation of ESL faculty and English faculty is very different and the approaches to teaching are different.

She stated, “A lot of our English faculty have a literary background whereas a lot of the ESL faculty have a background in applied linguistics.”
Participant 6 related perception of workload increase as a barrier. Second was implementing the collaboration rather than just talking about it. Third, adjuncts might be reluctant to participate if they are not getting paid. However, he stated:

Even if you’re not getting paid to do this sort of thing, it’s good to be able to speak up and see what else is going on, because maybe you can get some partnership going—even if it’s not official or paid--just working with people, trying to make something happen.

**Themes for Research Questions 2 and 3.** First, ESL instructors perceived twice as many barriers to collaboration as English instructors. English instructors rated three barriers in the high range, and ESL instructors rated six in the high range. Secondly, the two faculty groups related three common barriers: time, resources, and funding. Also, both faculty groups rated these three common barriers higher than the other barriers on the list.

**Data Analysis for Research Questions 4 and 5**

The fourth research question asked, “What do ESL instructors identify as strategies and practices that could improve collaboration with English 101 instructors in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?” The fifth research questions asked, “What do English 101 instructors identify as strategies and practices that could improve collaboration with ESL instructors in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?”
First, participants were asked to identify the characteristics of effective collaboration based on the Kolb and Gray (2005) model. Table 16 lists these characteristics in the order in which they are presented in the Kolb and Gray (2005) study and in the order in which they are listed in all five research questions. Table 16 illustrates the survey results. Tables 17 and 18 illustrate the interview results.

Table 16

*Strategies That Increase Collaboration – Survey Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English 101</th>
<th>ESL</th>
<th>English 101</th>
<th>ESL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common mission</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective responsibility</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary resources</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectful and supportive climate</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of group process</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity to deal with conflict</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17

*Characteristics of Effective Collaboration – Interview Findings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective collaboration</th>
<th>Common mission</th>
<th>Collective responsibility</th>
<th>Respectful supportive climate</th>
<th>Awareness of group process</th>
<th>Capacity to deal with conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Characteristics to effective collaboration (survey). The collaborative leadership model (Kolb & Gray, 2005) identifies seven key characteristics to effective collaboration, which are listed in Table 16. Instructors were asked to what extent the following strategies would increase collaboration between ESL and EC instructors. Necessary resources and creativity were high on the list for English 101 instructors, while creativity for ESL instructors was considered the least important strategy. ESL instructors prioritized collective responsibility and a respectful and supportive climate, and in contrast, English 101 instructors rated collective responsibility as less important than the other characteristics.

Characteristics to effective collaboration (interviews). In the interviews, Participant 1 identified common mission as a key characteristic to effective collaboration. Participant 2 explained the collaborative teaching model as an effective strategy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies to increase collaboration</th>
<th>Collaborative workshops</th>
<th>Collaborative teaching model</th>
<th>Administrative support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 3</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 6</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18

Strategies That Increase Collaboration – Interview Findings
My individual teaching experience was quite positive with the two teachers I worked with. They were added to my Canvas classrooms. They did some of the same assignments that they would do in the 131 EAP curriculum, so there were some elements of that class that remained the same, but I think they also geared a lot of assignments around my three essay assignments for 101. They would work on those essay assignments in the class. They would do revision exercises—introductory paragraph exercises—things like that in EAP—and those were specific to my essay assignments, and they did some close readings related to my essay assignments and with the texts that were relevant to the essay. I would come into their classroom on occasion, usually around the time of the essay due date, or even more frequently. Five to six times per quarter, I would spend an hour in the EAP classroom giving some extra assistance, reading over people’s shoulders when they were sharing drafts with each other. It gave me a little bit more time to see how students were doing, and beyond the extra help on the written assignments, they also got a sense of camaraderie that developed from students in that class and that carried into my two sections—just a little extra support system for each other. I enjoyed that part of it—it did seem to help—it just meant that they were having more class together and that helped in some ways. It was very helpful because you don’t usually see other people teaching.

Participant 3 identified common mission as a key characteristic to effective collaboration. If ESL instructors understand what skills ESL students are lacking when they enter English 101, and if English instructors understood what is being taught in ESL, then together they could work on a smoother transition for ESL students.
Participant 4 stated the issue needs to be important to the people in administration. She suggested a small group of ESL and English 101 faculty working together on strategies to aid in the success of ESL students in a Comp 101 class. Another suggestion was to create a special class focused on writing at the sentence level.

Participant 5 suggested more collaboration so people can learn from each other’s experience. ESL and English faculty can work on progression and pathways together, lining up what’s happening in the Intensive English program with what students will be doing when they enter their English classes. She stated this is happening at her college. She also enjoyed team teaching and believed sheltered models of instruction where teachers are teaching together would be effective.

Participant 6 shared collaborative strategies he uses in his classroom that could be used in any collaborative situation. For common mission, he shared how one instructor had a class build a mission statement together, and he thought this was a good way to get people in the group to buy into a common goal. For collective responsibility, he suggested group members start by sharing their resume of skills and what they can bring to the group. For respectful and supportive climate, he mentioned the importance of trusting in the process. He also mentioned coming up with a contract on how group members were going to act and how they were going to access each other and make everyone sign it. For capacity to deal with conflict, he asked them what the consequences would be if someone in the group was not pulling their weight. He said if that was spelled out ahead of time, then if conflict occurred, there would be something in place.
Professional development topics of interest. Participants were asked to relate the professional development topics of interest. One strategy to improve collaboration would be to develop a professional development program based on common interests. Table 19 illustrates the survey data gathered on topics of interest. The order of topics in Table 19 match the order in which these topics were presented in Chapter II.

Professional development topics of interest (survey). Those surveyed were asked which of the following topics they would like to see in a professional development program geared toward ESL and English 101 faculty collaboration. The largest difference between the two groups relates to collaborative writing activities, which English 101 instructors are interested in and ESL instructors are not. ESL instructors are interested in discussing rubrics and prewriting activities. Discussing prewriting activities is not a priority for English 101 instructors. Neither group is interested in discussing the use of writing labs or technology as a teaching tool.

Table 19

Professional Development Topics of Interest – Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>English 101</th>
<th></th>
<th>ESL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubrics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prewriting activities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative writing activities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing workshops</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of writing labs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology as a teaching tool</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professional development topics of interest (interviews). Participants 4 and 6 had experience working in writing labs. Participant 4 stated when she worked in the writing lab, there was a definite interest in finding ways to help ESL students and to come together with teachers to discuss strategies to overcome reading and grammar struggles. Participant 6 stated the writing lab is a great tool that is not being used. Before the pandemic it was difficult to get students to the writing lab, and with the pandemic, it has gotten worse. Participant 6 stated, “If the school were smart, they could budget staff for the writing lab to get experience or training to better handle foreign exchange students, and they’ve talked about it for a long time.”

Participant 6 discussed the benefits of collaborate writing activities. He discussed implementing group essays in an English 101 class. He said it was not just about the essay; it was about teaching people how to work successfully in groups. He shared group and team building strategies he has used with his students and what worked and what did not. He also tried collaborative grading, where his assessment was only one part of the grade, and he found students were often harder on each other than he was on them. He said he has imagined collaboration with an ESL and an English instructor producing a course together.

Participant 6 discussed the benefits of technology as a teaching tool. He had experimented with integrating various technologies into the classroom and said a lot of it focuses on education reform and collaboration: gamification, blogging, podcasts, and Google forms to create surveys. Students responded positively to these teaching and learning activities.
**Themes for Research Questions 4 and 5.** Both ESL and English composition instructors gave all of the key characteristics from the Kolb and Gray (2005) model high ratings. The order in which they prioritized the characteristics differed. Table 20 shows the difference.

**Table 20**

*Differences in Prioritizing Strategies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>ESL instructor ratings</th>
<th>English instructor ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common mission</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary resources</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectful and supportive climate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of group process</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity to deal with conflict</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

The purpose of this explanatory sequential mixed method study was to examine the collaboration between ESL and English 101 instructors at the community college level using the Kolb and Gray (2005) collaboration leadership model. A secondary purpose was to explore barriers to collaboration, and to describe what strategies and practices could improve collaboration. This chapter presented the data collected through retrieval of demographic archival data and through a survey and interviews. First, archival data were collected to provide a deeper understanding of the structure of the ESL and English programs at each of the colleges. Next, all ESL and English faculty at Edmonds College, Olympic College, and Peninsula College were emailed a survey request through SurveyMonkey. That data were coded and analyzed. Next, one ESL
instructor and one English instructor from three Washington state community colleges were interviewed, and that data were coded and analyzed. Following the two phases, the data from both the survey and interviews were synthesized.

The survey and interviews addressed the frequency of collaboration, as well as the desired frequency of collaboration, faculty perceptions regarding collaboration, factors that hinder collaboration, characteristics of effective collaboration, strategies to increase collaboration, and professional development topics of interest. Chapter V presents a final summary of the study, including major findings, unexpected findings, conclusions, and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter provides the purpose statement, research questions, methodology, population, and sample. This is followed by the major findings, unexpected findings, conclusions from the findings, implications for actions, and recommendations for further study. Reflections and concluding remarks are offered at the end of the chapter.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this explanatory sequential mixed methods study was to examine the collaboration between ESL and English 101 instructors at the community college level using the Kolb and Gray (2005) collaboration leadership model in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respective and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict. A secondary purpose was to explore barriers to collaboration, and to describe what strategies and practices could improve collaboration.

Research Questions

The following research questions were used to address the purpose of this study:

1. How do community college ESL and English 101 instructors perceive the frequency and opportunities for collaboration with one another in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?

2. What do community college ESL instructors perceive as barriers to collaborating with English 101 instructors in the areas of common mission,
collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?

3. What do community college English 101 instructors perceive as barriers to collaborating with ESL instructors in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?

4. What do ESL instructors identify as strategies and practices that could improve collaboration with English 101 instructors in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?

5. What do English 101 instructors identify as strategies and practices that could improve collaboration with ESL instructors in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?

**Methodology**

An explanatory sequential mixed method study was chosen because it offered a multifaceted and in-depth view of current practice, which allowed for a more thorough analysis. A mixed-method study combines the collection of quantitative and qualitative data. McMillan and Schumacher (2010) related that this method of study incorporates the strengths of each method, which provides more comprehensive data. The explanatory
sequential design has two phases (Creswell, 2015). In the first phase quantitative, data are collected and analyzed. In the second phase, qualitative data are collected and analyzed. Following the two phases, conclusions are drawn regarding how the qualitative results explain the quantitative results.

During the first phase of the explanatory sequential design, the researcher conducted a 9-question survey through SurveyMonkey to gather quantitative data related to each research question. McMillan and Schumacher (2010) stated, “Surveys are used frequently in educational research to describe attitudes, beliefs, opinions, and other types of information” (pp. 22–23), which the research questions in this study sought to address. A comparative analysis followed the collection of quantitative data. Objectivity was important when examining data related to the frequency and opportunities for collaboration, as well as the perceived barriers, strategies, and practices community college ESL and English 101 instructors identified.

During the second phase, the researcher interviewed three ESL instructors and three English 101 instructors to gather qualitative data related to each research question, which then could be used to explain the quantitative results. Kamamura (2011) stated, “Qualitative studies focus on the importance of participants’ perspective and how it informs the personal meaning behind the participant” (p. 72). Each participant was asked the same five open-ended research questions. Interviews were conducted through Zoom due to the COVID-19 pandemic, recorded and transcribed, and then a copy was sent to each participant to review as a way to ensure the accuracy of the data.
Population

ESL and English composition instructors at the community college level represented the population for this study. There were 1202 community colleges in the United States (Wilmington Trust, 2013). The number of ESL instructors and English instructors working in the community colleges in the United States can only be estimated, because there are so many variables, including location, college size, size of the ESL and English programs within each college, and finally the year and even the quarter. It is estimated that there are at least 6,000 ESL instructors and at least 36,000 English instructors working in community colleges in the United States. Given this was too large a population to reasonably study, a sampling frame was selected.

Sampling Frame

For this study, the sampling frame was ESL and English composition instructors at the 29 community colleges in Washington State, which is estimated to be 145 ESL instructors and 770 English instructors. The Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges lists 29 community colleges and five technical colleges.

Sample

The researcher narrowed the study to three community colleges in Washington State: Edmonds College, Olympic College, and Peninsula College. These community colleges were chosen due to logistical, time, and resource constraints. These three community colleges were geographically close to the researcher, and the researcher had professional contacts with these three colleges, which enabled access to staff during the COVID-19 pandemic. The three community colleges selected represented nearly 10% of the community colleges in the state.
Demographic Data

All ESL and English faculty at Edmonds College, Olympic College, and Peninsula College were emailed a survey request through SurveyMonkey. Of 110 total invitations, 24 faculty responded (21.82%). Of the 15 English 101 faculty and the nine ESL faculty who responded, all but one participant had been teaching in their discipline for over 10 years. In addition to the survey, three ESL instructors and three English composition instructors were interviewed—one ESL instructor and one English composition instructor from each of the three colleges.

Major Findings

The first objective of this study was to determine the frequency and opportunities for collaboration of community college ESL and English composition instructors. The second objective was to identify the perceived barriers to collaborations and strategies to improve collaboration. Findings resulting from this study are detailed in the following sections, organized by the five research questions. All five research questions were designed to gather data on the collaboration between ESL and English 101 instructors using Kolb and Gray’s (2005) collaborative leadership model in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respective and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict. Of the 10 key findings, three related to Research Question 1, the frequency and opportunity for collaboration; three related to Research Questions 2 and 3, barriers to collaboration; and five related to Research Questions 4 and 5, strategies to improve collaboration.
Research Question 1

Research Question 1 was: How do community college ESL and English 101 instructors perceive the frequency and opportunities for collaboration with one another in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?

Major Finding 1: Frequency of collaboration. To determine a need for collaboration between community college ESL and English faculty, it was important to survey and interview participants about the frequency of collaboration. Survey participants related that some collaboration occurred between ESL and English 101 instructors, but there had been few workshops focused on the learning needs and transitions of ESL students to mainstream college composition courses. Those surveyed stated there had been some discussion between colleagues within departments regarding the learning needs and transitions of ESL students but minimal discussion between colleagues outside of their departments. Interview participants supported the survey data in regard to the frequency of collaboration between faculty in the ESL and English departments. Of the six interview participants, four related no collaboration or minimal collaboration, one related some collaboration, and one related a strong effort on the part of the English department to collaborate with the ESL department. Of those interviewed, three ESL instructors and two English instructors said there were discussions within their department, but only one ESL instructor and one English instructor had collaborated with an instructor outside their department.
Major Finding 2: Opportunities for collaboration. Survey and interview participants perceived a positive impact regarding opportunities to collaborate. Those surveyed perceived a positive impact in regard to ESL transition into composition classes and in aiding teaching practice. Out of a possible 4.0 scale, ratings for professional development opportunities easing ESL transition to mainstream composition classes were as follows: The English 101 instructor rating was 3.07 and the ESL instructor rating was 3.33. Anything within the 3.0 range shows interest is in the good and above average range. ESL faculty perceived more of an increase in student learning than English teachers did, which makes sense, because ESL instructors in particular are aware of the learning needs of ESL students and how those learning needs differ from native speakers. ESL instructors would be looking forward and preparing students for their next step, whereas English teachers would be looking back and focusing on the skills ESL students need to develop to transition successfully into English 101.

All six interviewees agreed collaborative meetings or workshops between ESL and English 101 instructors would be beneficial, especially discussions related to ESL student learning needs, ESL students transitioning into mainstream college classes, and effective teaching strategies to foster ESL student success. Discussion topics of interest included (a) course outcomes and shared strategies, (b) difficulties students encounter when transitioning from ESL to English 101, (c) scaffolding activities so ESL students are prepared for English 101, (d) what instructors are teaching and common pedagogical approaches, (e) differences between a classroom of students who grew up speaking English and are culturally familiar with the community college system and a classroom that is predominantly international students, (f) language differences and how people
express their ideas to other cultures, and (g) creating practical tools for teaching ESL students. In the survey, on a scale of 4.0, 3.2 English 101 and ESL faculty instructors stated they would engage in collaborative professional development opportunities. All of those interviewed would participate.

**Major Finding 3: Desired frequency of collaboration.** Survey and interview participants were asked about the desired frequency of collaboration between ESL and English 101 instructors. Survey participants were given four choices: one-time event, once an academic year, once a quarter, or not at all. English instructors suggested meeting once a year, and ESL instructors suggested meeting once a quarter. Of the six faculty interviewed, two participants (one ESL instructor and one English instructor) stated the faculty in the two departments should meet regularly and work on projects together, two participants (one ESL instructor and one English instructor) stated collaboration between departments should happen two times per quarter, and two faculty (one ESL instructor and one English instructor) stated it should occur quarterly. Thus, the interviewees supported a higher frequency of collaboration than those surveyed. Interviewees suggested the following:

1. Participant 1: The faculty retreat at the beginning of academic year could be a good time and place for a collaborative workshop for ESL and English faculty.

2. Participant 1: Collaborative discussions or activities could be built into division meetings, which occur quarterly. This would allow associate faculty to be paid, which would encourage participation, as an ideal model would be to hear from as many voices as possible.
3. Participant 1: The administration could request more collaboration as a powerful way to show support.

4. Participant 3: The ideal frequency would be to meet twice a quarter: in the beginning to set goals and at the end to see if goals were met.

5. Participant 4: It would be more beneficial to have a smaller faculty group that met two times a quarter rather than trying to get the entire faculty from both departments together. This smaller group could meet twice a quarter.

6. Participant 6: A contextualized course combining ESL and English could be offered.

**Research Questions 2 and 3**

Research Question 2 was: What do community college ESL instructors perceive as barriers to collaborating with English 101 instructors in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?

Research Question 3 was: What do community college English 101 instructors perceive as barriers to collaborating with ESL instructors in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?

Survey participants were asked to identify barriers to collaboration based on Kolb and Gray’s (2005) collaborative leadership model. Kolb and Gray developed the collaborative leadership model to guide six workshops during a 5-year initiative called Leadership for Institutional Change funded by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. The purpose was to develop collaborative models for higher education to address the
changing culture of the institutions. The following list relates the obstacles in the same order in which they were prioritized in Kolb and Gray’s study: (a) missing or unclear goals, (b) individuals not pulling their weight, (c) lack of time, (d) lack of resources, (e) loss of vision, (f) lack of a point person, (g) talk instead of action, (h) dysfunctional alliances, (i) lack of collaborative skills, (j) logistics, (k) frustration with the process, (l) individual agendas, (m) need for more student involvement, (n) need for more resource people to conduct project, (o) alignment of faculty interests and priorities, (p) funding, (q) timing in academic calendar, (r) community resistance to new ideas, and (s) turf battles among participants.

**Major Finding 1: Barriers to collaboration.** Those surveyed reported lack of time was the main barrier for English 101 instructors. ESL instructors rated time as a 3.11 out of 4.0, and English instructors rated time as a 3.64 out of 4. Five of the six participants interviewed stated time was a factor that hindered collaboration. Lack of resources and funding were also a concern for English 101 instructors. ESL instructors perceived lack of resources and funding as the primary barriers with lack of time, individual agendas, alignment of faculty interests and priorities, and turf battles among participants as secondary concerns.

In the survey, the number of barriers ESL instructors related was higher than the number of barriers English composition instructors related. ESL instructors rated time, resources, talk instead of action, individual agendas, alignment of faculty interests and priorities, funding, and turf battles among participants above a 3.0 on a 4.0 scale. English 101 instructors rated time, resources, and funding above a 3.0 on a 4.0 scale.
Major Finding 2: Barriers align with barriers identified in collaborative leadership model. The six interviewees related the following barriers, and they are presented here in the order in which they were prioritized in Kolb and Gray’s (2005) study:

1. Lack of time. Faculty are busy taking care of their classes, participating in departmental meetings and committee meetings, and fulfilling other expectations coming from the administration. There is a perception of workload increase on top of what faculty are already doing.

2. Timing in the academic calendar. Coordinating a meeting time and trying to get people together can be challenging.

3. Lack of a point person. There is not point person to lead the project.

4. Talk instead of action. Implementing the collaboration rather than just talking about it can be a barrier.

5. Logistics. Being in separate divisions makes meeting together more challenging. Barriers have arisen over how the college is structured, the culture of the college, and how departments have historically worked.

6. Funding. There is a question as to whether adjuncts would be paid to attend meetings or work on collaborative projects. Adjuncts might be reluctant to participate if they are not being paid.

7. Community resistance to new ideas.

Community resistance to new ideas involved the administrative process, faculty perceptions, and the inclusion of adjunct faculty. First, two participants shared thoughts on the administration process. Participant 2 related that the administrative process makes
it complicated. Participant 4 asserted this issue needs to be a priority for the administration. Second, three participants shared thoughts on faculty perception. Participant 1 stated the perception of faculty expertise in certain areas may cause faculty to be resistant to collaboration. Participant 4 said faculty have different mindsets about English and the teaching of writing. Participant 5 said the orientation of ESL faculty and English faculty is different and the approaches to teaching are different. Third, one participant shared thoughts on the inclusion of adjunct faculty. Participant 4 stated there would need to be a change in the way adjuncts are received within the college community. She stated faculty, whether tenured or adjunct, need to be on an even playing field.

**Research Questions 4 and 5**

Research Question 4 was: What do ESL instructors identify as strategies and practices that could improve collaboration with English 101 instructors in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?

Research Question 5 was: What do English 101 instructors identify as strategies and practices that could improve collaboration with ESL instructors in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?

Participants were asked to identify the characteristics of effective collaboration based on Kolb and Gray’s (2005) model. These characteristics were presented to participants in the order in which they were presented in Kolb and Gray’s study and in the order in which they were listed in all five research questions. The order is as follows:
1. Common mission
2. Collective responsibility
3. Necessary resources
4. Respectful and supportive climate
5. Awareness of group process
6. Creativity
7. Capacity to deal with conflict

Instructors were asked to what extent the following strategies would increase collaboration between ESL and English composition instructors.

**Major Finding 1: Instructor priorities.** First, in the survey, ESL instructors rated collective responsibility as the highest characteristic for effective collaboration, and English instructors rated collective responsibility as the lowest characteristic. Second, although both groups of instructors rated 6 of the 7 characteristics above a 3.0 out of a possible 4.0, there was a .3 difference, with ESL instructors’ ratings being higher overall. Survey results for ESL instructors showed a high rating for 6 of the 7 characteristics (from 3.33 to 3.67 out of a possible 4 points). ESL instructors rated collective responsibility the highest characteristic (3.67) and creativity as the lowest characteristic (2.89). English 101 instructors rated 6 of the 7 characteristics above a 3 (from 3.07 to 3.36). English 101 instructors rated respectful and supportive climate the highest characteristic (3.36), and collective responsibility as the lowest characteristic (2.86).

**Major Finding 2: Common mission.** Of the six faculty who were interviewed, common mission was rated the highest of the seven Kolb and Gray (2005) key characteristics for effective collaboration. Five of the six interview participants related
common mission as a key characteristic. Interviewees related the importance of establishing a common mission:

1. If ESL instructors understand what skills ESL students are lacking when they enter English 101, and if English instructors understood what is being taught in ESL, then together they could work on a smoother transition for ESL students.

2. Through collaboration, instructors can learn from each other’s experience.

3. One effective strategy is to build a mission statement together; this is a good way to get people in the group to buy into a common goal.

Next, interview participants identified building a respectful and supportive climate as a key characteristic for effective collaboration. One participant related the importance of trusting in the process. Also, group members could develop a contract stating how group members were going to act and how they were going to access each other, and then everyone in the group would sign in, thus committing to the process.

Interviewees shared additional ideas related to Kolb and Gray’s (2005) key characteristics:

1. To achieve collective responsibility, group members could start by sharing their resume of skills and what they bring to the group.

2. To deal with conflict, the group could determine what the consequences would be if someone in the group did not do one’s fair share of work.

If this was determined in the beginning of the group process, then something would be in place should a conflict occur.
Major Finding 3: Strategies to address barriers. The collaborative leadership model (Kolb & Gray, 2005) provides strategies to address the barriers participants have identified in this study. Table 21 aligns the collaborative leadership model (Kolb & Gray, 2005) to the obstacles survey and interview participants have experienced. In the survey, ESL instructors rated time, resources, talk instead of action, individual agendas, alignment of faculty interests and priorities, funding, and turf battles among participants above a 3.0 on a 4.0 scale. English 101 instructors rated time, resources, and funding above a 3.0 on a 4.0 scale. Interviewees related that time/schedule and community resistance to new ideas were the two factors hindering collaboration the most. In Table 21, X represents the barriers ESL survey participants rated above a 3.0, Y represents the barriers English composition survey participants rated above a 3.0, and Z represents the barriers interview participants identified at least once in the 30–45 minute, 5-question interview.

Major Finding 4: Collaborative teaching models. Interviewees shared ideas on models for collaboration: Participant 2 shared a positive experience with the collaborative teaching model, where ESL and English classes are linked, and instructors of each class share resources and align their lessons, syllabi, and outcomes. Participant 4 suggested forming a small group of ESL and English faculty working together on strategies to aid in the success of ESL students in an English 101 class. Participant 4 also suggested creating a class focused on writing at the sentence level. Participant 5 suggested collaborative workshops where ESL and English faculty can work on progressions and pathways together, lining up what’s happening in the Intensive English
program with what students will be doing when they enter their English classes.

Participant 5 also stated team teaching is an enjoyable way to collaborate.

Table 21

*Aligning Barriers and Strategies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual agendas (X)</td>
<td>Common Mission</td>
<td>Finding: Establishing a common mission for a group can address the barriers related to individual agendas and can align faculty interests and priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment of faculty interests and priorities (X)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk instead of action (X, Z)</td>
<td>Collective Responsibility</td>
<td>Finding: Requiring equal responsibility from each group member will solve the problem of individuals not pulling their weight or talking but not taking action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of resources (X, Y, Z)</td>
<td>Necessary Resources</td>
<td>Finding: For collaboration to be effective, the group needs to have adequate funding, concrete resources, time, a schedule that works for each member, and a point person or someone to take on the leadership role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding (X, Y, Z)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time (X, Y, Z)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling (Z)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a point person (Z)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community resistance to new ideas (Z)</td>
<td>Respectful and</td>
<td>Finding: Obstacles related to resistance to new ideas and turf battles can be overcome if the group sets perimeters regarding respect and support for one another and the group process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turf battles among participants (X)</td>
<td>Supportive Climate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Finding 5: Common interests.** Those surveyed were asked what they would like to see in a professional development program geared toward ESL and English 101 faculty collaboration. One strategy to improve collaboration would be to develop a professional development program based on common interests. The order of topics listed in the survey matched the order in which these topics were presented in Chapter II: rubrics, modeling, prewriting activities, collaborative writing activities, feedback, revision, writing workshops, use of writing labs, and technology as a teaching tool.
The largest difference between the two groups was in regard to collaborative writing activities. Ten of the 15 English teachers surveyed (66.7%) related they were interested in collaborative writing activities, and 3 of the 9 ESL instructors surveyed (33.3%) expressed interest. ESL instructors were interested in discussing rubrics (88.9%) and prewriting activities (77.8%). Six of 15 English instructors (40%) were interested in discussion rubrics, and 4 of 15 English instructors (26.7%) were interested in discussing prewriting activities. Neither group was interested in discussing use of writing labs or technology as a teaching tool.

Two interviewees had experience working in writing labs and expressed a definite interest in finding ways to help ESL students and to come together with teachers and discuss strategies to overcome reading and grammar struggles. Collaborative writing activities and using technology as a teaching tool were other topics of interest.

**Unexpected Findings**

Three unexpected findings emerged from this study. First, quantitative and qualitative data collection reveal minimal collaboration between ESL and English composition instructors cannot be attributed to perceived benefits. Instructors perceive a positive impact from collaboration and are willing to attend professional development workshops if opportunities were made available. That instructors show interest in collaboration and see value in it supports a need for professional development workshops for ESL and English composition faculty. The extensive list of barriers research participants identified clarify why collaboration has been minimal in the past, but aligning the collaborative leadership model (Kolb & Gray, 2005) with the barriers identified in the study reveal a clear pathway for overcoming the barriers.
Another unexpected finding was that more adjunct English faculty were willing to participate in this study than there were full-time English faculty. Six full-time English instructors participated in the survey, and nine adjunct, part-time English instructors participated in the study. The researcher requested interviews from three full-time English faculty, and two full-time faculty said no, and one did not respond. The researcher could have continued to request full-time English faculty participation but found three adjunct English faculty who had been with their English departments for over 5 years and taught English 101 on a regular basis.

The third unexpected finding relates to the COVID-19 pandemic. Beginning in spring quarter of 2020, Washington state community colleges moved classes online (Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, 2021). It was through interviews with the ESL instructors that it was discovered just how much ESL student enrollment had dropped and the effect that had had on the programs in these colleges with 2 of the 3 colleges laying off adjunct faculty due to the loss in enrollment and fewer class offerings. Also emphasized through the interview sessions was the lack of collaboration between all faculty, making it more difficult for ESL and English composition instructors to collaborate.

**Enrollment**

Interview Participant 1 said, “It is harder with the pandemic. Everything has shifted. Our international numbers have plummeted.” Participant 5 stated, in the past, the ESL and Intensive English program was robust; however, the program had fluctuated over the years, and before the pandemic, the ESL and Intensive English programs were
on their way down. She stated international student enrollment as a whole had gone down, but it was the ESL students who had really gone down.

**Collaboration**

Interview Participant 1 stated there had been minimal collaboration outside of all-campus meetings, partially due to the pandemic, “especially during the first 6 months when people were trying to stay afloat and make a successful transition to all online and help the students do the same.” Interview Participant 4 shared, due to the pandemic, she had little communication with any faculty members for the last year. Prior to the pandemic, as an English 101 instructor, she never met with ESL instructors. Participant 6 said collaboration had been especially difficult during the last year. He said with the pandemic everyone is feeling overwhelmed and less willing to “go the extra mile” as they might if they were on campus. However, he added:

> They want to start bringing back more and more foreign exchange students because they are the bread and butter. . . . I have a feeling those are going to be the first group of people they try to go back and grab once the pandemic is more in hand, so if that’s the case, they need to be better prepared than they ever have been.

Even though community colleges in Washington state experienced drops in enrollment during the pandemic, and even though faculty did not have as many opportunities to collaborate when working from a distance, the pandemic had little impact on the study, as the survey and interview questions addressed prior, not present, experiences. If anything, the pandemic created time for reflection on past practices, which can help when planning for the future. At the time of this study, community
colleges in Washington state were reopening for in-person learning, and faculty and students were returning to campuses.

**Conclusions**

Several conclusions can be drawn from the findings of this study, which explores the frequency and opportunities for collaboration, barriers to collaboration, and strategies to improve collaboration in relation to the collaborative leadership model (Kolb & Gray, 2005). This model, developed specifically for higher education, has been applied to ESL and English composition instructor collaboration at the community colleges in Washington state. The focus of this specific study was how collaboration can aid instructors in addressing ESL learning needs as they transition from the ESL program to mainstream English composition courses.

**Conclusion 1: Frequency and Opportunities for Collaboration**

Data gathered from the survey and interview establish a need for and an interest in collaboration between ESL and English composition faculty. The literature supports this as well. Harrison (2014) studied students transitioning from a community college ESL program to a first-year English composition course and advocated for collaboration between departments. A need for professional development opportunities (Andrews, 2008) was established because (a) formally structured ESL-English faculty workshops had not been offered at these three colleges; (b) discussion about ESL learning needs and transition between faculty between departments has been minimal; (c) survey ratings showed both ESL and English faculty perceived a positive outcome from professional development opportunities; and (d) survey and interview data revealed an interest in participating, an interest correlating with need. Andrews (2008) claimed that sharing
strategies and best practices could foster a creative, productive, and position learning community among faculty and that collaboration is an effective tool to increase faculty understanding of students’ needs, which can result in enhanced student learning. Chandler (2011) explained professional development programs provide faculty with instructional tools they can choose from to best meet varied student needs.

**Conclusion 2: Barriers**

Based on responses from the survey and interviews, the researcher concluded lack of time is the key obstacle to collaboration between ESL and English composition instructors. Lack of time was also one of the top four obstacles Kolb and Gray (2005) reported from the LINC initiative. Interview Participant 1 said faculty are busy with their classes, meetings, and other college obligations. Interview Participant 4 shared adding in one more obligation is overwhelming. Interview Participant 6 shared there could be a perception of workload increase, and if an instructor is stretched thin on time, the idea of doing one more thing could be overwhelming. For faculty to invest time into a workshop, they must see the value in it. In Kolb and Gray’s (2005) study, time is seen as a necessary resource, and the authors stated a team cannot accomplish its goal if it lacks an essential element; thus, collaborators need to “identify common, predictable problems that impede their effectiveness in achieving collaborative goals” (p. 251).

In addition, based on the interview data, the research concluded the pandemic added an additional barrier to collaboration between ESL and English composition faculty. As of March 2020, community colleges in Washington state, as well as colleges and universities across the globe, moved classes online. Class, department, or college meetings occurred through online platforms. Colleges during the pandemic struggled
with enrollment declines and were overwhelmed with other challenges related to the pandemic. Trying to implement a professional development opportunity between ESL and English composition instructors would have had to happen online. Because formal professional development opportunities between ESL and English composition faculty were not happening pre-pandemic, to make it happen during a pandemic, when student enrollment and ESL numbers were declining, would have been difficult, although not impossible. Meetings of this kind would need to be supported by the administration and implemented by a point person.

**Conclusion 3: Strategies to Improve Collaboration**

The collaborative leadership model (Kolb & Gray, 2005) provides strategies to address the barriers both survey and interview participants identified in this study. Establishing a common mission (Strategy 1) can address barriers related to individual agendas and can align faculty interests and priorities. Requiring equal responsibility from each group member (Strategy 2) will solve the problem of individuals not pulling their weight or talking but not taking action. For collaboration to be effective, the group needs to have adequate funding, concrete resources, time, a schedule that works for each member, and a point person or someone to take on the leadership role (Strategy 3). Obstacles related to resistance to new ideas and turf battles can be overcome if the group sets parameters regarding respect and support for one another and the group process (Strategy 4).

**Implication for Action**

Implications for faculty collaboration between community college ESL and English composition instructors are grounded in this study’s significance. Community
colleges are at the forefront of introducing international and immigrant students to the U.S. education system. ESL students are a diverse group of students with different backgrounds, goals, and learning needs. Crandall and Sheppard (2004) noted it is difficult to develop educational programs to meet the needs of such a diverse group of learners. One hurdle ESL students face is transitioning from the ESL program into mainstream classes. English composition classes are the focus of the study, because writing is a core skill students need to be successful in college. Gil (2013) noted ESL students are not prepared for mainstream composition courses, and a gap in writing instruction exists between ESL and English 101. Collaboration between ESL and English faculty will help ESL students when they transition into English composition courses. Harrison (2014) studied students transitioning from a community college ESL program to a first-year English composition course. She stated the ESL and English department should communicate regularly to prepare students “for the types of literacy tasks they might encounter in for-credit courses” (Harrison, 2014, p. 193). Harrison (2014) found English 101 instructors needed more training related to multilingual classrooms and advocated for collaboration between these two faculty groups. She suggested cross training composition instructors in both ESL and composition pedagogy.

**Implication 1**

*Community colleges should use these findings to develop collaborative training programs for ESL and English composition faculty engaged in teaching ESL students.*

The role of community college is “to provide open access to all individuals in a community, to provide English as second language instruction, and to provide means for students to transfer to four-year postsecondary institutions” (Lee, 2014, p. 19). Elliot-
Nelson (2011) stated community colleges help immigrants assimilate to the U.S. culture and is the primary institution from which immigrants learn English, thus providing a gateway to higher education. Mellow (2000) stated the mission of community colleges is tied to a nationwide campaign to expand higher education. This is seen in the mission statements collected from the three colleges in this study. The mission statements at all three colleges included the word “diverse.” Edmonds College aims to strengthen its diverse community, Olympic College enriches its diverse community, and Peninsula College educates its diverse population. Johnson (2012) stated colleges are building globalization verbiage into their mission statements because internal and external forces are “pushing universities to embrace a more universal perspective” (p. 8). Johnson (2012) found administrative engagement and proactive policies were needed to recruit and support international students. His findings related the importance of collaboration between administration, faculty, and students.

**Implication 2**

*Educators, working in collaboration with one another, should use these findings to improve the methods used to meet the learning needs of ESL students. Student needs should be paramount to all educators.*

Without students, who are attending community college to fulfill their learning needs, there would not be a need for college or faculty. ESL students, like all students, are the customers the college is meant to serve and whom the faculty are hired to serve. The student body at a community college is diverse, and the vision statements of all three of these colleges refer to either transforming lives or embarking on a life-enhancing journey. International students constitute 5.5% of all students in U.S. higher education.
(IIE, 2021). Raufman et al. (2019) stated, “A growing proportion of community college students across the nation are English learners (ELs), or students who consider a language other than English their dominant language and who need support to access standard curricula in English” (p. 1), but “there is little direct data on the numbers of ELs enrolled at colleges” (p. 2). It is important for educators to identify and address the learning needs of ESL students.

Both Elliot-Nelson (2011) and Crandall and Sheppard (2004) addressed the challenges educators face when working with diverse groups of students. Elliot-Nelson stated ESL students come from a variety of cultures with different goals and learning needs. They include refugees, immigrants, permanent residents, and international students, and attend community college for a variety of reasons (Crandall & Sheppard, 2004). Vifansi (2002) further explained the diversity of ESL students by breaking them into two subgroups: international ESL students and U.S. ESL students. These two subgroups mirror the organizational structure in place at the three community colleges in this study. All three colleges in this study offer two tracks: one for international ESL students (referred to as Intensive English) and one for U.S. ESL students.

Vifanski (2002) explained the learning needs of immigrant and international students are different just as the learning needs of ESL students and native English-speaking students are different. This is why it is important for educators in mainstream classes to focus on learning needs, not just target needs (outcomes determined by department faculty and deans).
Implication 3

Community college ESL and English composition faculty should use these findings to develop ways to streamline the transition from ESL to English 101.

One of the hurdles international community college students face when pursuing an education in the United States is the transition from an ESL program to English composition classes. Gil (2013) and Harrison (2014) stated faculty collaboration can aid in ESL student transition. Gil claimed there is a gap between the ESL program and English 101 classes when students transition from one to the other. She indicated aligning syllabi would help to create a smoother transition for international students. This could be done through faculty collaboration.

Simon (2006) found ESL program structure had a lot to do with a successful transition. If the ESL program focused on multiple skills, was integrated within the English department, and was comprehensive (not separated into various levels), then the transition into mainstream community college classes was more successful. Simon (2006) stated the sooner ESL students mainstream, the more likely they were to succeed in community college classes. She asserted that, in truncated systems, the “initial placement affects ESL students’ mainstreaming” (Simon, 2006, p. 21) and that comprehensive programs build a stronger pipeline.

The ESL programs in the three community colleges in this study focus on multiple skills (reading, writing, listening, speaking), but they are not integrated within the English departments, and they are truncated, meaning they are separated into levels. Students have to move through the levels before moving into English 101. Moving into English 101 is an important step for two reasons: (a) English 101 is a for-credit class, and
student can now move forward in attaining a degree; and (b) the focus of English 101 is on writing, and writing is a core skill needed for college success. Because the departments are separate, collaboration between ESL and English faculty is needed to build that stronger pipeline.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

This explanatory sequential mixed-method study examined the collaboration between ESL and English instructors at the community college level, explored the barriers between the two groups of instructors, and described the strategies and practices that could improve collaboration. Collaboration between the two groups was tied to addressing ESL learning needs as ESL students transition from the ESL program to mainstream English composition courses. Findings of this study show collaboration between these two faculty groups has been minimal, and Kolb and Gray’s (2005) collaborative leadership model provides strategies to address the barriers survey and interview participants identified in this study. Based on these results, the researcher recommends further research on the following:

**Recommendation 1**

*Replicate this study focusing on other populations. A study could focus on ESL faculty and compare the responses of ESL faculty who only teach U.S. ESL students (Vifanski, 2002) and ESL faculty who only teach international students in a separate program often called Intensive English. A study could focus on adjunct English faculty, since adjunct faculty make up over half of the community college English composition faculty workforce (American Association of University Professors [AAUP], 2001).
The mission statements at all three colleges in this study include the word “diverse.” This study has shown the diverse nature of student and faculty populations in community colleges, all intersecting to share a teaching and learning experience. In the ESL program, there are international students and then what Vifanski (2002) referred to as U.S. ESL students. In addition, when ESL students mainstream into for-credit classes, they become part of a larger, diverse body of native-speaking students, who have varied life experiences and are part of various subcultures within the United States. When ESL students mainstream, they become part of the global classroom.

One thing that stood out in this research was the diversity not only of the student group involved in this study but also of the instructor group involved in this study. The three colleges in this study offered two tracks: one for international students (Intensive English) and one for residential students who need more English—refugees, immigrants, citizens, and asylees. However, there were differences in how each ESL program was structured, and in the students and classes ESL instructors taught. Simon (2006) discussed ESL program structure and how structure affected ESL student transition.

In addition, English faculty represent a diverse group of individuals. There are full-time and adjunct faculty, and English 101 is frequently taught by adjunct faculty—in fact, more often taught by adjunct faculty than full-time faculty. The Coalition on the Academic Workforce (CAW) conducted a study on part-time faculty in the humanities and social sciences in 1999 and reported, “The smallest proportion of full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty were reported by freestanding English composition programs” (AAUP, 2001, p. 8). It would be particularly important to involve adjunct faculty who regularly teach English 101 in discussions regarding the college readiness of ESL
students in English 101 classes, as they make up over half of the community college
English composition faculty workforce and teach a majority of the English 101 classes
(AAUP, 2001). Murray (2019) stated 73% of higher education faculty are part time.
Depending on the college, sometimes adjuncts are invited to English department
meetings, and sometimes they are not. Sometimes they are encouraged to attend, but not
required, and sometimes they are compensated, but sometimes not. It is interesting to
think about an English department meeting, where adjuncts are not invited, discussing
ESL student needs and college readiness when transitioning into English 101, when most
of the English 101 instructors are not there to add their voice to the mix. If there are
English department meetings or professional development workshops on this topic, invitations to adjunct English 101 faculty should be primary, not secondary.

There are many variables to diversity in the community college system. No one
student’s or instructor’s experience will be the same. Teaching and learning depends on
one moment in time, one course, one student’s perspective and experience, the peer
experience, the instructor, the course, the department structure, and the system that
houses the department. Any research done on the diverse nature of the teaching and
learning process in community colleges would be valuable. It might be interesting to
interview ESL students in particular on their individual experiences when transitioning
from ESL to English 101. Their perspective could be helpful in tailoring the program to
meet ESL student needs. Further research could be done on the different ways in which
ESL programs are structured at community colleges and their effectiveness in relation to
ESL student progression into mainstream courses. It would also be helpful to explore the
adjunct English instructor role in educating ESL students in English 101.
Recommendation 2

Identify and create improved methods of collaboration for ESL and English faculty.

Future research could be done on nontraditional collaborative opportunities between ESL and English composition instructors as a way to build partnerships to enhance ESL students’ learning experiences. In this way, collaboration would be built into the system, which may prove to be a more effective way to get instructors to commit to the collaborative process. Examples could include implementing learning communities, linked classes, and team teaching. Another example is drawn from Harrison (2014), who found English 101 instructors needed more training related to multilingualistic classrooms. She suggested cross-training composition instructors in both ESL and composition pedagogy. Anderson (2014) related a possible case study experiment between an English 101 class in the United States paired with students in a similar course in a different country. Instructors from both schools planned the syllabus, and students from both countries met online at the same time and shared online activities.

Concluding Remarks and Reflections

When this research project started in 2013, there was an influx of international students coming to the United States to pursue college degrees. Open Door data from the IIE (2021) showed there were 125,973 international students participated in Intensive English programs in the United States in 2013. This started to decline in 2016, due to the 2017 travel ban and the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic. When the travel ban was issued, nearly half of U.S. educational institutions saw drops in applications received from international students. Forty-eight college and university presidents in the United States
wrote to President Trump relating, “American higher education has benefited
tremendously from this country’s long history of embracing immigrants around the
world” (as cited in Johnson, 2018, p. 416). In addition, the American Council of
Education wrote to the Secretary of State John Kelly stating, “International exchange is a
core value and strength of American higher education” (as cited in Johnson, 2018, p.
416). The U.S. ESL student population (Vifanski, 2002) dropped due to the pandemic,
because of travel difficulties (Johnson, 2018), the uncertain economy, and because some
students did not have access to the internet to take online courses (Washington State
Board for Community and Technical Colleges, 2021). The travel ban was lifted in 2021,
and some travel bans related to COVID-19 pandemic were also lifted. This is a hopeful
sign for future international exchange between countries in regard to international
students, refugees, immigrants, and permanent residents.

The community college role in educating a diverse population that is inclusive of
ESL students has not changed. Numerical trends will rise and fall, but that does not
change the basic premise of this study. Bilingual education has been part of U.S. society
since the first colonies settled on its shores. As immigrant and international students
continue to seek U.S. or foreign shores, community colleges in the United States will
need to continue to embrace students for several reasons: (a) they bring diverse
perspectives into the classroom, (b) they improve the educational experiences for all
students, and (c) they build friendships with people all over the world.

This study has focused on the learning needs and transitioning of ESL students in
relation to faculty collaboration. Faculty in community colleges often work in isolation
of one another, but it is important that they come together and find ways to enhance the
learning of this population of their students. It is only through collaboration that these valuable teaching and learning experiences can be shared. Instructors are the ultimate learners, and to pass on that wisdom to others is a gift.
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APPENDIX B - PARTICIPANT’S BILL OF RIGHTS

BRANDMAN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

Research Participant’s Bill of Rights

Any person who is requested to consent to participate as a subject in an experiment, or who is requested to consent on behalf of another, has the following rights:

1. To be told what the study is attempting to discover
2. To be told what will happen in the study and whether any of the procedures, drugs or devices are different from what would be used in standard practice.
3. To be told about the risks, side effects or discomforts of the things that may happen to him/her.
4. To be told if he/she can expect any benefit from participating and, if so, what the benefits might be.
5. To be told what other choices he/she has and how they may be better or worse than being in the study.
6. To be allowed to ask any questions concerning the study both before agreeing to be involved and during the course of the study.
7. To be told what sort of medical treatment is available if any complications arise.
8. To refuse to participate at all before or after the study I started without any adverse effects.
9. To receive a copy of the signed and dated consent form.
10. To be free of pressures when considering whether he/she wishes to agree to be in the study.

If at any time you have questions regarding a research study, you should ask the researchers to answer them. You also may contact the Brandman University Institutional Review Board, which is concerned with the protection of volunteers in research projects. The Brandman University Institutional Review Board may be contacted either by telephoning the Office of Academic Affairs at (949) 341-9937 or by writing the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Brandman University, 16355 Laguna Canyon Road, Irvine, CA, 92618

Brandman University IRB      Adopted      November 2013
Dear _____________:

My name is Lynn Hovde, and I am a Doctoral Student at Brandman University. My dissertation is on community college ESL and English composition faculty collaboration. The purpose of this study is to examine the level of collaboration between community college ESL and English composition instructors, and to explore the perceptions that ESL and English instructors report regarding barriers to collaboration and strategies to improve collaboration.

I am writing to invite _________ (college and department) to participate in this study, which has been approved by the Brandman University Institutional Review Board. I am interested in surveying all ESL and English composition instructor at __________ College. The attached survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete.

Following the survey, I would like to ask one ESL faculty and one English composition faculty on your campus to volunteer to participate in a one-on-one, Zoom interview that will take approximately 30-45 minutes.

This research project would occur between March and April of 2021. Your departmental faculty’s participation in this study is strictly voluntary, and participants are free to withdraw at any time. All survey answers and interview response will be anonymous and confidential. The recordings of interviews will be placed into a password protected file.

In addition to surveying and interviewing faculty from your school, I am surveying and interviewing faculty from two other Washington state community colleges, as well as asking one other Washington state community college to participate in a pilot study. By having more than one institution take part in this study, I hope to be able to more thoroughly examine the perceptions that both ESL and English composition faculty identify as barriers to collaboration as well as strategies to improve collaboration. My hope is that this information will be valuable to all ESL and English composition instructors who are working with ESL students who are transitioning from one program to the next.

Thank you for taking the time to read my request. I hope that your institution will participate in the study.

Please feel free to contact me at hovde@brandman.edu.

Sincerely,

Lynn Hovde
APPENDIX D – LETTER OF INVITATION TO RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

Dear _____________:

My name is Lynn Hovde, and I am a Doctoral Student at Brandman University. My dissertation is on community college ESL and English composition faculty collaboration. The purpose of this study is to examine the level of collaboration between community college ESL and English composition instructors, and to explore the perceptions that ESL and English instructors report regarding barriers to collaboration and strategies to improve collaboration.

I am writing to invite you to participate in this study, which has been approved by the Brandman University Institutional Review Board. I am interested in surveying all ESL and English composition instructor at ________ College. The survey consists of 9 close-ended questions and will take approximately 10 minutes to complete.

Your participation in this study is strictly voluntary, and you are free to withdraw at any time. All survey answers will be anonymous and confidential. No personally identifiable information will be collected and responses will be aggregated with instructors across multiple community colleges with your response in any reports of the data.

In addition to surveying faculty from your school, I am surveying faculty from two other Washington state community colleges. By having more than one institution take part in this study, I hope to be able to more thoroughly examine the perceptions that both ESL and English composition faculty identify as barriers to collaboration as well as strategies to improve collaboration. My hope is that this information will be valuable to all ESL and English composition instructors who are working with ESL students who are transitioning from one program to the next.

Thank you for taking the time to read my request. I hope that you will consider participating in the study.

Please feel free to contact me at hovde@brandman.edu.

Sincerely,

Lynn Hovde
APPENDIX E – EMAIL REQUEST TO INTERVIEWEES

Dear ___________.

My name is Lynn Hovde, and I am a Doctoral Student at Brandman University. My dissertation is on community college ESL and English composition faculty collaboration.

I am writing to invite you to participate in this study, which has been approved by the Brandman University Institutional Review Board. I am interested in interviewing one ESL and one English composition instructor at _________ College. You were selected because of your experience as a ______ faculty. The interview consists of five open-ended questions and will take approximately 30-45 minutes. Because of the current pandemic, the interview would occur through Zoom in April 2021.

Your participation in this study is strictly voluntary, and participants are free to withdraw at any time. All interview responses will be anonymous and confidential. The recordings of interviews will be placed into a password protected file and destroyed once the study is complete.

In addition to interviewing one ESL and one English composition faculty from your school, I am interviewing one ESL and one English composition faculty from two other Washington state community colleges. By having more than one institution take part in this study, I hope to be able to more thoroughly examine the perceptions that both ESL and English composition faculty have regarding collaboration. My hope is that this information will be valuable to all ESL and English composition instructors who are working with ESL students who are transitioning from one program to the next.

Thank you for your time and for considering my request to interview you.

I look forward to hearing back to see if this is something that you will do.

Sincerely,

Lynn Hovde
APPENDIX F – RESEARCH PARTICIPANT INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Participant: _______________________________________________________

Principal Researcher: Lynn Hovde, Doctoral Candidate at Brandman University

Title of Project: Community College ESL and English Composition Faculty Collaboration

I consent to participate in a study on community college ESL and English composition faculty collaboration by Lynn Hovde as part of her doctoral research at Brandman University. The purpose of this study is to examine the level of collaboration between community college ESL and English composition instructors, and to explore the perceptions that ESL and English instructors report regarding barriers to collaboration and strategies to improve collaboration.

My involvement in the research will consist of taking a five-question interview. My participation is completely voluntary. I may withdraw from the study at any time. I further understand that there are no known risks involved in the participation. Confidentiality is ensured. I understand that the data collected will be stored in a secure location.

The study has been explained to me, and the researcher Lynn Hovde has provided me with her phone number (360-316-6514) and invited me to ask questions.

Signature _____________________________ Date _______________________
APPENDIX G – SURVEY

Welcome to this web-based survey on Community College ESL and English Composition Faculty Collaboration.

This brief survey is being conducted to examine the level of collaboration between community college ESL and English composition instructors, and to explore their perceptions regarding barriers to collaboration and strategies to improve collaboration.

This brief survey being emailed to you should take 5-10 minutes to complete. Your participation is voluntary and your responses will be kept confidential. No personally identifiable information will be collected and responses will be aggregated with instructors across multiple community colleges with your response in any reports of the data.

If you have any questions or comments about the survey, please feel free to contact Lynn Hovde, the researcher, by email at hovde@brandman.edu or by phone at 360-316-6514. By continuing to complete the survey, you acknowledge you reviewed the informed consent form, had all your questions answered, and are volunteering to participate in this study.

Clicking the box below signifies that you have read, understand, and agree to participate in this survey. The survey will not open unless consent is given.

1. Which of the following best describes your role?
   - Full-time community college ESL instructor
   - Adjunct community college ESL instructor
   - Full-time community college English Composition instructor
   - Adjunct community college English Composition instructor

2. How many years you have been teaching in your discipline?
   - 1-5
   - 6-10
   - 11-15
   - 16-20
   - Over 20

3. The following questions relate to the frequency and opportunities for collaboration between ESL (English Second Language) and EC (English Composition) instructors at your community college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not At All</th>
<th>A Little</th>
<th>Quite A Bit</th>
<th>To A Great Extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How often do ESL and EC instructors collaborate at your college?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. How often are collaborative workshops focused on the learning needs of ESL students offered at the college?

3. How often are collaborative workshops focused on the transition of ESL students to mainstream composition courses offered at the college?

4. How often have you discussed the learning needs of ESL students with another instructor at your college?

5. How often have you discussed the transition of ESL students to mainstream composition courses with another instructor at your college?

6. How often do you engage in conversations regarding ESL learning needs and transition with a colleague in your department (ESL or English)?

7. How often do you engage in conversations regarding ESL learning needs and transition with a colleague outside your department (ESL or English)?

4. The following questions refer to perceptions regarding collaboration between ESL and EC instructors at your college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
<th>A Little</th>
<th>Quite A Bit</th>
<th>To A Great Extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In your opinion, how likely will professional development opportunities focused on ESL-EC instructor collaboration increase student learning?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In your opinion, how likely will professional development opportunities focused on ESL-EC instructor collaboration ease ESL student transition into mainstream English composition classes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In your opinion, how likely will professional development opportunities focused on ESL-EC instructor collaboration aid you in your teaching practice?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. How likely are you to attend a professional development workshop that focuses on the collaboration between ESL and EC instructors?

5. If there was an option to attend an online synchronous workshop focused on ESL-EC instructor collaboration, how likely would you be to participate?

6. If there was an option to share best practices in discussion boards in an online platform like Canvas, how likely would you be to participate?

5. To what extent do the following factors hinder ESL-EC instructor collaboration at the college for which you teach?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
<th>A Little</th>
<th>Quite A Bit</th>
<th>To A Great Extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missing or unclear goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals not pulling their weight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a point person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk instead of action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dysfunctional alliances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of collaborative skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustration with the process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual agendas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for more student involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for more resource people to conduct project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment of faculty interests and priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing in academic calendar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community resistance to new ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turf battles among participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The Collaborative Leadership Model (Kolb & Gray, 2005) identifies seven key characteristics to effective collaboration. Those seven characteristics are listed below. To what extent would the following strategies increase collaboration between ESL and EC instructors at the college for which you teach?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not At All</th>
<th>A Little</th>
<th>Quite A Bit</th>
<th>To A Great Extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectful and supportive climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of group process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity to deal with conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Which of the following topics would you like to see in a professional development program geared toward ESL-EC instructor collaboration? Check all that apply.
   • Rubrics
   • Modeling
   • Prewriting Activities
   • Collaborative Writing Activities
   • Feedback
   • Revision
   • Writing Workshops
   • Use of Writing Labs
   • Technology as a Teaching Tool
   • Other

8. How often would you like to see a professional development program geared toward ESL and EC instructor collaboration?
   • One-time event
   • Once an academic year
   • Once a quarter
   • More often
   • Not at all

9. Would you be willing to participate in a follow-up interview? If so, please provide an email below.
APPENDIX H – INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Introduction
I appreciate your willingness to participate in the interview today. The purpose of this study is to examine collaboration between ESL and English Composition instructors at community colleges. Your participation will benefit the research regarding ESL and English instructor collaboration for improved student outcomes.

All information shared in this interview is confidential. A pseudonym for all participants will be used in this study. There are no foreseeable physical, psychological, or social risks involved with your participation. The researcher will protect confidentiality by keeping identifying letter codes, audio recordings, and transcribed documents in a locked file. Both the documents and audio recording will later be destroyed.

If you do not feel comfortable answering a question, you may skip it. I will be recording this interview as well as taking notes. It should only take about 30-45 minutes. After I record and transcribe the data, I will send it to you via electronic mail so that you can check to make sure that I have accurately captured your thoughts and ideas.

Any questions you have, may be answered by the researcher, myself, Lynn Hovde. I can be reached by email at hovde@brandman.edu or by phone at 360-316-6514.

Did you receive the Informed Consent and Brandman Bill of Rights I sent you via email? Do you have any questions or need clarification about either document?

Do you have any questions or concerns before we start?

The interview questions are based on the following research questions that were used to address the purpose of this study:

The following research questions were used to address the purpose of this study:

6. How do community college ESL and English 101 instructors perceive their level of collaboration with one another in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?

7. What do community college ESL instructors perceive as barriers to collaborating with English 101 instructors in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?

8. What do community college English 101 instructors perceive as barriers to collaborating with ESL instructors in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?
9. What do ESL instructors identify as strategies and practices that could improve collaboration with English 101 instructors in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?

10. What do English 101 instructors identify as strategies and practices that could improve collaboration with ESL instructors in the areas of common mission, collective responsibility, necessary resources, respectful and supportive climate, awareness of group process, creativity, and capacity to deal with conflict?

**Interview Question 1:** How would you describe the collaboration between ESL and English 101 instructors at your community college?

- How often do all the staff from both departments get together?
- Who leads or facilitates the collaboration?
- Are all instructors required to participate? If not, how are the participants selected?
- Describe any discussion at faculty meetings or collaborative workshops that focused on the learning needs of ESL students and their transition from the ESL program to English 101.

**Interview Question 2:** What do you think the ideal frequency of collaboration should be between the two departments?

- Can you describe a time when the ideal situation occurred and why it was successful?

**Interview Question 3:** Describe the barriers to collaboration between ESL and English 101 staff.

- What factors limited the ability of ESL and English 101 composition instructors to collaborate?
- Were the barriers you describe imposed by the staff or administrative procedures?

**Interview Question 4:** What strategies and practices could improve collaboration between ESL and English 101 instructors?

- Describe the ideal situation for this to occur.
- Has this been experienced before and what were the results?
- What can the administration, departments, or instructors do to increase collaboration?

**Interview Question 5:** Is there anything you would like to add or contribute to this topic?
APPENDIX I – FIELD TEST FEEDBACK FORM SURVEY

1. Has the researcher reduced the burden of length and complexity by limiting the questions and by constructing questions the participants can easily answer?
   - Yes
   - No
   If no, please explain.

2. Do these questions align with the research questions?
   - Yes
   - No
   If no, please explain.

3. Has the researcher built a sense of trust in the validity of the study through the language and tone used in the survey?
   - Yes
   - No
   If no, please explain.

4. Is there anything that the researcher should change?

5. Is there anything the researcher should add?
APPENDIX J – FIELD TEST FEEDBACK FORM INTERVIEW

1. Did the researcher create a comfortable setting for the interviewee?

2. Was the length of time too long, too short, or just right?

3. Were the open-ended questions effective in getting the interviewee to share his or her ideas openly.

4. How was the pace of the interview? Was there a flow when transitioning from one question to the next? Was the energy high throughout, meaning no lulls where the interviewee could be thinking “I wish this was over”?

5. Were the questions clear?